

1st Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 21 July 2010 at the Conference Room
on 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman
Mrs Carrie Lam	Vice-Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Attending on behalf of Business Environment Council
Prof Becky Loo	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Clement Kwok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Ann So	
Miss Joey Lam	Acting Commissioner for Tourism
Ms Carolina Yip	Acting Commissioner for Transport
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Bobby Cheng	Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)
Mr Francis Liu	Acting Director of Marine

Mr Jimmy Leung
Ms Maisie Chan

Director of Planning
Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas Chow
Ms Fannie Kong
Mr Chris Fung
Mr C K Hon
Mr Raymond Wong

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Acting Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, Development Bureau
Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Agenda Item 2

Mrs Avia Lai
Ms Helen Kwan
Mr Martin Wong
Dr Stephen Davies
Ms Catalina Chor
Mr Ian Brownlee
Mr Nick Glave
Ms Catherine Or

Principal Assistant Secretary (Culture)2, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Assistant Secretary (Culture)2, HAB
Assistant Secretary (Culture)2 (des.), HAB
Museum Director, Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM)
Executive Manager and Curator, HKMM
Planning Consultant, Masterplan Ltd
P&T Architects & Engineers
P&T Architects & Engineers

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Stephen Tang
Mr Anthony Lo

Head/Kai Tak Office, CEDD
Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1 (Kowloon), CEDD

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Fiona Lung
Mr Roy Li

Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD
Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, PlanD

For AOB

Mrs Claudia Cheng

Principal Information Officer/Creative

Absent with Apologies

Ms Lily Chow

Action

Welcoming message

1.1 **The Chairman** welcomed all to the 1st meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission). He said that the Commission comprised members from a wide spectrum of backgrounds and expertise, including non-official individual and organisation members from professional institutes, civic and environmental groups and the business sector; as well as senior government officials, including the Secretary for Development as the Vice-Chairman. He appreciated that the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) had laid down a very good foundation in harbourfront enhancement work. The Commission's task was to deliver on the primary objective of enhancing the harbourfront for public enjoyment. He looked forward to working closely with all Members, as well as the community and other stakeholders, towards realising the vision of creating a world class harbourfront.

1.2 **Mrs Carrie Lam** also welcomed Members to the meeting. She said that the Government was firmly committed to delivering a world class harbourfront and would work very hard with the Commission to achieve the goal. She paid her strongest tribute to the achievements of the HEC under the capable leadership of Professor Lee Chack-fan. She therefore could not agree with the allegation coined in a couple of newspaper editorials in the last few months that the HEC was no more than a public relations exercise during its six years of existence. In her capacity as Secretary for Development, she had written a letter to the Editor voicing her disagreement to those unjustified criticisms. While her letter had yet to be published, she requested the Secretariat to circulate it to Members for information after the meeting. *(Post-meeting note: The letter had been circulated to Members on 22 July 2010 and was published on 23 July 2010).* Mrs Lam also drew Members' attention to a note tabled at the

The Secretariat

meeting outlining the Harbour Unit's latest work on harbourfront enhancement, in particular paragraph 4 thereof concerning the issue of a Government General Circular (GC) on harbourfront enhancement. The GC appealed to the support of all policy bureaux and departments for harbourfront enhancement initiatives and informed them of the setting up of an internal mechanism to resolve conflicts on harbourfront matters. The GC was signed off by the Chief Secretary for Administration, demonstrating the Administration's high level commitment to harbourfront enhancement.

1.3 Upon the Chairman's invitation, all attendees introduced themselves round the table. On behalf of the Society for Protection of the Harbour, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Commission had great historic significance and the Society for Protection of the Harbour congratulated the Government for its vision in setting up this Commission and for its commitment to give Hong Kong a world class harbour and harbourfront.

Item 1 House Rules for the Harbourfront Commission and its Subsidiary Panels (Paper No. HC/01/2010)

2.1 **The Chairman** briefed the meeting on the paper which highlighted the more significant parts of the proposed House Rules for the Commission and its Panels. Specifically, he reminded Members of the need to disclose any direct personal or pecuniary interests in any matter under consideration by the Commission or its panels as soon as they became aware of it. In response to Mr Louis Loong's question concerning Section 5(5) of the proposed House Rules on Membership, **the Chairman** clarified that persons who were not Members of the Commission might be co-opted into the panels to bring in the necessary expertise. In respect of Section 3(4) of the proposed House Rules concerning Issue of Agenda and Meeting Papers, **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that Members would appreciate it if they could be given more time to peruse the meeting papers. While he did not propose to make changes to the Rule, he suggested that the Secretariat consider issuing meeting papers not less than 5 clear days before the date of meeting. The Secretariat undertook to issue meeting papers as soon as practicable in future.

2.2 **The meeting** endorsed adoption of the proposed House Rules for the Commission and its panels as set out in the Annex to

the Paper.

Item 2 Relocation of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum to the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/02/2010)

3.1 Before discussion, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** declared that he was the Chief Executive Officer of Designing Hong Kong Limited which was undertaking a community engagement programme on behalf of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) to solicit support for its relocation to Central Pier No. 8. **Mr Jimmy Leung** declared that he was the Chairman of the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board which would consider a planning application for permission to use part of the floor space of Central Pier No. 8 for exhibition hall and ancillary restaurant in August 2010. **The Chairman** suggested and **the meeting** agreed that Messrs Zimmerman and Leung could stay in the meeting but were not allowed to participate in discussion of the item.

3.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mrs Avia Lai, Principal Assistant Secretary (Culture)², Ms Helen Kwan, Assistant Secretary (Culture)² and Mr Martin Wong, Assistant Secretary (Culture)² (des.) of HAB, Dr Stephen Davies, Museum Director, and Ms Catalina Chor, Executive Manager and Curator of HKMM, Mr Ian Brownlee, Planning Consultant of Masterplan Ltd, Mr Nick Glave and Ms Catherine Or of P&T Architects and Engineers.

3.3 **Dr Stephen Davies** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint. **Mr Ian Brownlee** supplemented that HKMM had also consulted the Central and Western District Council and other interest groups on the relocation and expansion proposal. He stressed that although there had been concern over the removal of the public viewing gallery at Central Pier No. 8, opportunity for viewing the harbourfront at the eastern side of the pier could still be maintained as the ramp leading to the roof and the concourse of the pier would still be accessible by the public. He said that the project provided a unique opportunity for creating an interesting vantage point at the harbourfront.

3.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** asked whether HKMM had considered other locations as Central Pier No. 8 seemed to be constrained by its limited size. To enrich the maritime theme, **Prof Becky Loo** suggested that HKMM could consider acquisition of an actual sea vessel for the public to get on board. **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested that HKMM should consider extending its opening hours to the late evening in order to add vibrancy to the area at night time. **Prof Carlos Lo** wondered whether HKMM's funding model was sustainable to cater for its expansion in future. In response, **Dr Stephen Davies** said that they had explored other alternative locations but in vain; and they would identify another location after the 10-year lease if its operation at Central Pier No. 8 turned out to be not expandable. He added that it would be too costly for HKMM to run a historic ship. HKMM would explore with its staff to lengthen HKMM's opening hours in the evening. As HKMM had a very lean structure, its funding model was considered sustainable.

3.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that HKMM should be equipped with a historic ship, like other maritime museums in the world, so that more visitors would be attracted. **Mr Clement Kwok** commented that the project should be considered in a wider context with a view to regenerating the harbour. **Mr Eric Fok** agreed that relocating HKMM to Central Pier No. 8 could attract more tourists. **Mr Peter Wong** pointed out that as the existing lease for HKMM's premises at Stanley would soon expire, the urgency of the relocation proposal had to be considered. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** commented that given the long maritime history of Hong Kong and visions to make our harbour worthy of a world city, HKMM should deserve to be accommodated in a landmark building on a discreet site on its own. **Dr Stephen Davies** responded that Victoria Harbour sea states were not suitable for berthing historic ships of the limited size Central Pier No. 8's design could accommodate. Their own marketing survey indicated that the number of visitors could multiply if HKMM was relocated to Central Pier No. 8.

3.6 While noting the pressing need for relocation, **Mr Benjamin Cha** remarked that the application should be considered in relation to other alternative proposals for use of the space at Central Pier No. 8. Upon the Chairman's request, **Mr Jimmy Leung** told the meeting that he was not aware of any other applications for use of the space at the said pier. On the financial side, **Ms Dilys Chau** enquired whether HKMM had prepared any estimates of income and expenditure, and whether there were other revenue streams apart from those generated by the café. **Dr Stephen Davies** advised that apart from the revenue generated by the café, there were other revenue streams like ticket income, rental of the special event gallery, etc.

3.7 **Mrs Carrie Lam** reminded the meeting that the purpose of the paper was to invite Members' view and support for HKMM's relocation in terms of its contributions to a more vibrant harbourfront. She briefed the meeting on the background and history of the proposed relocation. Pending any long term plan on whether there should be a site-specific and iconic maritime museum, she considered that it was a pragmatic way forward to ensure HKMM's continual existence by relocating it to Central Pier No. 8 where there was ready space which had yet to be optimally utilized. Moreover, HAB had managed to develop the policy to support private museum through a capital grant and some initial recurrent subsidy. As for other cities with a maritime history, it was desirable to have a maritime museum in Hong Kong. Such proposal could attract people to that particular area of the Central harbourfront and enhance its vibrancy. The issue of whether Central Pier No. 8 was the final and best location for HKMM could be examined from the museum policy angle in future.

3.8 In concluding Members' views, **the Chairman** remarked that Members were generally supportive of HKMM's relocation and expansion proposal to Central Pier No. 8. That notwithstanding, they considered that it should be only an interim solution and it would be in HKMM's interest to identify a bigger site as its permanent premises in the long run given the space at

Central Pier No. 8 was rather limited and this might inhibit further expansion of the Museum.

Item 3 Kai Tak Development – Progress Update (Paper No. HC/03/2010)

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Stephen Tang, Head/Kai Tak Office and Mr Anthony Lo, Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1 (Kowloon) of CEDD. **Mr Stephen Tang** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

4.2 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** urged the Government to take measures to open the space at Kai Tak Development (KTD) for public enjoyment as early as possible. He opined that consideration should be given to building a footbridge system instead of subways to improve the connectivity to the area. While appreciating the Government's effort to further improve the development plan, in particular the shifting of roads from the waterfront to the middle of the former runway, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that he would like to be briefed on the entire implementation programme and specifically how the development projects could be properly phased so that the public could access and enjoy the waterfront as early as possible. **Mr Clement Kwok** commented that as the future cruise terminal was located in Kai Tak, there should be an overall concept theme for KTD so that it could attract more tourists and catch international attention. **Prof Becky Loo** supported the relocation of the roads from the waterfront to the middle of the former runway and she enquired whether there would be any environmentally-friendly mode of transport to connect the whole Kai Tak area. She also echoed Mr Lam Kin-lai's view that subways were less attractive to pedestrians than at-grade connections. **Mr Andy Leung** opined that as the Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development set up under the former HEC had completed the examination of the planning review and consolidation of the Outline Zoning Plan of Kai Tak, it would not be proper for the Commission to be regularly involved in the implementation and detailed design of the development. Hence, it was not necessary for the

Commission to set up a panel on KTD if a better mechanism could be devised for the Commission to work hand in hand with the Kai Tak Office. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the Commission should consider setting up a structured way to consult the members on the detailed designs of different developments, including that of the footbridges and subways in order to ensure that coherence was achieved in the final outcome. **Dr Andrew Thomson** enquired about the current status of the proposed 600-metre section deck which would have great ramification on the design of the Metro Park, how the existing temporary uses in Kai Tak would be relocated outside the development in order to release the site for more constructive uses, and the design of the Runway Park. **Ir Peter Wong** opined that zero carbon emission should be KTD's development theme and he suggested that the trunk road should be submerged with loops for internal traffic. To ensure a world class and green development, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested making it mandatory for all buildings, including public housing estates, in the area to use the proposed district cooling system. He also suggested constructing shared utility services tunnels to minimize the impact resulting from digging up the roads; and enhancing the cycling track system to connect the residential developments, transport nodes and amenity areas in the KTD. He commented that there was not enough berthing space for future expansion of the cruise terminal and that the Kai Tak River was not connected to the waterfront. He was also of the view that the conflict between the uses of the waterfront land for water sports and for "Government, Institution or Community" (G/IC) purposes should be addressed. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that there was no problem to use subway system to connect KTD with the nearby areas. He also shared the views of Mr Vincent Ng and Mr Paul Zimmerman that the waterfront should be opened for public use as early as possible even on a temporary basis, and that the limited berthing facilities at the cruise terminal would affect its expansion in future.

4.3 **The Chairman** suggested that a site visit cum on-site briefing for Members be arranged by the Kai Tak Office in early

Kai Tak Office

September 2010 so that Members could have a better understanding of KTD and the issues raised in the meeting could be discussed in greater detail. (*Post-meeting note: Site visit to Kai Tak Development was scheduled for 3 September 2010.*)

Item 4 Public-private Partnership and Design Concept and Development Approach for Site 4 in the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/04/2010)

5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Fiona Lung, Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, and Mr Roy Li, Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, of PlanD. With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Fiona Lung** presented the planning and design concept for Site 4 in the new Central harbourfront.

5.2 **Mr Clement Kwok** remarked that Site 4 was a prime site in Central which would be attractive to private investment. Since the private partner's goal of making the highest possible commercial return might not be in harmony with the objective of creating a distinctive harbourfront site, it would be advisable for the Government to set a main theme for the site. **Mrs Carrie Lam** explained that there had already been lengthy discussion on the uses of the various sites in the new Central harbourfront. To add vibrancy to the waterfront, Site 4 which was zoned for waterfront-related commercial and leisure use would be the first site available for development, among the 8 key sites, in the new Central harbourfront. Given the prominence of the site and HEC's previous work on the preferred management model for the harbourfront, developing and running it as a traditional public facility would not be a desirable option. Instead, it was proposed that the site be developed through public-private partnership (PPP) to tap the flexibility and innovation of the private sector. The present challenge for the Commission was to identify the key parameters for the PPP model and land premium was not the Government's primary concern. After identifying the key parameters, the response of the market could be tested through an Expression of Interest exercise. While the participation of non-governmental organisations was not ruled out, she expected

that the development and construction cost of the site should be borne by the successful private partner to ensure sustainability. It could take the form of a tender combined with a design competition.

5.3 In response to Ir Peter Wong's enquiry, **the Chairman** said that the Commission had to consider the management arrangements for various sites on both holistic and site-specific bases. **Mr Benjamin Cha** commented that given the prominence of Site 4, if PPP arrangement for this site turned out to be not successful, there could be implications for the development of other harbourfront sites. While supporting a PPP approach for Site 4, **Mr Vincent Ng** was concerned whether the PPP arrangement could be extended to part of Site 7. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported Mr Ng's idea and he opined that the first step was to define the deliverables and available services of the site. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the planning and design concept might add constraints to developing the site into an iconic precinct and its commercial viability. He agreed with Mrs Lam that the key parameters should be identified first. **Dr Paul Ho** considered that the financial aspects of the PPP arrangement would be determining factors which should be studied first. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that in setting the detailed criteria and parameters of development of the prime sites, provision should be allowed for the general public to have a fair share of the use of these sites and developments. **Prof Carlos Lo** said that it would be advisable to involve the private partner in the early planning stage to ensure enough flexibility in the PPP arrangements. **Prof Becky Loo** supported the establishment of a panel on PPP to look into the arrangements. The important elements like land use, gross floor area, open space, public access, etc. should be adhered to.

5.4 **The Chairman** said that the Commission could consider whether Site 4 was suitable for adopting PPP approach and, if so, what the appropriate management model would be. He suggested that the relevant panel could co-opt members with financial background to study the financial feasibility of the PPP

proposals.

5.5 To enable the public to enjoy the new Central harbourfront as early as possible, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the Administration planned to construct a temporary promenade at Site 7 and had consulted the Central and Western District Council on the proposal. To address Mr Benjamin Cha's concern, she would invite the panel on PPP to examine the PPP feasibility of another site in Quarry Bay for piloting PPP for the time being. In response to Mr Vincent Ng's suggestion, she advised the meeting that the Government would soon publish "The Management and Design Guidelines for Public Open Space (POS) in Private Developments" which might have relevance and applicability to extension of PPP arrangement to Site 7. As per the Guidelines, a part of the POS in Site 7 could be entrusted to the developer or operator of Site 4 under any tender or land lease or contract for management, subject to access and management conditions; and up to 10% of the POS would be allowed for commercial facilities complementary and related to the use of the POS. The arrangement could enhance the financial viability of the PPP proposal.

5.6 The meeting agreed to discuss details of the PPP proposal on Site 4 development at the relevant panel.

Item 5 Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (Paper No. HC/05/2010)

6.1 Due to insufficient time, **Members** agreed not to discuss the agenda item at the meeting.

Item 6 Establishment of Panels under the Harbourfront Commission (Paper No. HC/06/2010)

7.1 **The Chairman** briefed the meeting on the paper which recommended that three panels, namely a panel on Planning and Design, a panel on PPP and a panel on Branding and Promotion, be established under the Commission. He said that some

members had also suggested the setting up of three project groups, one for Kai Tak Development, one for Central and Wan Chai and one for the rest of the harbourfront areas to ensure quality delivery of those projects.

7.2 **Dr Paul Ho** and **Ir Peter Wong** supported the establishment of the three panels as recommended in the paper. **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested that project groups could be established under the panels so that the panels could filter the recommendations from the project groups before further reporting to the Commission and the Commission could provide guidelines to the project groups through the panels. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported the establishment of three area-specific panels, one for Kai Tak Development, one for Central and Wan Chai, and one for the rest of the harbourfront areas. He added that there should also be a panel on marine uses. **Mr Eric Fok** considered that there should not be too many hierarchies and panels; otherwise there might be integration problem with different panels or project groups. While he preferred a geographical approach, **Mr Clement Kwok** suggested that there should be a panel to ensure overall conceptual planning. **Ms Dilys Chau** supported the establishment of project-based panels but considered that it was not necessary to establish a separate panel for an overall development concept of individual sites. **Prof Carlos Lo** pointed out that if panels were established on a project basis, this might result in proliferation of panels with the increase in projects. **Mr Andy Leung** and **Dr Andrew Thomson** also supported adopting a geographical approach in the establishment of panels.

7.3 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that after listening to Members' views, she tended to agree that the panels should be established on a geographical basis. She suggested that the proposed panel on Central and Wan Chai could be extended to cover the harbourfront areas on Hong Kong Island within the Harbour Limit. As such, the panel could also study the PPP arrangements for other potential sites on Hong Kong Island.

7.4 In concluding the discussion, **the Chairman** proposed and **the meeting** agreed that three geographical panels be established to separately cover Kai Tak Development, harbourfront developments on Hong Kong Island and harbourfront developments in Kowloon including Kwai Chung, Tsing Yi and Tsuen Wan. The panels would meet shortly to work out their work plans and priorities. He encouraged Members to join at least one panel. The Secretariat would **The Secretariat** follow up on the arrangement.

Item 7 Any Other Business

(A) Logo for the Harbourfront Commission (Paper No. HC/07/2010)

8.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mrs Claudia Cheng, Principal Information Officer/Creative Sub-division of ISD. **Mrs Claudia Cheng** presented the six proposed logo designs for the Commission with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.2 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's enquiry, **Ms Maisie Chan** informed the meeting that CEDD, the implementation agent for the Harbourfront Signage Scheme, was seeking approval for the appointment of a consultant who would organise a harbourfront logo design competition later this year. **Mr Zimmerman** commented that out of the six proposed logo designs, only Option 1 might be further considered as it was the only option that had incorporated the concept of marine uses. He suggested that the Commission could consider using the winning designs in the harbourfront logo design competition as the Commission's logo. **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that none of the six proposed logo designs seemed to be appropriate and he agreed with Mr Zimmerman's proposal to wait for the result of the competition.

8.3 **The meeting** decided to revisit the issue in due course.

(B) Harbour Unit's Latest Work in Harbourfront

Enhancement

8.4 **The Chairman** said that a note outlining Harbour Unit's latest work on harbourfront enhancement had been prepared by the Secretariat and was tabled for Members' information and reference.

(C) West Kowloon Cultural District Authority's Invitation to the Commission as Collaborator

8.5 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) had written to invite the Commission to be a collaborator in the public engagement (PE) exercise for the preparation of the Development Plan for the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD). The HEC was a collaborator of WKCDA in the Stage 1 PE, and the stage 2 PE was scheduled to commence in August 2010. **The meeting** agreed to the Chairman's recommendation to accept the invitation.

(D) Ventilation Building of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass in front of International Finance Centre II

8.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he had been approached by a restaurant operator at International Finance Centre II (IFC II) who had expressed concern over the impact of the proposed ventilation building of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass in front of IFC II. He supported exploring the relocation of the proposed ventilation building to alternative location.

(E) Marine Facilities in Yau Tong Bay Development

8.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed his concern that the developer of the Yau Tong Bay project might have no plan to include marine facilities in the development. He urged the departments concerned to follow up the issue with the developer.

8.8 **The Chairman** responded that the two issues raised by Mr Zimmerman could be discussed at the respective panels.

(F) Dates of Next Two Meetings

8.9 **The Chairman** informed Members that the next two meetings of the Commission would be held on 25 October and 21 December 2010.

8.10 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

**Harbourfront Commission Secretariat
October 2010**