

Legislative Council Panel on Housing

Customer Satisfaction Surveys for Public Housing

PURPOSE

This paper informs Members of the results of the surveys on public rental housing (PRH) tenants' views on estate management and maintenance services in 2007.

BACKGROUND

2. Since 1992, the Housing Department (HD) has been conducting the Public Housing Recurrent Survey (PHRS) every year with the main objective to gauge the views and level of satisfaction of tenants and Estate Management Advisory Committee (EMAC) members towards PRH estate management services. Tenants' views on specific subjects such as the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates (the Marking Scheme) have also been collected under the PHRS. The 2007 PHRS was conducted between January and June this year and about 5 000 PRH households were interviewed. The findings of the PHRS from 2005 to 2007 show a steady rise in the level of satisfaction among tenants towards HD's management services. In addition, the Customer Satisfaction Survey on the Total Maintenance Scheme (TMS) In-flat Inspection and Maintenance Services completed in 2007 also recorded a very high satisfaction rate. These results show that the majority of PRH households are satisfied with the management and maintenance services provided by the HD.

VIEWS ON ESTATE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

General Estate Management Services

3. Over the years, the rates of tenants' satisfaction towards various aspects of estate management services have seen noticeable improvement. According to the results of the 2007 PHRS, the rates of satisfaction of PRH households towards the services of estate management officers, security services, cleanliness of common areas and maintenance-related services stood at 69%, 76%, 71% and 56% respectively, all higher than the corresponding findings in 2005 and 2006. The major findings of the 2007 survey and the corresponding findings in the previous two years are set out at [Annex A](#).

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates

4. According to the 2007 PHRS, 96% of the PRH households were aware of the Marking Scheme and 82% considered that the Marking Scheme could improve the cleanliness and hygienic conditions of public housing estates. Amongst the PRH tenants who knew about the Marking Scheme, 70% indicated that the penalty was reasonable. The response shows that the Marking Scheme could improve the environmental hygiene in public housing estates and was generally accepted by tenants.

5. Public housing tenants' expectations of a healthy living environment have been on the rise. In 2007, the no-smoking areas under the Marking Scheme have been extended, first from public lifts to all common areas within domestic buildings, and subsequently to all estate common areas. According to the 2007 PRHS, 79% of the PRH households supported the enlargement of no-smoking areas. The survey results on the Marking Scheme are set out at **Annex B**.

VIEWS ON TOTAL MAINTENANCE SCHEME

6. The TMS was implemented in 2006 to provide tenants with proactive and comprehensive in-flat inspection and maintenance services. According to the Third Interim Report of Customer Satisfaction Survey on the TMS completed in August 2007, the overall rate of tenants' satisfaction towards in-flat inspection and maintenance services was 88.5%, showing a steady improvement compared with the two previous surveys. In addition, some 73% of the households considered that the TMS could effectively improve the quality of in-flat maintenance. The relevant statistics are set out at **Annex C**.

WAY FORWARD

7. The Administration attaches great importance to tenants' views on estate management and maintenance services in PRH and would continue to conduct regular opinion surveys. The HD would carefully analyze the survey results and assess the effectiveness of its management services with a view to achieving continuous improvement.

Public Housing Recurrent Survey**Tenants' Views on General Estate Management Services**

Views on general estate management services	PRH households		
	2005	2006	2007
Service quality of estate management officers			
Very satisfied /satisfied	61.3%	62.4%	68.8%
Fair	33.6%	32.1%	26.5%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	5.1%	5.5%	4.7%
Quality of security services			
Very satisfied /satisfied	69.2%	71.6%	76.3%
Fair	26.4%	24.4%	20.4%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	4.4%	4.0%	3.3%
Cleanliness and hygienic conditions in common areas			
Very satisfied /satisfied	64.3%	68.6%	71.0%
Fair	29.6%	27.0%	24.6%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	6.1%	4.4%	4.4%
Maintenance-related services			
Very satisfied /satisfied	49.3%	51.7%	56.0%
Fair	32.2%	32.0%	29.8%
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	18.5%	16.3%	14.2%

**Public Housing Recurrent Survey
Tenants' Views on the Marking Scheme**

Views on the Marking Scheme	2005	2006	2007
Awareness of the Scheme			
Yes	95.0%	96.6%	96.4%
No	5.0%	3.4%	3.6%
Whether the Scheme can improve cleanliness			
Yes	76.0%	83.4%	81.8%
No	20.9%	14.2%	15.7%
<u>Reasons for not being able to improve cleanliness</u>			
<i>Poor self-discipline of tenants</i>	N.A.	N.A.	32.6%
<i>Difficult to identify the offenders instantly</i>	42.4%	43.5%	29.4%
<i>Not enough officers to enforce the Scheme</i>	24.9%	31.6%	22.9%
<i>Deterrent effect not strong enough</i>	21.8%	18.6%	12.1%
Don't know / No comment	3.1%	2.4%	2.5%
Whether the penalty is reasonable			
Stringent	13.1%	10.6%	10.3%
Reasonable	63.0%	67.6%	70.0%
Lenient	20.6%	18.3%	16.7%
Don't know / No comment	3.3%	3.5%	3.0%
Whether the no-smoking area should be further extended to various other public places			
Yes	N.A.	N.A.	78.5%
<u>What public places should it be extended to</u>			
<i>Park</i>	N.A.	N.A.	83.0%
<i>Children's playground</i>	N.A.	N.A.	91.2%
<i>Sports / recreational areas</i>	N.A.	N.A.	67.5%
<i>Performance areas</i>	N.A.	N.A.	67.0%
No	N.A.	N.A.	17.5%
Don't know / No comment	N.A.	N.A.	4.0%

Note: "N.A." denotes figures not available.

Customer Satisfaction Survey on TMS

(a) Satisfaction with the TMS service arrangements

Tenants' Feedback	June 2006	December 2006	August 2007
Very satisfied	85.2 %	86.7 %	88.5 %
Average / Neutral	14.3 %	12.2 %	10.6 %
Not Satisfied	0	0.8 %	0.8 %
No comment	0.5 %	0.3 %	0.1 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %

(b) Perception on whether TMS could improve the quality of in-flat maintenance

Tenants' Feedback	June 2006	December 2006	August 2007
Definitely Effective	75.8 %	69.0 %	73 %
Average / Neutral	20.6 %	25.6 %	22.5 %
Not Effective	1.8 %	3.9 %	3.5 %
No Comment	1.8 %	1.5 %	1.0 %
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %