

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)2010/15-16

(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/WS

Panel on Welfare Services

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Saturday, 6 February 2016, at 9:30 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP

Members absent : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Public Officers attending : Item I

Mr Matthew CHEUNG, GBS, JP
Secretary for Labour and Welfare
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Ms Carol YIP, JP
Director of Social Welfare
Social Welfare Department

Mr LAM Ka-tai, JP
Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services)
Social Welfare Department

Ms PANG Kit-ling
Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)
Social Welfare Department

**Attendance by
invitation** : Item I

非買位院舍專責小組

Ms CHAU Tsang
Representative

Hong Kong Evergreen Association of the Elderly

Ms YAU Chit-yee
Chairman

安老行業專業專責小組

Miss NG Lai-shan Pearl Joanna
代表

Third Side

Mr LI Wai
Executive Members

長者大聯盟

Mr Benjamin LOK Ko-yeung
Representative

The Elderly Services Association of Hong Kong

Ms LI Fai
Chairman

SME Global Alliance Elderly & Special Needs Services
Association Limited

Mr Richard LEE Pak-ying
Chairman

Mr KAM Man-fung, Member of Tuen Mun District
Council

Ms KONG Ching-man

Liberal Party

Mr Ken CHOW
Chairman, New Territories West District Affairs
Committee

前線員工權益關注組

Miss Rida CHEUNG
成員

Community Care and Nursing Home Workers General
Union

Ms CHUNG Wai-ling
Chairperson

中小企安老社區拓展部

Ms NG Yuk-hung

婦聯

Ms MAN Kam-lai
委員

SME Global Alliance Ltd.

Mr Tommy LO Man-ho
Founding President

Care For the Elderly & Disabled Association

Mr FONG Fu-leung
Committee

Elderly Community Care Services Concern Group

Mr LAU Kwong-kit
Member

深水埗家屬權益協會

Mr LEUNG Wang-chi
Committee

Neighbourhood and Worker's Service Centre

Mr Ivan WONG Yun-tat
Community Affair Officer

Mr WONG Wai-kwan

Mr FUNG Hing

長者政策監察聯席之友

Ms FUNG Miu-ha
Member

The Hong Kong Council of Social Service

Mr TANG Chung-wah
Officer (Elderly Service)

Chinese Young Men's Christian Association of Hong Kong Chai Wan Neighbourhood Elderly Centre

Ms TANG Sze-wai
Principal Programme Secretary

Tung Wah Group of Hospitals

Ms Alice LEUNG Bick-king
Assistant Community Services Secretary (Elderly Services)

Hong Kong Christian Service

Ms Andy TONG Yee-lai
Superintendent

Hong Kong Family Welfare Society

Ms Estelle WONG
Senior Manager

The Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Network on Community Care Service

Mr LEUNG Tsan-kuen
Convenor

Hong Kong S.K.H. Lady MacLehose Centre

Mr Benson NG Yuk-ming
Senior Service Coordinator

Care for Elderly Association

Mr NG Ting-shan
Chairman

Mr CHING Pak-nin

Mr CHEUNG Kie

St. James' Settlement

Ms Yvonne LO Pui-fan
Senior Service Manager (Service Development)

Hong Kong Lutheran Social Service, Lutheran Church
– Hong Kong Synod

Mr Philip CHOI Shing-kiu
Service Director

Mongkok Kai-Fong Association Limited Chan Hing
Social Service Centre

Ms Lisa LEUNG Sheung-ling
Programme Director (Integrated Elderly Service
Division)

Evangelical Lutheran Church Social Service – Hong
Kong

Ms Esther WONG Chui-yan
Service Director

The Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Specialized
Committee on Elderly Service

Ms Yvonne CHAK Tung-ching
Chairperson

長期護理關注平台

Mr CHENG Ching-fat

Ms Ishigami LEE Fung-king Alice

Concerning Home Care Service Alliance

Miss CHEUNG Nga-lam

Reclaiming Social Work Movement

Miss CHAN Shun-yi

The Democratic Party

Ms Joanne LEUNG
Representative

Victoria City Social Service Centre Ltd.

Ms YEUNG Siu-pik
Consultant

Clerk in attendance : Mr Colin CHUI
Chief Council Secretary (2) 4

Staff in attendance : Ms Catherina YU
Senior Council Secretary (2) 4

Miss Maggie CHIU
Legislative Assistant (2) 4

Ms Ada TANG
Clerical Assistant (2) 4

Action

- I. Pilot Scheme on Community Care Service Voucher for the Elderly (Second Phase)**
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)574/15-16(03) to (04), CB(2)781/15-16(01) to (04), CB(2)834/15-16(01) to (02), CB(2)857/15-16(01) to (02) and CB(2)1018/15-16(01)]

At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for Labour and Welfare ("SLW") briefed members on the implementation details of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme on Community Care Service Voucher for the Elderly ("the Pilot Scheme").

Presentation of views by deputations

2. The Chairman invited deputations to present their views. A total of 43 deputations expressed their views which were summarized in the **Appendix**. The Chairman requested the Administration to respond to the major views and concerns of deputations in relation to:

Action

- (a) reasons for requiring private organizations to have at least 12-month proven experience in providing community care services ("CCS") for the elderly in order to become recognized service providers ("RSPs");
- (b) on-going assessments for voucher users;
- (c) the role of the Centralized Team of the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") in monitoring service quality of RSPs and case management;
- (d) provision of seed money for private organizations which would become RSPs;
- (e) codes of practice for RSPs and the basis of setting service quality standards;
- (f) the basis of setting the co-payment rates and voucher values; and
- (g) audit of the books of account of RSPs.

The Administration's response to deputations' views

3. SLW said that according to the findings of the mid-term evaluation of the First Phase of the Pilot Scheme ("the mid-term evaluation"), the Pilot Scheme promoted greater choice and enabled service users to select their preferred RSPs and services that best fitted their needs. Having regard to the findings of the mid-term evaluation which endorsed the direction of the Pilot Scheme, the Administration proposed launching the Second Phase. The Administration had capitalized on the experience of the implementation of the First Phase and enhanced the design of the Second Phase. He said that "ageing in place as the core, institutional care as backup" was the underlying principle of the Administration's elderly care policy and the introduction of the Pilot Scheme would not reduce the existing provision of subsidized CCS.

4. To facilitate more personalized choices for elderly persons to meet their diverse needs, private organizations should be invited to become RSPs in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme so as to enhance service quality and diversity. Noting the concern about the service quality of private organizations participating in the Pilot Scheme, he said that apart from having 12-month proven experience in providing CCS for the elderly, it was desirable for these organizations to also have experience in providing home care services for the elderly. The Administration would evaluate the

Action

implementation of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme and make improvements to the Scheme if necessary.

5. Regarding the request for dissemination of more details of the Pilot Scheme, SLW said that the Administration had briefed the Panel on the progress of the implementation of the First Phase of the Pilot Scheme, including the reasons for the low participation rate in and withdrawal from the First Phase. Services not meeting users' individual care needs, the elderly persons being taken care of by their own carers/domestic helpers and the passing away of the elderly persons were some of the reasons.

6. SLW explained the Centralized Team's role which was set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)781/15-16(01)). As regards the suggestion of providing a summary of the evaluation findings in Chinese, SLW said that SWD would prepare the Chinese summary.

7. Director of Social Welfare ("DSW") said that as seed money to be provided for RSPs was funded by the Lotteries Fund ("LF"), there would be restrictions on its utilization. According to the LF requirements, seed money could only be used for provision of welfare services by non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"). Private organizations which would become RSPs were therefore ineligible to apply for seed money.

8. DSW said that all RSPs were required to sign a Service Agreement ("SA") for the provision of services under the Pilot Scheme. They were required to comply with the terms and conditions set out in the SA and the Service Specifications which included service quality standards, criteria and procedural requirements. The Service Specifications of the First Phase had been uploaded onto the SWD's website. To ensure service quality, RSPs would be required to deploy professional staff (i.e. physiotherapist, occupational therapist, enrolled/registered nurse or registered social worker) to coordinate and oversee the formulation, implementation, achievement and review of individual care plans ("ICPs") for individual voucher holders. RSPs should produce the ICPs for SWD's examination and monitoring as and when requested.

9. Regarding the concern about the monitoring of fees to be charged by and the service quality of private organizations, DSW said that the prices of service items under the Pilot Scheme were subject to SWD's approval and should be set within the permitted ceiling prices recognized by SWD. All RSPs, be they NGOs or private organizations, were required to make public and update the prices and information of service items to safeguard the

Action

interests of voucher holders. In addition to conducting unannounced visits and random checks at the premises where voucher services were delivered, SWD would visit service users to collect their feedback on RSPs' services. Service users' choice of RSPs would be the best way to reflect the service quality of RSPs.

10. DSW further said that five different voucher values would be offered in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme. The highest voucher value (i.e. \$8,300) proposed under the Second Phase was largely comparable with the unit cost of subvented full-time Day Care Centre for the Elderly. The lowest voucher value (i.e. \$3,500) was set with reference to the service pattern of the elderly persons with the minimum level of CCS required. The third level of voucher value (i.e. \$6,250) was the voucher value (at 2015-2016 price level) for the First Phase of the Pilot Scheme. This voucher value would facilitate First Phase users to migrate to the Second Phase. In line with the underlying principle of elderly care policy (i.e. ageing in place), voucher holders of the Second Phase would be provided with the options of home-based CCS only, centre-based CCS only (full-time or part-time) and a mixture of centre-based CCS and home-based CCS. She explained the scope of services under different voucher values outlined in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)781/15-16(01)).

11. As regards the basis of setting the co-payment rates, DSW said that given limited public resources and the ageing population, the Administration should ensure that elderly services could be sustained. As such, those who could afford should pay more so that public resources could be deployed to assist elderly persons who were most in need. For the Second Phase, six co-payment categories on a sliding scale would be adopted and the co-payment ratios of the Second Phase would generally mirror those of the First Phase.

12. Regarding the concern about inadequate provision of meal delivery and escort services, DSW said that these services would be provided under the Second Phase. She further said that both subvented and private RSPs would be subject to the same monitoring mechanism and professional staff requirements.

Discussion

Monitoring of service quality of recognized service providers

13. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that many deputations did not support the

Action

Pilot Scheme because they had grave concerns about the monitoring of the service quality of RSPs, the means test requirement and the engagement of private organizations in the provision of voucher services. They worried that it was the Administration's intention to privatize CCS so as to reduce its commitment. He asked whether the Administration would consider putting a halt to the implementation of the Second Phase in the light of deputations' concerns.

14. SLW responded that private organizations were required to meet stringent requirements in order to become RSPs and a mechanism was in place for monitoring the performance of RSPs. Private organizations should be given an opportunity to participate in the Pilot Scheme and improvements to the Second Phase could be made after its implementation having regard to the views collected.

15. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that given serious shortage of subvented CCS, many elderly persons were left with no choice but to receive substandard private CCS. Pointing out that the Panel passed the motion urging the Administration to suspend the implementation of the Pilot Scheme on Residential Care Service Voucher for the Elderly ("RCS Pilot Scheme") at its meeting on 28 March 2015 and the motion objecting to the extension of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme to private organizations at its meeting on 11 January 2016, he did not see the need for engaging private organizations in the Pilot Scheme in a rush. In his view, the Administration should first examine how the existing provision of non-profit making CCS could be strengthened in order to meet the service demands and improve case management.

16. SLW responded that the Administration attached great importance to the well-being of elderly persons and the resources committed by the Administration to elderly care services had continued to increase throughout the years. The Pilot Scheme sought to enable service users to select their preferred RSPs and services that best fitted their needs. Elderly persons were free to choose whether to use voucher services. The Administration would be careful in the engagement of private organizations in the Second Phase of Pilot Scheme.

(Dr Fernando CHEUNG took the chair at this juncture in the absence of the Chairman.)

17. Mr TANG Ka-piu welcomed the enhancements made to voucher values, district coverage and service types in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme but expressed concern about the service quality of private

Action

organizations. Expressing worries that staff of some private organizations might not have the required professional qualifications and some private organizations might compromise quality to make profit, he took the view that the Administration should enhance the monitoring of service quality of private organizations to restore the public's confidence in these organizations. The Administration should also set up a monitoring mechanism as well as a system for continuous evaluation of all service providers and make public the evaluation results. Noting that some private organizations attending the meeting had indicated that they were willing to enhance their service quality, he said that the Administration should consider stakeholders' views before launching the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme. The views of stakeholders should also be considered in the Administration's study of the RCS Pilot Scheme. He called on the Administration to defer the inclusion of private organizations in the pool of RSPs to the Third Phase of the Pilot Scheme.

(The Chairman took the chair at this juncture.)

18. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that engaging private organizations in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme would bring about greater demand for private CCS. The implementation of the Second Phase would be a waste of public money if the Administration did not step up the monitoring of private organizations. It was the Administration's responsibility to ensure the quality of elderly services. The Administration should therefore increase its commitment to elderly services and provide all service providers with the necessary resources for the provision of quality services. He asked whether the Administration had assessed the service quality of private organizations by using a service checklist before proposing the extension of voucher services to private organizations.

19. SLW responded that the inclusion of private organizations in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme was a trial which would be conducted in a prudent manner. A stringent selection mechanism was in place and the Administration would only consider applications by private organizations with proven quality and good track record. Performance of private organizations participating in the Pilot Scheme would also be monitored closely. There were no more than 10 qualified private organizations on SWD's list and only quality private organizations should be included in the pool of RSPs under the Second Phase.

20. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that many elderly persons were of the view that the Administration had made use of the Pilot Scheme to shift its responsibility of providing CCS to the private market. These elderly persons did not support the Pilot Scheme as they lacked confidence in private

Action

organizations and doubted whether there were sufficient qualified private service providers. He further said some elderly persons would not express their dissatisfaction about the performance of the service providers and chose not to switch to another service provider because they did not want to burden their family members. The Administration should not evade its responsibility and rely on elderly persons' choice of service providers as a means to monitor RSPs. The Administration should be proactive in gathering service users' views on the performance of RSPs, e.g. by using a service checklist. He also expressed concern that some private organizations might lower their fees in order to be RSPs in the Pilot Scheme, thereby affecting the service quality. While considering that private organizations should not be included in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme, he suggested that quality private organizations should do something to gain the public confidence and the engagement of these organizations in providing voucher services could be considered at a later stage.

Role of the Centralized Team

21. The Chairman enquired about how the Centralized Team would assist elderly persons in choosing voucher services and how the Administration would monitor top-up services provided by RSPs. SLW reiterated the objectives of the Pilot Scheme and stressed that the well-being of elderly persons was the Administration's primary concern. The Centralized Team would provide dedicated support and assistance for voucher holders with a view to enabling them to choose the services that best suited their needs. DSW supplemented that the Centralized Team would serve as the first point of contact for potential voucher holders and provide in collaboration with Responsible Workers dedicated support and assistance to voucher holders including providing information on RSPs, assisting elderly persons in deciding whether they should apply for vouchers, selecting suitable RSPs and service packages, transferring to another RSP where necessary, etc.

22. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to provide the caseload per social worker of the Centralized Team and the flowchart illustrating the workflow in relation to the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme. The Chairman said that the flowchart should include: (a) arrangements for applications on the Central Waiting List for subsidized long-term care services of elderly persons who had participated in the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme; (b) processing of applications received in the Second Phase; (c) processing of voucher holders' requests for switching to another RSP; (d) complaint-handling procedures; and (e) monitoring of service quality and auditing of the books of account of an RSP, etc. DSW undertook to provide the required information.

Admin

Action

23. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that although the Administration was unable to provide a full picture of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme, it would still proceed with the implementation of the Second Phase. He opined that such an arrangement was bizarre. In response to the enquiries of the Chairman and Dr Fernando CHEUNG about the manpower provision of the Centralized Team, DSW said that SWD had increased manpower for social welfare services and would keep in view the manpower requirement for the Centralized Team in the light of the implementation of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme. The Administration would provide the Panel with the manpower provision of the Centralized Team after the passage of the Appropriation Bill 2016.

II. Any other business

24. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:12 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
30 August 2016

Panel on Welfare Services

Special Meeting on Saturday, 6 February 2016 at 9:30 am

Pilot Scheme on Community Care Service Voucher for the Elderly (Second Phase)

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
1.	非買位院舍專責小組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging private organizations in the Pilot Scheme on Community Care Service Voucher for the Elderly ("the Pilot Scheme") would help replenish the supply of Community Care Service for the elderly ("CCS") and provide voucher users with more choices. The wide distribution of private organizations over the territory would enable elderly persons to choose a service provider in the neighbourhood.
2.	Hong Kong Evergreen Association of the Elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The types of services under the Pilot Scheme should be increased and more conveniently accessible recognized service providers ("RSPs") should be engaged. The Administration should take into account elderly persons' accessibility to services in formulating elderly care policies.
3.	安老行業專業專責小組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excluding private organizations from becoming RSPs would obstruct their development. It was unfair to exclude all private organizations from the Pilot Scheme because of a small number of black sheep. Including private organizations in the Pilot Scheme would enable more supply of CCS and more choices for voucher holders. The Administration should not confine the provision of seed money to non-profit making organizations only.
4.	Third Side	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early provision of suitable CCS for elderly persons would help delay their functional deterioration and reduce the pressure of hospitals and elderly care institutions. All elderly persons in need of CCS should therefore be covered by the Pilot Scheme. The Administration should provide subsidy for improving the fittings in the homes of elderly singletons and elderly couples. These elderly persons should be provided with homemaking services so as to reduce home accidents.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Administration should be innovative in the types of services under the Pilot Scheme to cater for the diversified needs of elderly persons.
5.	長者大聯盟	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private organizations should be included in the pool of RSPs of the Pilot Scheme. Private organizations should be given an opportunity to compete with non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") on a level playing field.
6.	The Elderly Services Association of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [LC Paper No. CB(2)781/15-16(02)] It was unfair to exclude all private organizations from the Pilot Scheme because of a small number of private organizations which provided substandard CCS.
7.	SME Global Alliance Elderly & Special Needs Services Association Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [LC Paper No. CB(2)1018/15-16(01)] Given that non-profit making organizations were not required to have 12-month proven experience in CCS when they first started to provide CCS, such a requirement should not be imposed on private organizations.
8.	Mr KAM Man-fung, Member of Tuen Mun District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Administration should not confine the provision of seed money to non-profit making organizations only. The Administration should consider adopting measures to address the manpower shortage problem in private organizations and strengthen CCS, e.g. unleashing women workforce, allocating more resources to provide training for care workers, nurses and social workers and increasing the quota of the Navigation Scheme for Young Persons in Care Services.
9.	Ms KONG Ching-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPs should be conveniently accessible by elderly persons. The Social Welfare Department ("SWD") should enhance the monitoring of RSPs.
10.	Liberal Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration between subvented and private organizations in the provision of CCS could address the imbalance in supply of subsidized and private CCS and enhance quality of CCS. SWD should establish performance benchmarks for private organizations and evaluate their performance according to the benchmarks. Voucher users should be invited to evaluate performance of private organizations and the evaluation results should be made available on the SWD's website to facilitate the public to make informed choices.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Administration should earmark sites and allocate lower floors of public rental housing blocks at the planning stage for the provision of residential care homes for the elderly.
11.	前線員工權益關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [LC Paper No. CB(2)857/15-16(01)] The Administration should monitor all RSPs regardless of whether they were private or non-profit making organizations.
12.	Community Care and Nursing Home Workers General Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notwithstanding the long waiting time for subsidized CCS, many elderly persons preferred subsidized CCS to private CCS because they lacked confidence in private organizations. To ensure the well-being of service users, SWD should monitor service quality and staffing provision of private organizations which would become RSPs. Private organizations should offer better terms of employment to attract qualified care workers.
13.	中小企安老社區拓展部	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPs should be available in the vicinity and the services they provided should meet the needs of elderly persons. Considering the amount of subsidy provided for NGOs and the number of service users, the services provided by NGOs were not cost effective.
14.	婦聯	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voucher services should be available in the communities with which elderly persons were familiar.
15.	SME Global Alliance Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instead of providing subvention for non-profit making organizations, the Administration should consider subsidizing elderly persons directly for meeting their care needs. Including private organizations in the Pilot Scheme would foster competition, enhance service quality, expand the geographical coverage of voucher services and provide more opportunities for those who were interested in joining the elderly care industry. The Administration should improve the infrastructure for elderly services and attract talents to the elderly care industry.
16.	Care For the Elderly & Disabled Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voucher users should be allowed to choose RSPs without any restriction.
17.	Elderly Community Care Services Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [LC Paper No. CB(2)834/15-16(01)]
18.	深水埗家屬權益協會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voucher services should be available in the vicinity and there should be more choices of RSPs for the interests of elderly persons.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
19.	Neighbourhood and Worker's Service Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objected to the Pilot Scheme as it was an attempt of the Administration to reduce its responsibility for providing CCS. • The Administration should have a comprehensive elderly services plan and allocate more resources to subvented CCS.
20.	Mr WONG Wai-kwan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [LC Paper No. CB(2)781/15-16(03)] • The Administration should address the manpower shortage problem in the elderly care sector in order to improve quality of elderly services.
21.	Mr FUNG Hing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should evaluate the health conditions of elderly persons on a regular basis and adjust the services according to their health conditions. • Services to be paid fully or partially by users and those to be fully subsidized by the Administration should be clearly defined. • Many low-income families might not be able to afford the co-payment.
22.	長者政策監察聯席之友	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case managers should assist elderly persons and their family members in understanding more about the Pilot Scheme, thereby facilitating them to choose the services. • Service modes under the Pilot Scheme should be diversified. • Services should be adjusted to suit the changes in health conditions of elderly persons.
23.	The Hong Kong Council of Social Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should devise tools for performance monitoring and quality assurance of voucher services. • Elderly persons' needs should be the core element of risk management and quality assurance of voucher services.
24.	Chinese Young Men's Christian Association of Hong Kong Chai Wan Neighbourhood Elderly Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should draw up codes of practice and service quality standards for RSPs and set up case management system as early as possible. • Services under the Pilot Scheme should be reviewed regularly and adjusted to suit the changing needs of users. • Long-term care support centres should be set up at district level to coordinate referrals of voucher users among districts and a central long-term care support office should be set up to review voucher services and monitor service quality.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
25.	Tung Wah Group of Hospitals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [LC Paper No. CB(2)781/15-16(04)]
26.	Hong Kong Christian Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pilot Scheme should provide elderly persons who were severely impaired as assessed under the Standardized Care Need Assessment Mechanism for Elderly Services with full-time carers or home-based CCS. Family members should be allowed to assume the role of full-time carers for these elderly persons under the Pilot Scheme. • Home-based respite services should be included in the Pilot Scheme. • The Administration should establish a case management system for the aforesaid elderly persons and provide the required manpower resources to support the system. Codes of practice for case managers should also be drawn up.
27.	Hong Kong Family Welfare Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should first determine the basis for calculating costs and subsidies for voucher services. Profit control on voucher services should be imposed before including private organizations in the pool of RSPs. • The elderly care sector opposed the implementation of the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme if the cost, subsidy and voucher values were not determined scientifically.
28.	The Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Network on Community Care Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private organizations should not be included in the pool of RSPs until a quality assurance and monitoring system was put in place.
29.	Hong Kong S.K.H. Lady MacLehose Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service flexibility under the Pilot Scheme should be enhanced. • The Administration should evaluate the service needs and the costs for providing voucher services. Voucher values should be worked out in a systematic and scientific manner. • The Pilot Scheme should not be implemented before a well-established case management and quality monitoring mechanism was in place.
30.	Care for Elderly Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objected to the inclusion of private organizations in the pool of RSPs. • The Administration should provide more information on how the SWD's Centralized Team would step up service monitoring of RSPs.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
31.	Mr CHING Pak-nin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many private organizations aimed at making profit rather than providing quality services. In implementing the Pilot Scheme, the Administration should attach importance to the interests of elderly persons. Meal delivery and escort services were inadequate.
32.	Mr CHEUNG Kie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objected to inviting private organizations to provide CCS at this stage as there was no monitoring mechanism and licensing system for these organizations.
33.	St. James' Settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objected to inviting private organizations to provide CCS at this stage. The Administration should establish a mechanism for monitoring service quality of private organizations and a case management system to assist service users in making informed choices of services.
34.	Hong Kong Lutheran Social Service, Lutheran Church – Hong Kong Synod	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for setting voucher values should be more transparent. The Administration should be more specific on its requirements for service standards, manpower arrangements and qualifications of care workers under the Pilot Scheme and see to it that these requirements were met. Private organizations which would become RSPs should be required to provide information on their costs and profits.
35.	Mongkok Kai-Fong Association Limited Chan Hing Social Service Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design of the Pilot Scheme should be more user-friendly to facilitate elderly persons to use the services. A mechanism for inspection of books of account should be established to check whether RSPs had used the Administration's subsidy on service users.
36.	Evangelical Lutheran Church Social Service – Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Administration should make use of InterRAI, which was an internationally recognized tool for long-term care service assessment and case management, to evaluate the quality of services under the Pilot Scheme. Objected to the inclusion of profit-making private organizations in the pool of RSPs in the absence of a monitoring system for these organizations. Unlike NGOs, private organizations were not required to employ professionals for providing voucher services. This arrangement was the Administration's attempt to pave way for private organizations which provided substandard CCS to become RSPs.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
37.	The Hong Kong Council of Social Service, Specialized Committee on Elderly Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should resolve the problems relating to planning and infrastructure for elderly services (e.g. the basis for setting voucher values and co-payment rates) before launching the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme. • An effective and independent case management system should be set up and a stringent monitoring system for service quality of RSPs should be established. • The Administration should ensure that RSPs would provide sufficient manpower for the provision of voucher services and private organizations should have more than 12 months of proven experience in providing CCS for becoming RSPs.
38.	長期護理關注平台	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Administration should draw up long-term plan and policies for provision of care services for elderly persons and persons with disabilities. • The Pilot Scheme did not address the inadequate supply of conventional CCS and the quality of private organizations was a cause of concern. • Instead of launching the Second Phase of the Pilot Scheme, the Administration should allocate resources to support those who were carers of their elderly family members.
39.	Ms Ishigami LEE Fung-king Alice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concern that private organizations might not be able to provide quality services for elderly persons. • Lacked confidence in the Administration in stepping up monitoring of RSPs.
40.	Concerning Home Care Service Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [LC Paper No. CB(2)834/15-16(02)] • In addition to voucher services, elderly persons should be provided with choices of other subvented CCS.
41.	Reclaiming Social Work Movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed dissatisfaction about the Administration's intention to engage private organizations to provide voucher services. • Expressed concern that private organizations might be unable to deploy sufficient manpower for providing voucher services and their staff might not have the required professional qualifications for providing certain care services. • The Administration should review the service monitoring mechanism and formulate a comprehensive plan for elderly services.

No.	Deputation/individual	Views
42.	The Democratic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="608 239 1145 275">[LC Paper No. CB(2)857/15-16(02)]
43.	Victoria City Social Service Centre Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="608 313 1503 461">Supported the "money-following-the-user" approach and the inclusion of private organizations in the Pilot Scheme. The Administration should establish a stringent mechanism for the selection and monitoring of private organizations. <li data-bbox="608 499 1503 790">The Administration should provide more details of the Pilot Scheme (e.g. reasons for low participation rate in and withdrawal from the First Phase of the Pilot Scheme). The mid-term evaluation report of the First Phase of the Pilot Scheme, which was only in English, was too difficult for service users. A Chinese version of the evaluation report and a summary of the evaluation findings in Chinese should be made available to the public. <li data-bbox="608 828 1503 936">The Administration should strengthen publicity of the Pilot Scheme and make improvements in consulting stakeholders on the Pilot Scheme.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
30 August 2016