

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1154/12-13(02)

Ref : CB2/HS/1/12

Subcommittee on Poverty

**Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
for the meeting on 24 May 2013**

Community Care Fund

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the Community Care Fund ("CCF") and summarizes the discussions at meetings of the Council and its committees on the subject.

Background

2. In his 2010-2011 Policy Address, the Chief Executive ("CE") announced the establishment of CCF to which the Government and the business sector would each contribute \$5 billion. CCF aims at providing assistance to people facing financial difficulties, particularly those who fall outside the safety net, i.e. the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") Scheme, or those within but are not covered by the safety net because of special circumstances. CCF may also implement measures on a pilot basis to help the Administration identify people who can be considered for incorporation into the Government's regular assistance and service programmes.

3. In November 2010, CE appointed the Steering Committee on CCF ("the Steering Committee") which was chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration to oversee and co-ordinate, among others, the work of CCF. The Steering Committee comprised 20 non-official members drawn from various sectors of the community including the business, welfare, education, health, labour, political and district sectors, and four official members, viz. the Secretary for Home Affairs, Secretary for Education, Secretary for Labour and Welfare, and Secretary for Food and Health. An Executive Committee and four Subcommittees (Education, Home Affairs, Medical and Welfare) were set up under the Steering Committee to support the CCF's operation. On 13 May 2011, the Finance Committee ("FC") approved the Government injection of \$5 billion into CCF.

4. Following the re-establishment of the Commission on Poverty ("CoP") by the Government in December 2012, CCF has been integrated into the work of CoP since 2013. The CCF Task Force, set up under CoP, will continue to make use of CCF resources to implement the existing programmes and draw up new projects to provide assistance to the underprivileged and low-income families.

Assistance programmes

5. Since its establishment in early 2011, with the Government's \$5 billion injection and donations from the community¹, CCF has launched a total of 18 assistance programmes² which are set out in **Appendix I**. According to the Administration, people outside the existing safety net or the coverage of the Government's short-term relief measures have been successfully identified and provided with immediate assistance. More than 100 000 people have benefited under these programmes. In addition, CCF has also implemented measures on a pilot basis to help the Government identify those measures that have been proven effective for incorporation into the regular assistance programme. Among these, the programme providing subsidy to needy patients of Hospital Authority for the use of Samaritan Fund subsidized drugs (i.e. programme (11) in Appendix I) has been incorporated into the regular assistance programme since September 2012. The Government is also studying the incorporation of three other programmes listed in Appendix I, i.e. subsidy to meet lunch expenses for primary school students from low-income families (programme (3)), subsidy for CSSA recipients who are owners of Tenant Purchase Scheme flats for five years or above and not eligible for rent allowance under the CSSA Scheme (programme (6)) and training subsidy for children with special needs from low-income families who are on the waiting list for subvented pre-school rehabilitation services (programme (9)), into the regular assistance programme.

Proposed additional injection to CCF

6. As at end February 2013, the balance of CCF stood at around \$5.93 billion, including the placement of \$5 billion³ and the investment return of \$455 million at the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA"), as well as \$480 million bank deposits. In the 2013-2014 Budget, the Financial Secretary has proposed to inject an additional \$15 billion into CCF to strengthen the poverty alleviation efforts. The injection mainly serves the following three purposes –

¹ The amount of donations pledged is about \$1.8 billion, some of which is made by yearly instalments over three years. The actual amount of donations received up till February 2013 was around \$1.19 billion.

² Separately, FC approved in July 2011 an injection of \$1.5 billion into CCF to launch a programme to provide allowance to new arrivals.

³ The placement period is six years, and the placement cannot be withdrawn until the end of the period (i.e. mid-June of 2017)

- (a) to provide assistance to persons who cannot benefit from the Budget's relief measures, i.e. those colloquially known as "N have-nots" (generally refer to those who do not own any properties, live in public rental housing or receive CSSA);
- (b) to enhance CCF's capacity to fill the gaps in the existing system and launch more targeted assistance programmes and pilot schemes to help those who are facing economic difficulties; and
- (c) to continue the implementation of programmes which are proved to be effective but have yet to be incorporated into the Government's regular assistance programme for the time being owing to the recurrent expenditure limit of a particular year or the time taken to study or rationalize related policies.

According to the Administration, the proposed additional injection, together with the original \$5 billion Government injection, is expected to generate an annual investment return of over \$1 billion.

Members' deliberations

7. The Panel on Home Affairs deliberated on CCF-related issues at its meetings on 14 January, 8 July and 9 December 2011. When the House Committee was briefed on the work of CoP and the Steering Committee on Population Policy at its special meeting on 22 March 2013, issues relating to CCF were also raised. Members' major concerns are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

Impact on charities

8. Some Members expressed concern about the possible dilution of CCF on the business sector's donations to charities, such as the Community Chest of Hong Kong ("CCHK"), from which many non-governmental organizations had received support. They called on the Administration to keep in view whether CCHK had any fund-raising difficulties after the establishment of CCF and render assistance when necessary. Members were also worried that CCF and CCHK might have duplicate functions. They considered it necessary for the Administration to clearly delineate the respective scope of CCF and CCHK.

9. According to the Administration, CCF would not launch any public fund-raising campaigns. The business sector had only been invited to make voluntary donations to CCF on top of its support for charities. The Administration assured Members that it would monitor CCF's impact on donations to charities. The fund-raising activities of CCHK had not been affected by CCF. CCF would

not duplicate the programmes under CCHK, other charitable funds and the Government's existing social welfare service network.

10. Some Members were of the view that CCF should not be taken as a long-term measure. Its programmes should be those that could be considered by the Government for incorporation into its regular assistance and service programmes. There was a view that CCF should be wound up within three to five years, as the Government's policies affecting people's livelihood should have been improved during the period.

Source of funding

11. Some Members considered that it was the Government's responsibility to help the target beneficiaries of CCF, i.e. those who fell outside the safety net or those within but were not covered by the safety net because of special circumstances. As the Government had amassed huge fiscal reserves, it could well afford to include these people in its existing recurrent assistance programmes. The success of CCF should not hinge on the collaboration between the Government and the business sector, as this would mix up the Government's responsibility for taking care of the needy and the business sector's donations to charities. The business sector should donate to CCHK and other charities instead of CCF, or might set up its own community care fund. The Government should stop raising fund from the business sector for CCF and should fully fund CCF by itself.

12. In the Administration's view, CCF could promote the collaboration between the Government, the business sector and the community, which would create a synergy effect on charity work in Hong Kong. The Administration would continue to strengthen its existing welfare services for the underprivileged.

13. Some Members were concerned that the Government might make secret deals with the business sector when appealing to it for donations. They called on the Administration to disclose the amount of donations received from the business sector. However, some other Members were of the view that CCF should be seen from a positive perspective, as it could line up different parties in the community to work together for building a caring culture in Hong Kong. Any fund that could help the needy should be welcomed. The Administration considered it inappropriate to label CCF as collusion between the Government and the business sector. It would disclose the total amount of donations to CCF but would not disclose the amount of donations from individual donors.

14. Noting that the actual amount of donation received as at December 2011 was only \$680 million and the amount of donations pledged was \$1.8 billion, some of which would be by yearly instalments over three years, members of the HA Panel expressed grave concern about the slow progress in raising donations. They also cast doubt on the achievement of the donation target of \$5 billion from the business

sector. They considered that the Government should further inject public funds into CCF should it fail to raise the targeted amount of donations from the business sector.

15. The Administration advised that the relevant business organizations had made donations to CCF as pledged and CCF was operating smoothly. Some business organizations had also expressed interest in making donations to CCF after the implementation of its assistance programmes. It was expected that more donations would come to CCF when its assistance programmes were proven effective.

16. Pointing out that the business sector had been asked by the Government to donate to CCF but had no say in how the donations would be used, Members called on the Administration to review the appropriateness of the arrangement and look into the reasons why CCF had not been well received by the business sector. The Administration advised that the business sector had been supportive of the operation of CCF and had been encouraged to contribute to CCF on top of its existing donations to charities.

17. Some Members considered that the primary funding source of CCF should come from the public purse, as the business sector might not support CCF continuously. As the target beneficiaries of CCF were mainly the grass-roots and elders, the Administration was requested to explore whether CCF's assistance programmes should be run on a regular basis and funded by the Government's recurrent expenditure account.

18. The Administration responded that CCF should be able to gain more support from the business sector if operated smoothly and proved effective. The Government would evaluate the assistance programmes of CCF and consider incorporating appropriate programmes into its regular assistance and service programmes having regard to factors such as the number of beneficiaries and the effectiveness of the programmes.

Operation and monitoring

19. Some Members expressed concern that the application procedures for CCF's programmes might be cumbersome and costly, and suggested that a cap be set on CCF's administrative expenses. The Administration advised that CCF's programmes would provide swift and direct assistance to target beneficiaries through the Government's existing service network where possible to minimize administrative costs. The target was to limit the average administrative expenses of CCF to within 5% of its total disbursements on a long-term basis.

20. Some Members urged the Administration to keep the operation of CCF transparent and accountable. They considered that as the Council was the gatekeeper for the Government injection into CCF, it was incumbent upon the

Administration to report to the Council on its progress of work at regular intervals, say, in every three to six months, and its recommendations on how to improve the policies which impacted on people's livelihood annually. The Administration assured Members that CCF's operation, including its income and expenditure, would be highly transparent. The statement of accounts of CCF would be audited by the Director of Audit and tabled at the Council annually.

21. Given that the operation of CCF would mainly be funded by investment returns on the seed capital and the overall investment returns in the market was currently low, Members worried that the investment returns might not be sufficient for carrying out some of the assistance programmes. They expressed concern about how CCF would ensure reasonable investment returns so that more assistance programmes could be launched, and enquired about the circumstances under which the seed capital could be used for running the assistance programmes.

22. According to the Administration, the Government's previous injection of \$5 billion which was placed with HKMA had generated an investment return of around 5%. With the additional injection of \$15 billion, if approved, the capital of CCF would stand at \$20 billion. The investment returns so generated should be able to sustain the operations of the assistance programmes for a considerable period of time and the deployment of the capital should not be required in the near future. Nevertheless, the capital could be used to fund CCF programmes when necessary.

Elderly Dental Assistance Programme

23. Pointing out that the Elderly Dental Assistance Programme ("the EDA Programme") had not been effective as it covered only a small number of elders, some Members suggested that the Administration should formulate policies to subsidize needy elderly for dentures.

24. The Administration responded that the EDA Programme, which was expected to be a two-year programme, was rolled out in September 2012 to subsidize needy elderly persons for dentures and other necessary dental services. Having regard to the view that the scope of the EDA programme was not wide and flexible enough, the CCF Task Force had set up a working group to consider whether and how to revise the scope of the programme taking into account the progress of implementation and the experience gained.

Assistance for the "N have-nots"

25. Some Members were of the view that the Administration should review the residence requirement under the CSSA Scheme and CCF should regularize its assistance programmes for the "N have-nots" until the completion of the review. Some Members suggested that rent allowance should be provided for people who had housing problems, for example those who were living in cubical apartments or

"sub-divided units", and for those "N have-nots" people who were on the waiting list for public rental housing ("PRH").

26. The Administration responded that through a CCF programme, some 20000 households (around 39 000 persons) were identified as "N have-nots". The number of "N have-nots" households were expected to increase to 70 000 households if the definition of "sub-divided units" was relaxed. Given the huge additional injection into CCF, the "N have-nots" would continue to receive the required support if the relevant programmes were proven effective, even though they were not incorporated into the Government's regular assistance programme. In the Administration's view, the "subsidy for low-income persons who are inadequately housed" programme launched by CCF was effective in providing financial assistance to the "N have-nots" as those who did not meet the eligibility criteria for applying PRH were also covered by the programme, provided that they were inadequately housed and were low-income earners.

Latest development

27. The Administration will brief the Subcommittee on its proposal to inject an additional \$15 billion into CCF at its meeting on 24 May 2013.

Relevant papers

28. A list of the relevant papers on the LegCo website is in **Appendix II**.

Assistant Programmes under the Community Care Fund (CCF)

(same as Annex 3 to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)845/12-13(01)) on "Report on the work of the Commission on Poverty and the Steering Committee on Population Policy" for the Special House Committee meeting on 22 March 2013)

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
<p>(1) Setting up the School-based Fund (Cross-boundary Learning Activities) to subsidise primary and secondary school students from low-income families to participate in cross-boundary learning activities/competitions</p> <p>(A subsidy of not more than \$3,000 for each benefited student to participate in cross-boundary learning activities and competitions respectively)</p>	June 2011 (a three-year programme)	194.66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Students receiving full or half grant from the Student Financial Assistance Agency (SFAA); ● Students receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA); or ● Students meeting the "financially needy" criteria as determined by individual schools. 	22 093 persons	Around 52	<p>The programme was initially set up to subsidise eligible students to participate in cross-boundary learning activities. The scope of the programme was expanded in July 2012 to subsidise eligible students to represent Hong Kong to take part in cross-boundary competitions.</p> <p>Evaluation is being planned and the progress will be reported to the CCF Task Force in future.</p>
(2) Subsidy for patients of Hospital Authority (HA) for specified self-financed cancer	August 2011 (a two-year programme)	121.208 ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The prevailing SF financial assessment mechanism and its 	959 person-times	Around 86.49	The programme initially covered six specified self-financed cancer drugs and was expanded to nine

¹ Including the administrative and audit expenses of this programme and programme (11) below. Revised funding for the second year of the programme is pending approval by the Commission on Poverty.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
<p>drugs which have not yet been brought into the Samaritan Fund (SF) safety net but have been rapidly accumulating medical scientific evidence and with relatively higher efficacy</p> <p>(To subsidise the drug costs borne by benefited patients for the relevant drug treatment)</p>			sliding scale are adopted as the financial assessment criteria.			<p>subsequently.</p> <p>The evaluation results were reported to the former Steering Committee on the CCF in May 2012.</p>
<p>(3) Subsidy to meet lunch expenses for primary school students from low-income families</p> <p>(The subsidy level is determined by the actual fee charged by lunch suppliers and the subsidy is directly paid to lunch suppliers through the schools)</p>	September 2011 (a three-school year programme)	529.207	● Primary school students receiving full grant from SFAA and having lunch as arranged by their schools.	56 387 persons ²	Around 306.2	The former Steering Committee on the CCF was briefed on the evaluation results in May 2012 and it supported the programme's regularisation by the Education Bureau (EDB). As the Government is studying its incorporation into regular assistance

² This is the number of benefited students in the 2011/12 school year. The estimated number of benefited students in the 2012/13 school year is 62 000.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
						programme, the CCF agreed to continue the provision of subsidy to eligible primary school students in 2012/13 and 2013/14 ³ .
(4) Financial assistance for ethnic minorities and new arrivals from the Mainland for taking language-related international public examinations (Reimbursement of relevant examination fees to the beneficiaries on an accountable basis)	September 2011 (a two-year programme)	1.05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Passed the family/household-based means-test establishing eligibility for CSSA Scheme, student financial assistance schemes or HA Medical Fee Waiving Mechanism; or ● household income not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income. 	128 persons	Around 0.13	The evaluation plan was reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013. The Home Affairs Department (HAD) is evaluating the programme.

³ Pending approval by the Commission on Poverty.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
<p>(5) Subsidy for the severely disabled persons aged below 60 from families with financial difficulties who are non-CSSA recipients, requiring constant attendance and living in the community</p> <p>(A monthly subsidy of \$2,000)</p>	September 2011 (application period for the extended programme till end February 2013)	133.83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Aged below 60 and receiving Higher Disability Allowance (HDA) under the Social Security Allowance (SSA) Scheme as at 31 July 2012; ● living in the community as at 31 July 2012; and ● monthly household income not exceeding 100% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income. 	1 974 person-times	Around 35	<p>The former Steering Committee on the CCF approved to invite a new round of applications in November 2012, with certain eligibility criteria relaxed (including the income limits and the method of calculating the number of household members). A subsidy for 12 months at most will be provided to the beneficiaries during the extended period.</p> <p>The evaluation results were reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013.</p>
(6) Subsidy for CSSA recipients who are owners of Tenant Purchase Scheme flats for five years or above and not eligible for rent allowance under the CSSA Scheme	September 2011 (a one-off subsidy programme which has been completed)	1.73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSSA households meeting the relevant criteria as at 1 July 2011. 	825 households	1.65	The former Steering Committee on the CCF was briefed on the evaluation results in May 2012 and it supported the programme's regularisation by the Social Welfare Department (SWD).

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
(A subsidy of \$2,000 per household)						The Government is now planning for the programme's incorporation into regular assistance programme, and expects to have the specific proposal ready within 2013.
(7) Subsidy for elders aged 65 or above from low-income families who are on the waiting list of Integrated Home Care Services (IHCS) (Ordinary Cases) for Household Cleaning and Escorting Services for Medical Consultations (A monthly subsidy of not more than \$480 which has been raised to \$560 since December 2012)	October 2011 (application period for the extended programme till end March 2013)	15.256	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Aged 65 or above; living in the community; and have been on the waiting list for IHCS (Ordinary Cases) on or before 31 October 2012; and ● household income not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income. 	1 144 persons	Around 2.02	<p>The former Steering Committee on the CCF approved in November 2012 to invite a new round of applications and extend the provision of subsidy for existing beneficiaries. Eligible elders may receive the subsidy until 31 March 2014 the latest.</p> <p>The evaluation results were reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013.</p>
(8) Subsidy for CSSA recipients living in private housing paying rents which exceed the	October 2011 (a one-off subsidy programme)	33.671	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CSSA households meeting the relevant criteria as at 1 July 2011. 	22 605 households	Around 32.09	The evaluation results were reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
<p>maximum rent allowance under the CSSA Scheme</p> <p>(A subsidy of \$1,000 for one-person household; and \$2,000 for two-or-more-person household)</p>	<p>which has been completed)</p>					<p>SWD will consider to relaunch the programme.</p>
<p>(9) Training subsidy for children with special needs from low-income families who are on the waiting list for subvented pre-school rehabilitation services</p> <p>(A monthly subsidy of not more than \$2,500)</p>	<p>December 2011 (application period for the extended programme till end February 2013)</p>	<p>68.145</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On the waiting list for subvented pre-school rehabilitation services on or before 30 November 2012; and ● household income not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income. 	<p>1 435 persons</p>	<p>Around 14.58</p>	<p>The former Steering Committee on the CCF approved in November 2012 to invite a new round of applications and extend the provision of subsidy for existing beneficiaries. Eligible children may receive the subsidy until 31 March 2014 the latest.</p> <p>The former Steering Committee on the CCF was briefed on the evaluation results in May 2012 and it supported the programme's regularisation by the</p>

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
						SWD, which is now being studied by the Government.
(10) Relocation allowance for eligible residents of sub-divided units in industrial buildings who would have to move out as a result of the Buildings Department (BD)'s enforcement action (An allowance of \$2,100 for one-person household; \$4,600 for two-to-three-person household; and \$6,100 for four-or-more-person household)	December 2011	4.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Persons who have passed the family/household-based means-test establishing eligibility for CSSA Scheme, student financial assistance schemes, HA Medical Fee Waiving Mechanism or Work Incentive Transport Subsidy; or ● household income not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income. 	140 households	Around 0.39	<p>BD has inspected all 30 target industrial buildings, and found suspected cases of unauthorised sub-divided units in 10 of them. BD has taken enforcement action against these cases and enforcement action was completed in one building. BD will continue to follow up the enforcement actions in other industrial buildings.</p> <p>Evaluation is being planned and the progress will be reported to the CCF Task Force in future.</p>

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
(11) Subsidy for needy HA patients who marginally fall outside the SF safety net for the use of SF subsidised drugs (To subsidise the drug costs borne by benefited patients for the relevant drug treatment)	January 2012	4.293	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The prevailing SF financial assessment mechanism was adopted by applying a more relaxed maximum contribution ratio than that for the SF (i.e. 20%). 	281 person-times ⁴	4.293	The programme has been incorporated into the SF's regular mechanism with effect from 1 September 2012.
(12) Subsidy for non-school-attending ethnic minorities and new arrivals from the Mainland to enroll in language courses (A subsidy of \$350 to \$700 is provided for attending language courses organised by the Employees Retraining Board)	March 2012	0.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Passed the family/household-based means-test establishing eligibility for CSSA Scheme, student financial assistance schemes or HA Medical Fee Waiving Mechanism; or ● household incomes not exceeding 75% of 	83 persons	Around 0.03	The evaluation plan was reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013. HAD is evaluating the programme.

⁴ The programme has ceased operation since 31 August 2012, and the statistics as at 31 August 2012 is shown.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
			the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income.			
(13) Subsidy for low-income elderly tenants in private housing (A subsidy of \$4,000 for one-person elderly household, \$8,000 for two-person elderly household and \$12,000 for three-or-more-person elderly household)	July 2012 (a one-off subsidy programme with the application period closed on 31 January 2013)	11.89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Elderly households aged 65 or above; ● not receiving CSSA; ● household income and rent not exceeding the specified limit⁵; and ● not owning any property in Hong Kong. 	2 068 households (2 561 persons)	Around 10.24	<p>The evaluation plan was reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013.</p> <p>The CCF Secretariat is evaluating this programme and programme (17) below, and considering to launch an integrated programme.</p>
(14) After-school Care Pilot Scheme (The subsidy cap for each	August 2012 (a two-school year programme)	69.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Primary one to Secondary three students receiving CSSA or SFAA 	5 437 persons	Around 13.77	EDB has disbursed 50% of the subsidy to 73 schools/ non-governmental

⁵ The specified limits for monthly household income and rental cap vary with the household size, with details as follows –

<u>Household size</u>	<u>Specified limit for monthly household income (\$)</u>	<u>Rental cap (\$)</u>
1	8,740	4,370
2	13,410	6,705
3 or above	17,060	8,530

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
project is \$500,000)			<p>full grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Participating schools or non-government organisations have discretion to include needy students who do not meet the above criteria, but the number of these students should not exceed 25% of the total number of student beneficiaries. 			<p>organisations granted with the funding, and the remaining 50% will be disbursed in the first half of 2013.</p> <p>Having regard to the good progress of the pilot scheme, and the scope for enhancement for further trial, the CCF Task Force agreed to extend the programme to 2013-14⁶.</p> <p>The progress of evaluation will be reported to the CCF Task Force in future.</p>
(15) Elderly dental assistance programme (The subsidy cap for each beneficiary is \$9,240)	September 2012 (expected to be a two-year programme)	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Aged 60 or above; ● not receiving CSSA; and ● users of the IHCS or “Enhanced Home and Community Care Services” subvented by 	84 persons	Around 0.51	<p>422 eligible elders have been referred to receive the dental services under the programme.</p> <p>The evaluation plan was reported to the CCF Task Force in February 2013. The CCF Task Force has</p>

⁶ Pending approval by the Commission on Poverty.

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
			SWD as at 31 December 2011 and are paying level 1 or level 2 fee charge of the above services.			set up a working group to consider whether and how to revise the scope of the programme taking into account the progress of implementation and the experience gained.
(16) Subsidy for owners' corporations of old buildings (Eligible owners' corporations can be granted a subsidy with the total amount capped at \$20,000 for relevant expenditure items on an accountable basis)	October 2012 (a three-year programme)	67.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Residential or composite buildings aged 30 years or above; and ● average rateable value of the residential units does not exceed \$120,000 for urban area and \$92,000 for New Territories. 	41 owners' corporations	Around 0.14	<p>Among the 4 300 eligible owners' corporations, about 2 400 have indicated their intention to make an application.</p> <p>The progress of evaluation will be reported to the CCF Task Force in future.</p>
(17) Subsidy for low-income persons who are inadequately housed (A subsidy of \$3,000 for one-person household; \$6,000 for two-person	October 2012 (a one-off subsidy programme with application period to be closed on 8	174.43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Persons renting on a monthly basis rooms/cubicles, cocklofts or bedspaces in private permanent housing; persons renting bedspaces 	14 172 households (33 426 persons)	Around 84.32	The former Steering Committee on the CCF approved to increase the estimated funding of the programme from \$91.43 million to \$174.43 million in December 2012, and it is expected that the

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
household; and \$8,000 for three-or-more-person household)	April 2013)		<p>offered under the Home Affairs Department's Singleton Hostel Programme; persons residing in temporary housing; or homeless persons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● monthly household income and rent shall not exceed the specified limit⁷; ● not receiving CSSA; and ● not owning any property in Hong Kong. 			<p>number of beneficiaries will be 27 718 (about 55 436 persons)</p> <p>The CCF Secretariat is evaluating this programme and programme (13) above, and considering to launch an integrated programme.</p>
(18) Provision of special	Late January	12.6	● All requirements	The	Figures are not	SWD has extended

⁷ The specified limits for monthly household income and rental cap vary with the household size, with details as follows –

<u>Household size</u>	<u>Specified limit for monthly household income (\$)</u>	<u>Rental cap (\$)</u>
1	8,740	4,370
2	13,410	6,705
3	17,060	8,530
4	20,710	10,355
5	23,640	11,820
6 or more	26,590	13,295

Assistance programme (Disbursement amount)	Implementation date	Funding provision (\$ million)	Major eligibility criteria	Beneficiary statistics (as at 28 February 2013)	Disbursements (\$ million) (as at 28 February 2013)	Progress and evaluation
<p>subsidy to persons with severe physical disabilities for renting respiratory support medical equipment</p> <p>(For beneficiaries with annual household disposable financial resources of \$100,000 or below, a monthly subsidy of \$2,500 will be granted. For beneficiaries with annual household disposable financial resources over \$100,000 but not exceeding \$180,000, a monthly subsidy of \$2,000 will be granted)</p>	<p>2013 (the application period will end on 30 June 2013)</p>		<p>of “Special Care Subsidy for the Severely Disabled” (programme (5) above) are met;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● persons who have to rent the respiratory support medical equipment without any relevant assistance, and are still receiving HDA under the SSA Scheme; and ● the annual household disposable financial resources do not exceed \$180,000. 	<p>programme is recently launched and figures are not yet available.</p>	<p>yet available.</p>	<p>invitations for applications to persons who may meet the eligibility criteria since early February 2013. It is expected that the subsidy can be disbursed from late March onwards.</p> <p>The progress of evaluation will be reported to the CCF Task Force in future.</p>

Appendix II

Relevant papers on Community Care Fund

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Legislative Council	13 October 2010 (Item II)	Agenda Minutes
Panel on Home Affairs	14 January 2011 (Item IV)	Agenda Minutes
Finance Committee	6 May 2011	Minutes FCR(2011-12)8
Finance Committee	13 May 2011 (Item II)	Minutes FCR(2011-12)8
Panel on Home Affairs	8 July 2011 (Item II)	Agenda Minutes
Finance Committee	18 July 2011 (Item II)	Minutes FCR(2011-12)41
Legislative Council	2 November 2011	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 122 to 124
Panel on Home Affairs	9 December 2011 (Item III)	Agenda Minutes
House Committee	22 March 2013	Agenda Verbatim Record of Proceedings

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 May 2013