

政府總部  
民政事務局

香港灣仔  
軒尼詩道一百三十號  
修頓中心四樓



LC Paper No. CB(2)59/13-14(01)

**GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT  
HOME AFFAIRS BUREAU**

4TH FLOOR, SOUTHERN CENTRE,  
130 HENNESSY ROAD,  
WAN CHAI,  
HONG KONG.

Our Ref. : HAB/CCF/1-55/3

Tel. No. : 2835 1365

Fax Line : 2147 1326

10 October 2013

Legislative Council Secretariat  
Legislative Council Complex  
1 Legislative Council Road  
Central, Hong Kong  
(Attn: Ms Catherina YU)

Dear Ms YU,

Evaluation reports of the Community Care Fund assistance programmes

At the meeting of the Subcommittee on Poverty under the LegCo House Committee held on 24 May, Members asked the Administration to provide the evaluation reports of the Community Care Fund (CCF) assistance programmes. We provided nine completed evaluation reports (covering 10 programmes) on 19 June, including the evaluation reports for the programmes of "Subsidy for Low-income Persons who are Inadequately Housed" and "Subsidy for Low-income Elderly Tenants in Private Housing". Recently, the CCF Secretariat has prepared the latest statistics for these two reports. Attached please find the information for Members' reference.

In addition, the following three reports which have been completed recently are also attached for Members' information:

- (i) the evaluation report for the programme of "Financial Assistance for Ethnic Minorities and New Arrivals from the Mainland for Taking Language-related Public Examinations";
- (ii) the evaluation report for the programme of "Subsidy for Non-school-attending Ethnic Minorities and New Arrivals from the Mainland Participating in Language Courses"; and

(iii) the interim evaluation report for the “Elderly Dental Assistance Programme”.

Attached please also find the English translation copies of the above reports and information.

For enquiries, please feel free to contact the undersigned. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,



(Billy AU)

for Secretary for Home Affairs

C.C.

Secretary for Food and Health (Attn: Ms Jenny WONG)

Director of Home Affairs (Attn: Mr CHENG Kwan-yam)

**“Subsidy for Low-income Persons who are Inadequately Housed” Programme  
(the programme) Evaluation Report:  
Statistics  
(as at 15 August 2013)**

**1. Application statistics**

Number of applications received by the Community Care Fund Secretariat	26 061 households (59 682 persons)
Applications processed	26 039 households (59 616 persons)
(a) Successful applications [disbursement amount]	25 768 households (59 005 persons) [\$150.16 million]
(b) Unsuccessful applications	271 households (611 persons)

**2. Distribution of districts where applications were submitted by the households<sup>1</sup>**

Districts where applications were submitted	Number of applications	Percentage of the total number of applications
Sham Shui Po	7 303	28.0%
Yau Tsim Mong	4 581	17.6%
Kowloon City	3 166	12.1%
Tsuen Wan	2 164	8.3%
Wan Chai	1 763	6.7%
Kwun Tong	1 509	5.8%
North	1 413	5.4%
Yuen Long	957	3.7%
Kwai Tsing	831	3.2%
Central & Western	699	2.7%
Tai Po	696	2.7%
Tuen Mun	309	1.2%
Southern	290	1.1%
Islands	281	1.1%
Sai Kung	99	0.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26 061</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> The statistics were drawn up based on the location of the community service units where applications were submitted by the households. There were no community service units in the Eastern, Sha Tin and Wong Tai Sin districts that assist in implementing the programme.

### 3. Number of beneficiary households, persons and disbursement amount

Household size <sup>2</sup>	Number of beneficiary households	Percentage of the total number of beneficiary households	Number of persons in beneficiary households	Disbursement amount (\$ million)
1-person	8 502	33.0%	8 502	25.51
2-person	6 737	26.1%	13 474	40.42
3-person	5 999	23.3%	17 997	47.99
4-person	3 758	14.6%	15 032	30.07
5-person	653	2.5%	3 265	5.22
6-or-more-person	119	0.5%	735	0.95
<b>Total</b>	<b>25 768</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>59 005</b>	<b>150.16</b>

### 4. Types of residence of beneficiary households

Types of residence  Household size	Rooms, cubicles, cocklofts or bedspaces in private housing (households)	Temporary housing (households)	Bedspaces offered under the Singleton Hostel Programme (households)	Homeless (including street sleepers and persons living in temporary shelters) (households)	Total number of households (households)
1-person	7 120	848	115	419	8 502
2-person	5 915	818	not applicable	4	6 737
3-person	5 280	719	not applicable	0	5 999
4-person	3 316	442	not applicable	0	3 758
5-person	525	128	not applicable	0	653
6-or-more person	91	28	not applicable	0	119
<b>Total</b>	<b>22 247</b>	<b>2 983</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>25 768</b>
Percentage of the total number of households	86.3%	11.6%	0.5%	1.6%	100%

<sup>2</sup> This refers to the number of persons who received subsidy in the household.

## 5. Income of beneficiary households

Household size	Average monthly household income (\$)	Average monthly household income to the programme's income limit ratio (%)
1-person	4,840	55.4%
2-person	7,894	58.9%
3-person	10,838	63.5%
4-person	13,505	65.2%
5-person	14,733	62.3%
6-or-more-person	16,399	61.7%
All households	8,603	Not applicable

## 6. Rent paid by beneficiary households (only applicable to households renting rooms/cubicles, cocklofts or bedspaces in private housing)<sup>3</sup>

Household size	Average monthly household rent paid (\$)	Average monthly household rent paid to the programme's rental limit ratio (%)
1-person	2,332	53.4%
2-person	2,825	42.1%
3-person	3,157	37.0%
4-person	3,284	31.7%
5-person	3,554	30.1%
6-or-more-person	3,751	28.2%
All households	2,835	Not applicable

## 7. Average rent paid by beneficiary households (according to the regions where applications were submitted)

Household size	Hong Kong Island (\$)	Kowloon (\$)	New Territories <sup>4</sup> (\$)
1-person	2,509	2,300	2,351
2-person	3,149	2,773	2,825
3-person	3,616	3,076	3,162
4-person	3,878	3,192	3,313

<sup>3</sup> As only households renting rooms/cubicles, cocklofts or bedspaces in private housing were required to provide the information of their average monthly household rent paid in the past three months, hence only their rental information and statistics are available.

<sup>4</sup> including the Islands district.

<b>Household size</b>	<b>Hong Kong Island (\$)</b>	<b>Kowloon (\$)</b>	<b>New Territories<sup>4</sup> (\$)</b>
5-person	4,315	3,442	3,383
6 or above-person	3,887	3,699	3,615
All households	3,196	2,773	2,852

## **8. Rent paid by and income of beneficiary households**

<b>Household size</b>	<b>Average monthly household rent paid (see table 6 above) to average monthly household income (see table 5 above) ratio (%)</b>	<b>Average monthly household rent paid to the programme's income limit ratio (%)</b>
1-person	48.2%	26.7%
2-person	35.8%	21.1%
3-person	29.1%	18.5%
4-person	24.3%	15.9%
5-person	24.1%	15.0%
6 or above-person	22.9%	14.1%
All households	33.0%	Not applicable

## **9. Information about the beneficiaries**

(a)	Total number of applicants and household members	59 005 persons
(b)	Residence status	
	- permanent resident	28 185 persons (47.8%)
	- non-permanent resident	30 820 persons (52.2%)
(c)	Age group	
	- household members aged under 11	9 604 persons (16.3%)
	- household members aged between 11 and 17	6 117 persons (10.4%)
	- applicants/ household members aged 18 or above	43 284 persons (73.3%)

Community Care Fund Secretariat  
October 2013

**“Subsidy for Low-income Elderly Tenants in Private Housing” Programme  
(the programme) Evaluation Report:  
Statistics  
(as at 15 August 2013)**

**1. Application statistics**

Number of applications processed by the Community Care Fund Secretariat	2 130 households (2 641 persons)
(a) Successful applications [disbursement amount]	2 097 households (2 601 persons) [\$10.4 million]
(b) Unsuccessful applications	33 households (40 persons)

**2. Distribution of districts where applications were submitted by the households<sup>1</sup>**

Districts where applications were submitted	Number of applications	Percentage of the total number of applications
Sham Shui Po	356	16.7%
Yau Tsim Mong	292	13.7%
Yuen Long	235	11.0%
Kowloon City	223	10.5%
Eastern	206	9.7%
Tuen Mun	127	6.0%
North	117	5.5%
Central & Western	98	4.6%
Wan Chai	89	4.2%
Tsuen Wan	88	4.1%
Tai Po	64	3.0%
Kwun Tong	52	2.4%
Islands	50	2.3%
Kwai Tsing	38	1.8%
Wong Tai Sin	38	1.8%
Sha Tin	21	1.0%
Southern	20	0.9%
Sai Kung	16	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 130</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> The statistics were drawn up based on the location of the elderly centres where applications were submitted by the households.

### 3. Number of beneficiary households, persons and disbursement amount

Household size <sup>2</sup>	Number of beneficiary households	Percentage of the total number of beneficiary households	Number of persons in beneficiary households	Disbursement amount (\$ million)
1-person	1 599	76.2%	1 599	6.4
2-person	492	23.5%	984	3.93
3-or-more-person	6	0.3%	18	0.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 097</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2 601</b>	<b>10.4</b>

### 4. Income of beneficiary households

Household size	Average monthly household income (\$)	Average monthly household income to the programme's income limit ratio (%)
1-person	2,848	32.6%
2-person	4,197	31.3%
3-or-more-person	9,205	54.0%
All households	3,182	not applicable

### 5. Rent paid by beneficiary households

Household size	Average monthly household rent paid (\$)	Average monthly household rent paid to the programme's rental limit ratio (%)
1-person	2,431	55.6%
2-person	3,852	57.4%
3-or-more-person	6,200	72.7%
All households	2,775	not applicable

<sup>2</sup> This refers to the number of persons who received subsidy in the household.



**6. Average rent paid by beneficiary households (according to the regions where applications were submitted)**

<b>Household size</b>	<b>Hong Kong Island (\$)</b>	<b>Kowloon (\$)</b>	<b>New Territories<sup>3</sup> (\$)</b>
1-person	2,741	2,196	2,590
2-person	4,235	3,260	4,159
3-or-more-person	4,867	not applicable <sup>4</sup>	7,533
All households	3,066	2,393	3,099

**7. Rent paid by and income of beneficiary households**

<b>Household size</b>	<b>Average monthly household rent paid (see table 5 above) to average monthly household income (see table 4 above) ratio (%)</b>	<b>Average monthly household rent paid to the programme's income limit ratio (%)</b>
1-person	85.4%	27.8%
2-person	91.8%	28.7%
3-or-more-person	67.4%	36.3%
All households	87.2%	not applicable

Community Care Fund Secretariat  
October 2013

---

<sup>3</sup> including the Islands district.

<sup>4</sup> 3-or-more-person households did not submit applications in Kowloon.

**Community Care Fund - Assistance Programme  
Financial Assistance for Ethnic Minorities and  
New Arrivals from the Mainland for  
Taking Language-related Public Examinations  
Evaluation Report**

## **Background**

The Community Care Fund (CCF) has been established since early 2011 to provide assistance to people facing economic difficulties, in particular those who fall outside the social safety net or those within the safety net but have special circumstances that are not covered. In addition, the CCF may take forward measures on a pilot basis to help the Government identify those that can be considered for incorporation into the Government's regular assistance and service programmes.

2. The former Steering Committee on CCF endorsed at its meeting on 20 April 2011 the launch of the programme in 2011-12 on a pilot basis to provide financial assistance for non-school-attending ethnic minorities (EMs) and new arrivals from the Mainland (NAs) from low income families to take language-related international public examinations so as to facilitate further study or employment.

3. The two-year pilot programme was administered by the Home Affairs Department (HAD) and application was accepted from 26 September 2011 to 25 September 2013. Applicants for assistance must be non-school-attending EMs or NAs from low income families<sup>1</sup> and must obtain a pass or a specified result in the specific international public examination on languages. The amount of financial assistance per application is equal to the examination fee, ranging from some \$200 to some \$1,000. The original estimated expenditure for the programme was \$3.15 million (i.e. an amount of financial assistance of \$3 million and an administrative fee of \$150,000). It was expected that the programme would benefit around 3 000 people.

---

<sup>1</sup> Low income families refer to those whose monthly household incomes not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income applicable to their household size, or those who have passed the means tests of specified assistance schemes.

## **Implementation of the Assistance Programme**

4. HAD has commissioned a non-governmental organisation (NGO) through open quotation as the service provider of the programme to assist in promotion of the programme, handling of applications and disbursement of financial assistance to the successful applicants, etc.

5. HAD and the service provider conducted a briefing at the end of September 2011. Representatives from over 30 organisations attended the briefing, including government departments and organisations concerned, examination authorities, Support Service Centres for EMs, community support teams for ethnic communities, as well as other relevant NGOs and local organisations. HAD and the service provider introduced to them the programme in detail, and appealed to them to promote and publicise the programme to the target groups through their respective networks.

6. HAD and the service provider promoted the programme to EMs and NAs through various channels, including posters, leaflets, websites, radio, newspapers and the Ambassador Scheme, etc. Furthermore, HAD and the service provider promoted the programme through Support Service Centres for EMs, the Immigration Department (ImmD), social enterprises (SEs) and examination authorities. They also held promotions and accepted applications at examination venues on examination days.

7. In November 2011, HAD accepted the views of EM groups and included the Chinese Language Examinations of the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) and the Advanced Level and Advanced Supplementary Level of the General Certificate of Education (GCE) to the list of specific examinations under the programme so as to allow more choices for target beneficiaries.

8. Having regard to the applications to the programme, the estimated expenditure was revised to \$1.05 million (i.e. an amount of financial assistance of \$1 million and an administrative fee of \$50,000) in February 2013. It was expected that the programme would benefit around 1 000 people.

## **Review**

9. HAD conducted a review of the programme in late February 2013. The effectiveness of the programme was mainly assessed by analysing the application data and applicant profile as well as the questionnaire survey on the beneficiaries and the service provider. The review was completed in early June 2013.

## **Applicant Profile and Survey Results**

### **I. Application Data and Applicant Profile (Details are at Appendix (i))**

10. As at late May 2013, a total of 483 applications have been received. 363 of them have been vetted and 120 were being processed<sup>2</sup>. Among the 363 vetted cases, 283 were successful with the financial assistance disbursed amounting to around \$300,000, and 80 were ineligible.

11. Among the 483 applications received, 45 (9.3%) were from EMs and the remaining 438 (90.7%) were from NAs. The majority of applicants belonged to the age group of 31 to 40, accounting for 50.3%.

12. Among the 483 applications received, 385 (79.7%) took Putonghua tests, such as State Language Commission – PSC (Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi) Test, 78 (16.1%) took examinations on English language, such as those of International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and 20 (4.2%) took examinations on Chinese language, such as those of the Advanced Level of the GCE.

13. Regarding the 80 ineligible applications, the chief reason for rejection was incomplete information. Information required, such as examination result certificates, was not provided after repeated contact and the applications were withdrawn by the applicants (60 cases, accounting for 75%). The second reason was that the applicants were still attending school (10 cases, accounting for 12.5%).

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicants must submit to the service provider a copy of notification of examination results upon receipt of the notification so that their applications can be further processed. As a result, quite a number of applications were being processed.

## II. Feedback from the Beneficiaries (Details are at Appendix (ii))

14. Participation of the beneficiaries in the questionnaire survey was voluntary. As at late May 2013, among the total of 210 questionnaires received by the service provider, 2 were from EMs, and 208 from NAs. Among the responding beneficiaries, the majority belonged to the group having resided in Hong Kong for one to three years, accounting for 32.3%. In terms of age, the majority belonged to the age group of 31 to 40, accounting for 50.9%. In terms of education level, the majority were of senior secondary level, accounting for 43.8%.

15. The responding beneficiaries who agreed or strongly agreed that the promotion efforts of the programme were adequate accounted for 82.4%; that the programme had achieved the objective of encouraging further study accounted for 93.3%; and that the financial assistance under the programme was helpful to the beneficiaries accounted for 94.7%. The feedback of the responding beneficiaries on the service provider was positive. With regard to the enquiry service, handling of applications, reimbursement arrangement and staff service attitude of the service provider, over 95% of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied.

## III. Feedback from the Service Provider

16. HAD also conducted a questionnaire survey on the service provider. On the whole, the service provider considered that the arrangement and preparation of the programme were appropriate and was satisfied with the HAD's active support and overall arrangement. It also expressed willingness to continue providing assistance to similar programmes.

## IV. Public Enquiries (Details are at Appendix (iii))

17. The service provider had set up a hotline to provide necessary support and information to the public. During the implementation of the programme from September 2011 to late May 2013, the service provider received a total of 130 calls involving 157 enquiries. The majority were about the eligibility criteria, application procedures, reimbursement of the examination fee, etc.

## Evaluation Results

18. The results of HAD's analysis are as follows:

(a) The programme can encourage and help some non-school-attending EMs and NAs to take examinations for improving language abilities

- Faced with the pressure of life and work after leaving school, EMs and NAs have limited motivation to take language examinations.
- In spite of the above, the feedback of the beneficiaries of the programme was highly positive. They expressed that the financial assistance under the programme was very helpful to them and the programme could encourage them to take language examinations for improving language abilities. Organisations providing services for EMs and NAs were also generally supportive of the programme.
- HAD considers that a multi-pronged approach should be adopted to help EMs and NAs improve their language abilities. While schooling is generally regarded as most important for improving language abilities, it is also necessary to consider providing them with other forms of support in addition to attending school.
- HAD considers that the programme should be incorporated into its regular support service so that those EMs and NAs aspiring for self-enhancement to increase their competitiveness will have the opportunity to continue to receive financial assistance in future for taking language examinations. HAD will meet the expenditure required through deployment of internal resources.

(b) The mode of operation of the programme was smooth

- According to the survey results, all respondents, be they EMs or NAs, the beneficiaries or the service provider, were satisfied

with the current operational arrangement. Only a minority considered that improvement was needed with most of them opined that promotion should be strengthened.

(c) The promotion of the programme was generally adequate

- HAD and the service provider had tried to promote the programme to EMs and NAs as far as possible through various channels, including posters, leaflets, websites, radio, newspapers and the Ambassador Scheme, etc. Moreover, the programme was also promoted through Support Service Centres for EMs, ImmD, SEs and examination authorities. Promotions were also held and applications accepted at examination venues on examination days.
- If the programme is incorporated as a regular service, HAD will intensify promotion at the district level with a view to creating an atmosphere of self-enhancement and encouraging non-school-attending EMs and NAs to pursue further study and take examinations for improving their personal abilities through the programme.

## **Conclusion**

19. HAD considers that the programme can indeed encourage and help some non-school-attending and low income EMs and NAs to take language examinations for improving their personal abilities. It should therefore be incorporated into the regular support service of HAD so that those EMs and NAs aspiring for self-enhancement to increase their competitiveness can continue to receive financial assistance in future for taking language examinations. HAD will explore the feasibility of streamlining the application procedures and strengthen promotion at the district level to further fine-tune the programme.

Home Affairs Department  
July 2013

**Applicant Profile****(a) Age of Applicants**

<b>Age group</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Aged under 18	1	0.2%
Aged 18-30	192	39.8%
Aged 31-40	243	50.3%
Aged 41-50	46	9.5%
Aged 51 or above	1	0.2%
Total	483	100.0%

**(b) Reasons for Ineligible Application**

<b>Reason for rejection</b>	<b>No. of Cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Information incomplete. Information required, such as examination result certificates, was not provided after repeated contact, and the applications were withdrawn by the applicants.	60	75%
Applicants still attending school	10	12.5%
Household income exceeding the specified limit	6	7.5%
Examinations not taken within the specified period	3	3.8%
Taking non-specific examination	1	1.3%
Total	80	100.0%



(c) **Examinations taken by the Applicants (as at 31 May 2013)**

<b>Exam Code</b>	<b>Name of Examination</b>	<b>No. of Applications</b>
A01	Business English Certificates	0
A02	Business Language Testing Service	2
A03	English for Business	0
A04	English for Business Communications	0
A05	English for Commerce	0
A06	English for Office Skills	0
A07	English Language Skills Assessment	0
A08	International English for Speakers of Other Languages	0
A09	International English Language Testing System	69
A10	International Spoken English for Speakers of Other Languages	0
A11	Pearson Test of English	0
A12	Spoken English for Industry and Commerce	0
A13	Test of English As a Foreign Language	1
A14	Test of English for International Communication	5
A15	Test of English for International Communication Bridge	0
A16	Trinity Graded Examinations in Spoken English for Speakers of Other Languages	0
A17	Trinity Integrated Skills in English Examination	0
A18	Versant for English with open questions	0
A19	Written English for Tourism	0
B01	Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority – Test of Proficiency in Putonghua (TPP)	21
B02	State Language Commission – Putonghua Shuiping Ceshi Test (PSC)	364
C01	International General Certificate of Secondary English – Chinese Language	0
C02	General Certificate of Education(GCE) (Advanced Supplementary Level)	2
C03	General Certificate of Education(GCE) (Advanced Level)	18
C04	General Certificate of Secondary Education(GCSE)	0
	Non-specific Examination	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>483</b>

**Survey on the Beneficiaries<sup>3</sup>****(a) Length of Residence**

<b>Length of Residence</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 1 year	14	6.7%
1 to 3 years	68	32.3%
3 to 5 years	62	29.5%
5 to 7 years	63	30.0%
More than 7 years	1	0.5%
No response	2	1.0%
Total	210	100.0%

**(b) Age**

<b>Age</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
18 to 30	69	32.8%
31 to 40	107	50.9%
41 to 50	27	12.9%
51 or above	2	1.0%
No response	5	2.4%
Total	210	100.0%

**(c) Education Level**

<b>Education level</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Primary or below	1	0.5%
Junior secondary	51	24.3%
Senior secondary	92	43.8%
Post-secondary/undergraduate	45	21.4%
Postgraduate	16	7.6%
No response	5	2.4%
Total	210	100.0%

---

<sup>3</sup> Participation in the survey was voluntary and the service provider has received a total of 210 questionnaires.

**(d) Feedback on the Programme**

<b>Statement and Comment</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1. The promotion efforts of the programme are adequate		
- Strongly agree	58	27.6%
- Agree	115	54.8%
- Neither agree nor disagree	36	17.1%
- Disagree	0	-
- Strongly disagree	1	0.5%
- No comment	0	-
Total	210	100.0%
2. The programme can achieve the objective of encouraging further study		
- Strongly agree	93	44.3%
- Agree	103	49.0%
- Neither agree or disagree	12	5.7%
- Disagree	1	0.5%
- Strongly disagree	1	0.5%
- No comment	0	-
Total	210	100.0%
3. The financial assistance under the programme is helpful to you		
- Strongly agree	104	49.5%
- Agree	95	45.2%
- Neither agree or disagree	9	4.3%
- Disagree	0	-
- Strongly disagree	1	0.5%
- No comment	1	0.5%
Total	210	100.0%

(e) **Feedback on the Service Provider**

<b>Statement and Comment</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1. Enquiry service provided by the service provider for the programme		
- Very satisfied	102	48.6%
- Satisfied	102	48.6%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	2.4%
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	1	0.5%
- No comment	0	-
Total	210	100.0%
2. Handling of applications by the service provider		
- Very satisfied	95	45.2%
- Satisfied	108	51.4%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	2.9%
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	1	0.5%
- No comment	0	-
Total	210	100.0%
3. Reimbursement arrangements		
- Very satisfied	107	50.9%
- Satisfied	93	44.3%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	2.4%
- Dissatisfied	2	0.9%
- Very dissatisfied	1	0.5%
- No comment	2	0.9%
Total	210	100.0%
4. Staff service attitude		
- Very satisfied	116	55.2%
- Satisfied	89	42.4%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	1.9%
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	1	0.5%
- No comment	0	-
Total	210	100.0%

**Appendix (iii)**

**Public Enquiries**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>No. of Cases</b>
Eligibility criteria	62
Application procedures	38
Examination fee reimbursement procedures	4
Progress of application	2
Obtaining application forms	2
Information on examinations	2
Others	47
- Scheme \$6,000 under the Community Care Fund (36)	
- Training courses (5)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>157</b>

**Community Care Fund - Assistance Programme  
Subsidy for Non-School-Attending Ethnic Minorities  
and New Arrivals from the Mainland  
Participating in Language Courses  
Evaluation Report**

## **Background**

The Community Care Fund (CCF) has been established since early 2011 to provide assistance to people facing economic difficulties, in particular those who fall outside the social safety net or those within the safety net but have special circumstances that are not covered. In addition, the CCF may take forward measures on a pilot basis to help the Government identify those that can be considered for incorporation into the Government's regular assistance and service programmes.

2. The former Steering Committee on CCF endorsed at its meeting on 17 October 2011 the launch of the programme in 2011-12 on a pilot basis to provide subsidy for non-school-attending ethnic minorities (EMs) and new arrivals from the Mainland (NAs) from low income families participating in dedicated language courses of the Employees Retraining Board (ERB) to encourage them to engage in life-long learning and to improve personal abilities.

3. The pilot programme was administered by the Home Affairs Department (HAD). It commenced on 1 March 2012 with no specified end date as at present. Applicants for subsidy must be non-school-attending EMs and NAs from low income families<sup>1</sup> taking dedicated language courses of the ERB with 80% attendance or above for each course. The amount of subsidy per application varies with the number of course hours, ranging from \$350 to \$700. The original estimated expenditure for the programme was \$30 million (i.e. a subsidy of \$28,575,000 and an administrative fee of \$1,425,000). It was expected that the programme would benefit around 60 000 people.

---

<sup>1</sup> Low income families refer to those whose monthly household incomes not exceeding 75% of the Median Monthly Domestic Household Income applicable to their household size, or those who have passed the means tests of specified assistance schemes.

## **Implementation of the Assistance Programme**

4. HAD has commissioned two non-governmental organisations (NGOs) through open quotation as the service providers of the programme to handle matters concerning the promotion of the programme, application and disbursement of subsidy to the successful applicants, etc for EMs and NAs respectively.

5. HAD and the service providers conducted a briefing in early March 2012. Representatives from government departments concerned, training bodies, Support Service Centres for EMs, as well as other relevant NGOs and local organisations attended the briefing. HAD and the service providers introduced to them the programme in detail, and appealed to them to promote and publicise the programme to the target groups through their respective networks.

6. HAD and the service providers promoted the programme to EMs and NAs through various channels, including posters, leaflets, websites, radio, newspapers and the Ambassador Scheme, etc. Furthermore, HAD and the service providers promoted the programme through Support Service Centres for EMs, the Immigration Department (ImmD), social enterprises (SEs) and training bodies. They also held promotions and accepted applications in training centres on course days.

7. Having regard to the application to the programme, the estimated expenditure was revised to \$500,000 (i.e. an amount of subsidy of \$418,000 and an administrative fee of \$82,000) in February 2013. It was expected that the programme would benefit around 800 people.

## **Review**

8. HAD conducted a review of the programme according to the advice of the consultant in late February 2013. The effectiveness of the programme was mainly assessed by analysing the application data and applicant profile as well as the questionnaire survey on the beneficiaries and the service providers. The review was completed in early June 2013.

## **Applicant Profile and Survey Results**

### **I. Application Data and Applicant Profile (Details are at Appendix (i))**

9. As at late May 2013, a total of 212 applications have been received. 117 of them have been vetted and 95 were being processed<sup>2</sup>. Among the 117 vetted cases, 89 were successful with the subsidy disbursed amounting to around \$30,000, and 28 were ineligible.

10. Among the 212 applications received, 18 (8.5%) were from EMs and the remaining 194 (91.5%) were from NAs. The majority of applicants belonged to the age groups of 31 to 40 and 41 to 50, accounting for 32.1% and 34% respectively.

11. Among the 212 applications received, the course the majority took was Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese I for New Arrivals (141 cases, accounting for 66.5%), followed by Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese II for New Arrivals (33 cases, accounting for 15.6%).

12. Among the 28 ineligible applications, the chief reason for rejection was incomplete information. Information required, such as proof of attendance, was not provided after repeated contact and the applications were withdrawn by the applicants (23 applications, accounting for 82.1%).

### **II. Feedback from the Beneficiaries (Details are at Appendix (ii))**

13. Participation of the beneficiaries in the questionnaire survey was voluntary. As at late May 2013, among the total of 65 questionnaires received by the service providers, 2 were from EMs, and 63 from NAs. Among the responding beneficiaries, the majority belonged to the group having resided in Hong Kong for less than one year, accounting for 53.9%. In terms of age, the majority belonged to the age group of 31 to 40, accounting for 41.5%. In terms of education level, the majority were of junior secondary level, accounting for 43.1%.

---

<sup>2</sup> Upon completion of the course, applicants must submit to the service provider proof of attendance of over 80% so that their applications can be further processed. As a result, quite a number of applications were being processed.



14. The responding beneficiaries who agreed or strongly agreed that the promotion efforts of the programme were adequate accounted for 86.2%; that the programme had achieved the objective of encouraging further study accounted for 93.9%; and that the subsidy under the programme was helpful to the beneficiaries accounted for 89.2%. The feedback of the responding beneficiaries on the service providers was positive. With regard to the enquiry service, handling of applications, disbursement arrangement and staff service attitude of the service providers, over 95% of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied.

### III. Feedback from the Service Providers

15. HAD also conducted a questionnaire survey on the two service providers. On the whole, the service providers considered that the arrangement and preparation of the programme were appropriate and the programme could encourage continuous learning among EMs and NAs, especially attractive to the beneficiaries who were seeking employment. The service providers expressed willingness to continue providing assistance to similar programmes.

### IV. Public Enquiries (Details are at Appendix (iii))

16. The service providers set up a hotline to provide necessary support and information for the public. During the implementation of the programme from March 2012 to late May 2013, the service providers received a total of 77 calls involving 85 enquiries. The majority were about the eligibility criteria, application procedures, the progress of application, etc.

## **Evaluation Results**

17. The results of HAD's analysis are as follows:

- (a) The programme can encourage and help some non-school-attending EMs and NAs to take courses for improving language abilities
  - Faced with the pressure of life and work after leaving school, EMs and NAs have limited motivation to participate in language courses.

- In spite of the above, the feedback of the beneficiaries of the programme was highly positive. They expressed that the subsidy under the programme was very helpful to them and the programme could encourage them to take language courses for improving personal abilities. Organisations providing services for EMs and NAs were also generally supportive of the programme.
- HAD considers that a multi-pronged approach should be adopted to help EMs and NAs improve their language abilities. While schooling is generally regarded as most important for improving language abilities, it is also necessary to consider providing them with other forms of support in addition to attending school.
- HAD considers that the programme should be incorporated into its regular support service so that those EMs and NAs aspiring for self-enhancement to increase their competitiveness will have the opportunity to continue to receive subsidy in future for taking language courses. HAD will meet the expenditure required through deployment of internal resources.

(b) The mode of operation of the programme was smooth

- According to the survey results, all respondents, be they EMs or NAs, the beneficiaries or the service providers, were satisfied with the current operational arrangement. Only a minority considered that improvement was needed with most of them opined that promotion should be strengthened.

(c) The promotion of the programme was generally adequate

- HAD and the service providers had tried to promote the programme to EMs and NAs as far as possible through various channels, including posters, leaflets, websites, radio, newspapers and the Ambassador Scheme, etc. Moreover, the programme was also promoted through Support Service Centres for EMs,

ImmD, SEs and training bodies. Promotions were also held and applications accepted in training centres on course days.

- If the programme is incorporated as a regular service, HAD will intensify promotion at the district level with a view to creating an atmosphere of self-enhancement and encouraging non-school-attending EMs and NAs to pursue continuous study for improving their personal abilities through the programme.

## **Conclusion**

18. HAD considers that the programme can indeed encourage and help some non-school-attending and low income EMs and NAs to take language courses for improving their personal abilities. It should therefore be incorporated into the regular support service of HAD so that those EMs and NAs aspiring for self-enhancement to increase their competitiveness can continue to receive subsidy in future for participating in language courses. HAD will explore the feasibility of streamlining the application procedures and strengthen promotion at the district level to further fine-tune the programme.

Home Affairs Department  
July 2013

**Applicant Profile****(a) Age of Applicants**

<b>Age group</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Aged under 18	3	1.4%
Aged 18-30	55	25.9%
Aged 31-40	68	32.1%
Aged 41-50	72	34.0%
Aged 51 or above	14	6.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**(b) Reasons for Ineligible Application**

<b>Reason for rejection</b>	<b>No. of cases</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Information incomplete. Information required, such as proof of attendance, was not provided after repeated contacts and the application were withdrawn by the applicants.	23	82.1%
Household income exceeding the specified limit	2	7.1%
Non EMs/NAs	1	3.6%
Courses not taken within the specified period	1	3.6%
Taking non-specified courses	1	3.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

(c) **Courses taken by the Applicants (as at 31 May 2013)**

<b>Course Code</b>	<b>Name of Course</b>	<b>No. of Applications</b>
<b>Courses for EMs</b>		
E01	Module Certificate in Basic English II	0
E02	Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese I for Non-Chinese Speakers	16
E03	Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese II for Non-Chinese Speakers	0
E04	Module Certificate in Elementary Workplace Chinese (Reading and Writing) I for Non-Chinese Speakers	1
E05	Module Certificate in Elementary Workplace Chinese (Reading and Writing) II for Non-Chinese Speakers	0
E06	Module Certificate in Employment Set Sail for Non-Chinese Speakers	0
The course taken was not specified, and the applicant was providing further information to facilitate vetting and approval.		1
<b>Courses for NAs</b>		
N01	Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese I for New Arrivals	141
N02	Module Certificate in Elementary Cantonese II for New Arrivals	33
N03	Module Certificate in Employment Set Sail (Cantonese)	0
N04	Module Certificate in Employment Set Sail (English)	19
Non-specified Courses		1
<b>Total</b>		<b>212</b>

**Appendix (ii)****Survey on the Beneficiaries<sup>3</sup>****(a) Length of Residence**

<b>Length of Residence</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Less than 1 year	35	53.9%
1 to 3 years	16	24.6%
3 to 5 years	6	9.2%
5 to 7 years	5	7.7%
More than 7 years	0	-
No response	3	4.6%
Total	65	100.0%

**(b) Age**

<b>Age</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Below 18	1	1.5%
18 to 30	19	29.3%
31 to 40	27	41.5%
41 to 50	15	23.1%
51 or above	1	1.5%
No response	2	3.1%
Total	65	100.0%

**(c) Education Level**

<b>Education Level</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Primary or below	2	3.1%
Junior secondary	28	43.1%
Senior secondary	25	38.4%
Post-secondary/undergraduate	8	12.3%
Postgraduate	0	-
No response	2	3.1%
Total	65	100.0%

---

<sup>3</sup> Participation in the survey was voluntary and the service providers received a total of 65 questionnaires.

**(d) Feedback on the Programme**

<b>Statement and Comment</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1. The promotion efforts of the programme are adequate		
- Strongly agree	24	36.9%
- Agree	32	49.3%
- Neither agree nor disagree	6	9.3%
- Disagree	1	1.5%
- Strongly disagree	1	1.5%
- No comment	1	1.5%
Total	65	100.0%
2. The programme can achieve the objective of encouraging further study		
- Strongly agree	35	53.9%
- Agree	26	40.0%
- Neither agree nor disagree	3	4.6%
- Disagree	1	1.5%
- Strongly disagree	0	-
- No comment	0	-
Total	65	100.0%
3. The subsidy under the programme is helpful to you		
- Strongly agree	33	50.8%
- Agree	25	38.4%
- Neither agree nor disagree	7	10.8%
- Disagree	0	-
- Strongly disagree	0	-
- No comment	0	-
Total	65	100.0%

(e) **Feedback on the Service Providers**

<b>Statement and Comment</b>	<b>No.of Persons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1. Enquiry service provided by the service providers for the programme		
- Very satisfied	44	67.7%
- Satisfied	19	29.3%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	1.5%
- Dissatisfied	1	1.5%
- Very dissatisfied	0	-
- No comment	0	-
Total	65	100.0%
2. Handling of applications by the service providers		
- Very satisfied	44	67.7%
- Satisfied	21	32.3%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	-
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	0	-
- No comment	0	-
Total	65	100.0%
3. Disbursement arrangements		
- Very satisfied	41	63.1%
- Satisfied	22	33.8%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	3.1%
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	0	-
- No comment	0	-
Total	65	100.0%
4. Staff service attitude		
- Very satisfied	49	75.4%
- Satisfied	15	23.1%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	-
- Dissatisfied	0	-
- Very dissatisfied	0	-
- No comment	1	1.5%
Total	65	100.0%



**Public enquiries**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>No. of Cases</b>
Eligibility criteria	42
Application procedures	17
Progress of processing applications	9
Disbursement of subsidy	3
Others	14
- Scheme \$6,000 under the Community Care Fund (2)	
- Whether subsidy would be provided for a particular course (2)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>

# **Community Care Fund Elderly Dental Assistance Programme**

## **Interim Evaluation**

### **Purpose**

This report sets out the findings of the interim evaluation of the Community Care Fund (CCF) Elderly Dental Assistance Programme (the Programme).

### **Background**

2. The CCF was established in early 2011 to provide assistance for people with economic difficulties, in particular those who fall outside the social safety net or those who have special needs not covered by the safety net. The CCF also implements programmes on a pilot basis to help the Government identify measures which can be considered for incorporation into the Government's regular assistance and service programmes.

3. In April 2011, the then Steering Committee on the CCF approved a provision of \$100 million for subsidising dentures and related dental services for elders. It was subsequently endorsed in February 2012 that beneficiaries of the Programme must meet the following criteria:

- (a) Aged 60 or above;
- (b) Users of the Integrated Home Care Services (IHCS) or Enhanced Home and Community Care Services (EHCCS) subvented by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) as at 31 December 2011 and paying Level 1 or Level 2 fee charge when applying for the assistance of the Programme, but are not recipients of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA);
- (c) Lose all or some of their teeth or suffer from dental illness and encountering difficulties in eating or chewing; and are willing to accept the subsidy and dental services under the Programme; and

- (d) Assessed by participating home-based service teams and dentists as in need of and suitable for dentures and related dental services, based on the guidelines drawn up by the Hong Kong Dental Association (HKDA).

4. The then Steering Committee commissioned the HKDA to implement the Programme. The Programme was officially launched on 24 September 2012 and is expected to run for two years.

### **Interim Evaluation**

5. In July 2013, the HKDA completed the interim evaluation of the the Programme covering the first nine months of its implementation (i.e. from 24 September 2012 to 30 June 2013). The interim evaluation assessed the effectiveness of the Programme based on the following indicators:

- (a) number of beneficiaries;
- (b) average amount of subsidy granted to each beneficiary;
- (c) processing time required from the date of application to the first consultation; and
- (d) beneficiaries' satisfaction with the Programme.

6. In conducting the interim evaluation, the HKDA mainly based on the information provided by applicants, participating non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and dentists/clinics; comments from the benefited elders given in surveys conducted by NGOs as well as those collected through the enquiry hotline or briefing sessions of the Programme.

### **Findings**

7. Based on the evaluation indicators mentioned in paragraph 5 above, the HKDA had conducted an analysis taking the position of 30 June 2013 as follows:

- (a) Number of NGOs and dentists participating in the Programme

8. The progress in the recruitment of NGOs and dentists was as

follows:

- (a) 26 NGOs providing home-based services (a total of 79 service teams) had participated to refer elders for the Programme; and
- (b) 259 dentists and 47 dental clinics operated by NGOs had participated in the Programme to provide dental services.

(b) Number of beneficiaries

9. Out of the 637 elders referred to the participating dentists/clinics for dental services, 343 had completed dental treatment, while treatments for the remaining 294 elders were yet to be completed. Among the afore-mentioned 637 elders, the largest age group was 80 or above (370 persons, 58.1%), followed by 75 to 79 (141 persons, about 22.1%). Most of these elders were users of IHCS (482 persons, 75.7%). Over half of them (353 persons, 55.4%) were paying the Level 1 fee charge of the home-based services when applying for the Programme. Most of them lived in Kowloon City (100 persons, 15.7%).

10. Among the 343 elders who had completed dental treatment, most of them received consultation in their respective districts (326 persons, 95%). Only a small number of elders were required to seek cross-district consultation. Most elders needed to attend 5 consultations (65 persons, 19%) and the average number of consultations was also 5. A total of 114 elders (33%) required accompanying service and the average number of accompanying service provided was about 4.

11. Among these 343 elders, 283 (82.5%) received dentures (full dentures for 234 elders (68.2%) and partial dentures for 49 elders (14.3%)). Twenty out of the 343 elders did not have their dental services fully completed because they were unwilling to continue to receive dentures or related dental treatment after undergoing check-up or receiving part of the dental treatment due to personal reasons.

(c) Average amount of subsidy granted to each beneficiary

12. The HKDA has disbursed subsidy of about \$2.3 million to participating dentists/clinics and NGOs for the 343 completed cases (including \$2.17 million of dental fees to dentists/clinics and

\$0.13 million of accompanying service fees to NGOs). The average amount of subsidy granted to each elder was about \$6,700.

(d) Processing time from application to the first consultation

13. Regarding the 343 completed cases, less than 20 days were required for most cases in processing an application for the first consultation (263 persons, 76.7%). Only a small number of cases (37 persons, 10.8%) required 31 days or more to process due to dentists' consultation schedule or elders' own preference.

(e) Elders' satisfaction with the Programme

14. Under the Programme, NGOs making referrals are required to conduct a survey with elders within six weeks upon completion of dental treatment to ascertain whether such elders find the dentures helpful and whether they are satisfied with the Programme. Relevant data must be properly recorded for submission to the HKDA.

15. Among the 343 completed cases, 342 elders have completed the survey. The remaining elder had passed away and did not conduct the survey. Among the 342 respondents, 94 (27.5%) and 230 (67.2%) were very satisfied and satisfied with the Programme respectively.

**Other relevant information**

(a) Comments of participating NGOs

16. The HKDA organised a series of briefings and sharing sessions on 28 June 2012, 20 September 2012, 16 November 2012, 9 April 2013 and 23 May 2013 to facilitate better understanding of the Programme and to enhance communication and exchanges of views and experiences among NGOs and service teams operating the IHCS and the EHCCS. Some NGOs suggested to adjust the accompanying service fees to enable the engagement of additional staff to cope with the extra work. They also asked for more flexible arrangements for dental appointments (appointments to be made by elders or their family), more thorough understanding of the Programme by participating dentists/clinics, support

for barrier-free provisions, expansion of the target beneficiaries, etc.

(b) *Comments of participating dentists/clinics*

17. The HKDA conducted a briefing and a seminar on the Programme for dentists/clinics on 17 September 2012 and 17 March 2013 respectively to give them a better understanding of the Programme so as to attract more dentists for enrolment. Participating dentists had also shared their experiences and exchanged views on the implementation of the Programme. Most enquiries were related to the workflow and guidelines, as well as issues concerning maintenance of dentures.

(c) *Public enquiries*

18. During the implementation of the Programme, a hotline and an e-mail account have been set up to receive enquiries from NGOs, dentists/clinics and the public. The HKDA has received a total of 1 969 enquiries during the period from 24 September 2012 to 30 June 2013.

**Conclusion of the Interim Evaluation**

19. The objective of the Programme is to subsidise elders for dentures and related dental services. Based on the statistics up to June 2013, among the 343 elders who have completed dental treatment under the Programme, 283 (82.5%) have received full or partial dentures and the average subsidy is \$6,700. This indicates that the Programme has provided appropriate assistance to elders who have financial difficulties and are in need of dentures. Most of the benefited elders found the dentures helpful and were satisfied with the services of the Programme.

20. Based on the experience in the first nine months, the Programme has been implementing smoothly. For instance, less than 20 days were required to process an application for the first consultation. The referral and appointment arrangements by NGOs have been effectively conducted. Besides, participating dentists/clinics are able to provide timely dental treatment to the elders. Most of whom (95%) could receive dental treatment in their respective districts, thus substantially reducing the inconvenience caused by cross-district referral. Taking into account the

progress of implementation and stakeholders' feedback, the HKDA has made continuous efforts to refine the operational arrangements of the Programme for better service delivery. For example, the accompanying service fees to NGOs have been adjusted on 3 June 2013 as proposed. Some NGOs suggested for elders or their family members to make dental appointments with dentists/clinics direct. Given that the existing arrangements have been smoothly conducted, and NGOs have played an important role in facilitating communication between elders and dentists, it is considered desirable to maintain the existing arrangement.

21. Under the Programme, applications must be made on a referral basis by service teams of the IHCS or the EHCCS under NGOs participating in the Programme. Before making referrals, the service teams will conduct initial screening for the elders based on the criteria listed in paragraph 3 above. The eligible elders will be referred to the participating dentists/ clinics for necessary dental treatment. NGOs will provide accompanying service for individual elders if required.

22. Based on the number of beneficiaries recorded for the first nine months of the implementation of the Programme, the initial response did not fully meet the expected result. Having considered the recommendations of the Task Force and its Working Group, the Commission on Poverty approved the following arrangements at its meeting on 2 May 2013 with a view to increasing the participation rate of the Programme:

- (a) **Adjusting the eligibility criterion of the Programme**– At the commencement of the Programme, beneficiaries must be using the two home-based services subvented by the SWD as at 31 December 2011. In view that some elders asked for relaxation of this requirement, the Commission on Poverty approved to adjust the date on which elders must be using the home-based services from 31 December 2011 to 31 December 2012 as so to benefit more elders.
- (b) **Adjusting the fees to NGOs** – Some NGOs have indicated difficulty in implementing the Programme because of manpower shortage. In order to provide NGOs with more resources for employing sufficient manpower to cope with operational needs so as to encourage them to refer more elders

for the Programme, the Commission on Poverty also endorsed the adjustment of fees to NGOs.

23. As per the adjustments mentioned in paragraph 22(b) above, the existing fees for NGOs and dental fees are set out in **Annex (1)**. As the adjustments have just been introduced on 3 June 2013, the impact on the Programme have yet to be ascertained. The HKDA will continue to monitor the implementation of the Programme and report progress to the Task Force periodically.

24. Notwithstanding that the initial response of the Programme did not fully meet the expectation, it has helped elders who cannot benefit from the CSSA dental grant or the Pilot Project on Outreach Primary Dental Care Services for the Elderly in Residential Care Homes and Day Care Centres in receiving subsidised dentures and related dental services. On the whole, the objectives of the CCF and that of the Programme have been achieved.

25. To benefit more elders who are in financial difficulties but not receiving CSSA, the HKDA suggests that the Task Force and its Working Group should continue to review the Programme and consider expanding gradually the eligibility criteria, taking into account the progress of implementation and the experience gained, as well as factors such as the number of participating dentists. Also, the implementation details of the Programme may be revised in order to cope with expansion of the programme to other target beneficiaries.

### **Follow-up Work**

26. In expanding the target beneficiaries of the Programme, the Working Group considers it necessary to strike a balance between elders' demand for dentures and the capacity of the participating dentists/clinics. In this connection, the Working Group suggested the HKDA to consider revising dental fees of the Programme so as to attract more dentists to join the programme. In light of the experiences gained and after deliberation, HKDA proposed to -

- (a) allow participating dentists/clinics to reimburse on an accountable basis within a cap of 5 teeth each on fillings and



extractions (ceiling of fees at \$1,600 and \$1,725 respectively);  
and

(b) include subsidy for X-ray checks (ceiling of fees at \$260).

27. The Commission on Poverty endorsed the above proposals at its meeting on 13 September 2013. The revised dental fees at **Annex (2)** will take effect from 21 October 2013.

28. The HKDA will conduct a final evaluation of the Programme. Apart from assessing the effectiveness of the programme, it will also consider the sustainability and suitability of the Programme for incorporation into Government's regular service.

Food and Health Bureau

October 2013

**Community Care Fund Elderly Dental Assistance Programme****Existing fees to NGOs and dental fees****(I) Fees to NGOs**

	<b><u>Fees to NGOs</u></b>
For each referral case not requiring NGOs to provide accompanying services	Administrative fee: \$ 50 Referral fee: \$ 50
For each referral case requiring NGOs to provide accompanying services	Administrative fee: \$ 50 Referral fee: \$ 50 Accompanying service fee: \$ 70 per hour

**(II) Dental fees**

<b><u>Dental treatment and service items</u></b>	<b><u>Ceiling of fees charged by dentists/clinics<sup>1</sup></u></b>
(a) Registration and check-up (including cases in which the elder is not suitable for/declines to have his/her teeth replaced with denture(s) after the check-up, and is not in need of other dental services i.e. scaling and polishing, fillings and tooth extraction)	\$ 55
(b) Dentures for both arches for an elder who is in need of and suitable for such service as confirmed after the check-up	\$8,000 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Apart from the charge(s) specified in items (a) to (d), dentists/clinics participating in the Programme shall not charge the elders any other fee.

<sup>2</sup> Payment for items (b) and (c) apply as listed above regardless of the number of teeth being replaced by the denture.

(c) Denture for either upper arch or lower arch for an elder who is in need of and suitable for such service as confirmed after the check-up	\$4,005 <sup>2</sup>
(d) Other dental service(s) i.e. scaling and polishing, fillings and tooth extractions provided by the dentist based on assessment of the oral conditions of the elder irrespective of whether denture(s) is / are involved <sup>3</sup>	Scaling and Polishing (\$375)  Filling (\$320)  Tooth extraction (\$345)

---

<sup>3</sup> Payments listed under item (d) shall cover other related dental services (e.g. pain relief, anaesthesia, X-ray checks, etc.). The ceiling of individual treatment items shall not exceed the respective payment ceilings so specified.

**Community Care Fund Elderly Dental Assistance Programme**

**Dental fees with effect from October 2013**

<b><u>Dental treatment and service items</u></b>	<b><u>Ceiling of fees charged by dentists/clinics<sup>1</sup></u></b>
(a) Registration and check-up (including cases in which the elder is not suitable for/declines to have his/her teeth replaced with denture(s) after the check-up, and is not in need of other dental services i.e. scaling and polishing, fillings, tooth extraction and X-ray checks)	\$ 55
(b) Dentures for both arches for an elder who is in need of and suitable for such service as confirmed after the check-up	\$8,000 <sup>2</sup>
(c) Denture for either upper arch or lower arch for an elder who is in need of and suitable for such service as confirmed after the check-up	\$4,005 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from the charge(s) specified in items (a) to (d), dentists/dental clinics participating in the Programme shall not charge the elderly beneficiaries any other fee.

<sup>2</sup> Payment for items (b) and (c) apply as listed above regardless of the number of teeth being replaced by the denture.

(d) Other dental service(s) i.e. scaling and polishing, filling, tooth extractions and X-ray checks provided by the dentist based on assessment of the oral conditions of the elder irrespective of whether denture(s) is / are involved <sup>3</sup>	Scaling and Polishing (\$375)
	Filling (\$320 per tooth, ceiling at \$1,600)
	Tooth extraction (\$345 per tooth, ceiling at \$1,725)
	X-ray check (\$65 per film, ceiling at \$260)

---

<sup>3</sup> Payments listed under item (d) shall cover other related dental services (e.g. pain relief, anaesthesia, etc.). The ceiling of individual treatment items shall not exceed the respective payment ceilings so specified.