

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1082/16-17
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PS/1/16

Panel on Welfare Services and Panel on Health Services

Joint Subcommittee on Long-term Care Policy

**Minutes of the third meeting
held on Tuesday, 14 February 2017, at 10:30 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung (Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Members absent : Hon SHIU Ka-chun (Deputy Chairman)
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Members attending : Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP

Public Officers attending : Item I
Mr Donald CHEN, JP
Deputy Secretary (Welfare)²
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Miss Stella CHANG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare
(Welfare)³
Labour and Welfare Bureau

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

Ms Diana CHU
Chief Social Work Officer (Elderly)³
Social Welfare Department

Attendance by invitation : Item I

Hong Kong Ample Love Society Ltd.

Ms TSANG Cheuk-yi
Chairlady

Mr FUNG Yi-lun

全港認知障礙症照顧者聯盟

張月琴女士
主席

Reclaiming Social Work Movement

Miss CHAN Shun-yi
Representative

The Civic Party

Mr CHENG Man-kit
District Developer of the Kowloon East Branch

Community Care and Nursing Home Workers General Union

Mr CHENG Ching-fat
秘書

將軍澳長者民生關注會

Mr KWONG Wing-tai
Representative

Ms LI Wing-sheung

Ms YIP So-yu

Mr WONG Wai-kwan

Concerning Home Care Service Alliance

Miss LAU Oi-lam
Member

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

Staff in attendance : Miss Kay CHU
Council Secretary (2) 4

Miss Meisy KWOK
Legislative Assistant (2) 6

Miss Cally LAI
Legislative Assistant (2) 10

I. Pilot Scheme on Residential Care Service Voucher for the Elderly
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)789/16-17(01) to (04) and CB(2)812/16-17(01) to (02)]

The Joint Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**).

Action

Admin

2. As requested by the Chairman, the Administration undertook to provide in writing information on the minimum staffing requirements for licensed residential care homes for the elderly and EA1 homes under the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme.

II. Any other business

3. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:42 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
28 March 2017

**Proceedings of the third meeting of the
Joint Subcommittee on Long-term Care Policy
on Tuesday, 14 February 2017, at 10:30 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
<i>Agenda item I – Pilot Scheme on Residential Care Service Voucher for the Elderly</i>			
001028 – 002009	Chairman Administration	Opening remarks The Administration briefed members on the progress of the preparation for implementing the Pilot Scheme on Residential Care Service Voucher for the Elderly ("the RCSV Pilot Scheme").	
002010 – 002355	Chairman Hong Kong Ample Love Society Ltd.	Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(2)812/16-17(02)]	
002356 – 002744	Mr FUNG Yi-lun	Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(2)789/16-17(03)]	
002745 – 003011	全港認知障礙症照顧者 聯盟	Presentation of views	
003012 – 003336	Reclaiming Social Work Movement	Presentation of views	
003337 – 003700	The Civic Party	Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(2)812/16-17(01)]	
003701 – 004001	Community Care and Nursing Home Workers General Union	Presentation of views	
004002 – 004251	將軍澳長者民生關注會	Presentation of views	
004252 – 004618	Ms LI Wing-sheung	Presentation of views	
004619 – 004926	Ms YIP So-yu	Presentation of views	
004927 – 005332	Mr WONG Wai-kwan	Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(2)789/16-17(04)]	
005333 – 005718	Concerning Home Care Service Alliance	Presentation of views	
005719 –	Chairman	The Chairman said that all deputations/individuals	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
010629	Admin	<p>attending the meeting did not support the implementation of the RCSV Pilot Scheme with their major concerns/suggestion as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) elderly persons in need of residential care services ("RCS") were inevitably led by the nose by the market even with the adoption of the "money-following-the-user" principle; (b) some deputations/individuals doubted whether eligible elderly persons or operators of private residential care homes for the elderly ("RCHEs") would benefit from the RCSV Pilot Scheme and the Old Age Living Allowance Scheme; (c) concerns regarding staff training for and monitoring of RCHEs, the punishments imposed on RCHEs which had contravened the law, and the respective numbers of RCSVs expected to be received by the participating private homes and subvented homes/contract homes/NGO-run self-financing homes; and (d) the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Ordinance (Cap. 459) ("the Ordinance") should be reviewed as soon as possible with the participation of service users. <p>The Administration advised that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the RCSV Pilot Scheme would provide an additional choice for elderly persons in need of RCS. No elderly persons would be forced to take up RCSV; (b) the Administration would continue to enhance RCS and Community Care Services for the elderly ("CCS"). In addition, the Elderly Services Programme Plan ("ESPP") would cover the planning of the provision of subsidized RCS based on the projected population in Hong Kong; (c) the implementation of the RCSV Pilot Scheme might incentivize private RCHEs to enhance their service quality; (d) voucher users would be provided with case management service by the Social Welfare 	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
		<p>Department ("SWD") throughout their participation in the RCSV Pilot Scheme;</p> <p>(e) a total of 23 RCHEs had submitted applications for joining the RCSV Pilot Scheme as Recognized Service Providers ("RSPs") under the First Phase of the Scheme. According to these applications as of their respective submission dates, these RCHEs could provide voucher users with over 800 residential care places in total and near 100 of them were vacant. The Administration was now vetting these applications, and would keep in view the consumption of RCSV and supply of residential care places during implementation of the Pilot Scheme; and</p> <p>(f) the Administration would start working on the review of the Ordinance and the Code of Practice for RCHEs in 2017.</p>	
010630 – 011217	Chairman Mr Alvin YEUNG Admin	<p>Mr Alvin YEUNG was worried that private RCHEs, which did not meet the minimum requirements of EA1 homes, might try to retain their residents who were invited to join the RCSV Pilot Scheme. He asked how the Administration could ensure the invited eligible elderly persons, who were living in private RCHEs and without family support, would be well informed of the RCSV Pilot Scheme as well as their rights and interests under the Scheme.</p> <p>The Administration advised that elderly persons on the Central Waiting List ("CWL") were assigned with caseworkers to follow up issues relating to their applications for subsidized RCS. When SWD issued a letter to invite an eligible elderly person on CWL to join the RCSV Pilot Scheme, the responsible caseworker would receive a copy of the letter. The caseworker would help brief the elderly person concerned on the Scheme and, if necessary, refer the elderly person to contact the Residential Care Service Voucher Office ("RCSVO") of SWD on the details. SWD would conduct a briefing session on the RCSV Pilot Scheme in which caseworkers would be reminded of the above. If the elderly person concerned was interested in joining the RCSV Pilot Scheme, the case would be referred to and followed up by a case manager under the Scheme.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
011218 – 011949	Chairman Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung Admin	<p>Noting that only a maximum of 3 000 eligible elderly persons on CWL could benefit from the three-year RCSV Pilot Scheme, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung was concerned that the needs of other elderly persons on CWL could not be addressed as the completion time for relevant legislative amendments was unknown and the Administration had not implemented other measures for helping them. He:</p> <p>(a) called on the Administration to allocate more resources to enhance elderly services, in addition to implementing the RCSV Pilot Scheme; and</p> <p>(b) asked the Administration to provide information on the amount of resources to be allocated to elderly care services (excluding the \$800 million earmarked for the RCSV Pilot Scheme) in the coming three years, and the number of additional residential care places to be provided for the elderly in the same period.</p> <p>Reiterating that piloting RCSV would not affect the Administration's commitment to enhancing CCS and subsidized RCS and its reply at (b) above (time marker: 005719 – 010629), the Administration briefed members on the planned provision of RCS set out in paragraph 9 of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)789/16-17(01)). In addition, the Administration had provided 1 666 additional places for the Enhanced Home and Community Care Services which had already commenced service from mid-2015. The Administration had also launched the two phases of the Pilot Scheme on CCS Voucher for the Elderly ("the CCSV Pilot Scheme") in 2013 and 2016 respectively, involving a total commitment of over \$1 billion. The Administration would continue to provide support for elderly persons on CWL by the provision of CCS in conventional means or via the issue of CCSV.</p>	
011950– 012543	Chairman Dr LAU Siu-lai Admin Mr WONG Wai-kwan	<p>Dr LAU Siu-lai said that the implementation of the three-year RCSV Pilot Scheme was a wrong direction for the provision of elderly services. At the end, time and resources spent on the Scheme would be wasted. She asked the</p>	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
		<p>Administration to advise on under what circumstances the Administration would decide to suspend the Scheme.</p> <p>The Administration advised that a trial period was provided for first-time voucher users. With the support of his/her case manager, a voucher user might switch to another RSP if he/she so wished. Besides, the Administration would commission a university to conduct an evaluation on the effectiveness of the Scheme.</p> <p>Dr LAU expressed discontent that the Administration had decided to implement the RCSV Pilot Scheme without commissioning a party to conduct the evaluation or drawing up an assessment mechanism. At the invitation of Dr LAU, Mr WONG Wai-kwan gave his views on the Administration's earlier replies at the meeting.</p>	
012544 – 013246	Chairman Mr KWONG Chun-yu Admin	<p>Mr KWONG Chun-yu held the view that the three-year RCSV Pilot Scheme should not be implemented as the Administration had not yet addressed the problems of substandard services and ineffective monitoring of RCHEs as well as unduly long waiting time for subsidized RCS. Noting that about 5 000 elderly persons had passed away while on the waiting list for subsidized RCS in each of the past three years, he urged the Administration to enhance the provision of subsidized RCS instead of privatizing RCS.</p> <p>The Administration advised that it would continue to enhance the provision of subsidized RCS. In addition, the Administration would review the Ordinance and the Code of Practice for RCHEs, and take measures to strengthen the inspection of RCHEs. Regarding the concern about privatization, the Administration stressed that the RCSV Pilot Scheme was not restricted to the participation of private RCHEs, and voucher users would be provided with case management service by SWD to help them make informed decisions under the Scheme.</p>	
013247 – 013956	Chairman Admin	<p>Noting that a substantial amount of resources was allocated to infrastructural projects, the Chairman expressed dissatisfaction that the amount of resources allocated to social welfare, which had been increased in recent years though, was far</p>	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
		<p>from adequate. Regarding the RCSV Pilot Scheme, he enquired about the number of case managers to be recruited.</p> <p>The Administration advised that the RCSV Pilot Scheme would be implemented in phases. As of today, there were a total of 10 registered social workers in the case management team. The Administration planned to increase the number of social work staff in the team from 10 to 12 in the 2017-2018 financial year to cater for the service needs arising from the issue of a total of 750 RCSVs by then.</p> <p>Estimating that the average caseload per case manager would be over 60, the Chairman expressed grave concern about the heavy caseload of and the qualification requirement for the case managers under the RCSV Pilot Scheme.</p> <p>The Administration advised that it would keep in view the manpower requirement taking into account the number of RCSVs issued. It also clarified that all case managers must be registered social worker and would work in RCSVO.</p>	
013957 – 020503	<p>Chairman Hong Kong Ample Love Society Ltd. Mr FUNG Yi-lun Reclaiming Social Work Movement Community Care and Nursing Home Workers General Union Ms LI Wing-sheung Mr WONG Wai-kwan Concerning Home Care Service Alliance Admin</p>	<p>At the invitation of the Chairman, some deputations/individuals gave further views on the RCSV Pilot Scheme and related issues. In response, the Administration reiterated its efforts in providing additional CCS and RCS places (time marker: 011218 – 011949) and added that:</p> <p>(a) as compared to the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme ("EBPS"), the RCSV Pilot Scheme provided its voucher users with greater flexibility in switching among RSPs under the Scheme;</p> <p>(b) some elderly persons on CWL were living in private RCHEs and receiving the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance. If they used RCSV, more choices would be provided for them, fees paid would commensurate with service quality, and RSPs were expected to be incentivized to upgrade their service quality;</p> <p>(c) the Administration was examining how to enhance provision of CCS, which would be</p>	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
		<p>covered in ESPP;</p> <p>(d) case management service under the RCSV Pilot Scheme would be provided by SWD instead of RSPs in order to avoid conflict of interests;</p> <p>(e) SWD would keep in view the caseload of case managers, and conduct a review in this regard as and when appropriate;</p> <p>(f) SWD had reserved some vacant school premises for conversion into RCHEs;</p> <p>(g) RSPs would receive supplements for providing appropriate care service for their voucher users during their stay in the RSPs concerned. Voucher users whose health deteriorated and were in need of a higher level of care would be re-assessed by case managers for waitlisting for Nursing Homes;</p> <p>(h) in his 2017 Policy Address, the Chief Executive had announced that an additional 2 000 CCSVs would be issued given the positive response to the CCSV Pilot Scheme, which could help shorten the waiting time for CCS, including home care and day care services; and</p> <p>(i) if voucher users had been admitted to hospital for two consecutive months or longer, they would still be voucher holders while SWD would cease the provision of subsidies under the RCSV Pilot Scheme for the RSPs concerned.</p> <p>As requested by the Chairman, the Administration undertook to provide in writing information on the minimum staffing requirements for licensed RCHEs and EA1 homes under EBPS.</p>	<p>Admin (para. 2 in the minutes)</p>
020504–021000	Chairman Dr LAU Siu-lai Admin	In response to Dr LAU Siu-lai's question about how to assess whether voucher users had benefitted from the RCSV Pilot Scheme, the Administration reiterated the objectives of the RCSV Pilot Scheme and the proposed coverage of the evaluation set out in paragraphs 2(a), 2(b), 4 and 5(i) of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)789/16-17(01)). In addition, case	

Time marker	Speaker(s)	Subject(s) / Discussion	Action required
		<p>managers would pay regular visits to voucher users and provide support services.</p> <p>Expressing concern about the absence of assessment mechanism and the ineffective case management service under the RCSV Pilot Scheme, Dr LAU urged the Administration to review the existing policy on elderly services.</p>	
021001– 021330	Chairman	<p>Considering that the Administration would implement the RCSV Pilot Scheme regardless of the objection of members and the deputations/individuals attending the meeting, the Chairman asked the Administration to note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) there was great reservation about introducing RCSV given that the effectiveness of the CCSV Pilot Scheme had not been assessed; (b) concerns about launching the RCSV Pilot Scheme without having drawn up an assessment mechanism and engaged a party to conduct an evaluation for the Scheme, the heavy caseload of case managers, and differentiation of EBPS and the RCSV Pilot Scheme; (c) how to ensure that elderly persons with dementia or without family support could make an informed decision on joining the RCSV Pilot Scheme, and could receive appropriate support services afterwards; (d) how to follow up the cases of voucher users whose health deteriorated or when they had been admitted to hospital for a period of time; and (e) the Administration should brief the Joint Subcommittee on the progress of the implementation of the RCSV Pilot Scheme at an appropriate time. 	