

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)1403/18-19

(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/WS

**Panel on Welfare Services**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 11 March 2019, at 10:15 am**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

- Members present** : Hon KWONG Chun-yu (Chairman)  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
- Members absent** : Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
- Member attending** : Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH

**Public Officers attending** : Items III to V

Dr LAW Chi-kwong, GBS, JP  
Secretary for Labour and Welfare  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Item III

Mr David LEUNG, JP  
Commissioner for Rehabilitation  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mr KOK Che-leung  
Assistant Director (Rehabilitation and Medical Social  
Services)  
Social Welfare Department

Item IV

Ms PANG Kit-ling  
Assistant Director (Family and Child Welfare)  
Social Welfare Department

Item V

Ms Vivian KO  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare  
(Welfare) 1  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

**Attendance by invitation** : Item V

監察公共屋邨福利規劃聯盟

Mr NG Kwan-lim  
召集人

HKSKH Lady MacLehose Centre

Mr LEUNG Siu-lung  
Organizing Officer

Community Development Alliance

Miss CHENG Hiu-man  
Organizer

Christian Family Service Centre Jockey Club New  
Estate Support Programme

Miss LAU Wai-ki  
Service Manager

Hong Kong Evangelical Church Yan Lam Community  
Service Centre

Mr WONG Chi-fai  
Social Worker

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Wendy JAN  
Chief Council Secretary (2) 4

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

Miss Alison HUI  
Legislative Assistant (2) 4

---

Action

**I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting**  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)854/18-19(01)]

Members noted that a letter dated 19 February 2019 from Dr Fernando CHEUNG regarding the redevelopment of the site for Factory for the Blind in To Kwa Wan had been issued since the last meeting.

## **II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)924/18-19(01) to (02)]

2. Members agreed to discuss at the next meeting scheduled for 15 April 2019 the following items:

- (a) Providing extra allowance to recipients of social security, Working Family Allowance and Work Incentive Transport Subsidy; and one-off grant to students in need;
- (b) Strengthening the monitoring of residential care homes for the elderly and residential care homes for persons with disabilities and enhancing their service quality; and
- (c) Annual briefing on welfare facility projects funded by Lotteries Fund.

## **III. Special Needs Trust**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)924/18-19(03) to (04) and CB(2)942/18-19(01)]

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for Labour and Welfare ("SLW") briefed members on the service scope and implementation arrangements of the Special Needs Trust ("SNT").

### First payment

4. Noting that parents who participated in SNT ("Settlors") were required to deposit a minimum of \$204,000 and the prevailing trustee fee for the first year ("First Payment") into their SNT accounts, the Chairman, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG urged the Administration to reduce the amount of the First Payment so that low-income families could also participate in SNT. The Deputy Chairman said that in Singapore, parents of children with special needs could set up a public trust account with a minimum of around HK\$28,000.

5. SLW responded that the Administration understood that some parents might not afford the First Payment. However, the First Payment was to ensure that the living expenses of the Settlors' children with special needs ("Beneficiaries") could be catered for not less than 12 months in case the executors of the Settlors' wills needed some time in liquidating the Settlors' assets after the Settlors had passed away. If the amount of the

First Payment was small, the smooth execution of the care plan for the Beneficiaries would be adversely affected.

6. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the basis for determining the amount of the First Payment. SLW advised that it was calculated according to the financial limit of the monthly living expenses for a mentally incapacitated person set by the Guardianship Board and the prevailing trustee fee for the first year, the details of which were set out in paragraph 13 of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. 924/18-19(03)).

7. In response to Mr Alvin YEUNG's further enquiry about the operation of an SNT account after the exhaustion of the First Payment, SLW said that if the First Payment in an SNT account was used up, the Beneficiary concerned would be supported by the social welfare system.

#### Annual fee

8. Noting that the annual fee for each trust account under SNT was \$21,000, the Chairman, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung expressed concern that the level of annual fee was too high, which would deplete the trust fund over time. In their views, the Administration should lower the annual fee so that the trust fund could cover the living expenses of the Beneficiaries for a longer period. Opining that the trust fund had in a way reduced the Administration's financial commitment to the Beneficiaries, Mr LUK Chung-hung called on the Administration to subsidize or waive the annual fee under SNT.

9. Dr KWOK Ka-ki suggested that instead of charging a flat rate, a lower annual fee should be charged for cases where the monthly living expenses incurred by the Beneficiaries were less than the level set by the Guardianship Board, and the annual fee should be waived if the amount of funds in an SNT account was below a certain level.

10. SLW responded that if the annual fee was not charged at a flat rate but at a percentage of the value of assets, the Settlers with higher value of assets would bear more of the cost of operating SNT, thus subsidizing those Settlers having lower value of assets.

11. In response to the enquiries of Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr POON Siu-ping and Mr LUK Chung-hung about the basis for setting and adjusting the annual fee, Assistant Director (Rehabilitation and Medical Social Services) ("AD(R&MSS")) said that the annual fee was charged to cover the management and administrative expenses of the trust fund

incurred by the SNT Office, mainly including the salary of the civil servants working in the asset management and general administration in the SNT Office and their departmental expenditures. The annual fee would be adjusted according to the changes in these expenses.

12. Commissioner for Rehabilitation ("C for R") supplemented that, when estimating the operating cost of the SNT Office, the Administration used the assumption of having 300 trust accounts in the first few initial years in estimating the operational costs by making reference to the experience of Singapore in implementing a similar special needs trust.

13. SLW further explained that it was estimated that the Administration had to subsidize almost fully the total operating cost of SNT accounts in the first few years of implementing the SNT service, as no fee would be charged until a trust account was activated. When the number of activated accounts had reached 300, the amount of annual fee received should be able to cover the operating cost on the administration and investment of these accounts. Hence, it would not be likely that the annual fee could be adjusted downward in the near future. The Chairman was of the view that a reduction in the annual fee might induce more parents of children with special needs to join SNT, thus boosting the numbers of SNT accounts and reaching the threshold for reducing the annual fee in a faster pace.

14. In response to Mr POON Siu-ping's enquiry about the estimated number of applications for the SNT service, AD(R&MSS) said that it was difficult to make an estimation at this stage, but some parents had made further enquiries about SNT and expressed interests in applying for the SNT service after attending the briefing sessions on the SNT service.

15. The Deputy Chairman said that the annual fee for a public trust account in Singapore was much lower than that of SNT because the Singapore Government had provided 90% or full subsidy for the annual fee. He asked whether similar arrangements could be made for SNT. C for R responded that the Administration understood that in addition to the fee charged by the SNT Company as mentioned by the Deputy Chairman, a user of the SNT service needed to pay a fee calculated on a cost recovery basis for fund management by the Singapore's Public Trustee's Office.

#### Trust account managers

16. Opining that trust account managers played an important role in reviewing the implementation of care plans for the Beneficiaries, the

Deputy Chairman and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the ratio of trust account manager to Beneficiaries. AD(R&MSS) responded that a trust account manager would be responsible for around 30 trust accounts. In addition to reviewing the implementation of care plans, the trust account managers would refer the Beneficiaries to welfare, care or health services, if necessary, having regard to their needs and health conditions.

17. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that many parents hoped that the trust fund could be used for meeting the special needs of their children (e.g. hiring part-time carer, purchasing special medication or medical equipment) rather than their basic needs. Case managers instead of trust account managers should therefore be appointed for the Beneficiaries. He further called on the Administration to adopt a case-oriented approach rather than a financial management approach in providing services for the Beneficiaries. He also suggested that the Panel should receive views from parents of children with special needs on SNT.

18. SLW responded that the role of trust account managers was to manage the care plan of the Beneficiaries and the use of the trust fund. The Beneficiaries under SNT included persons with intellectual disability (including Down's syndrome), mental disorder or autism. Under the existing social welfare system, if deemed necessary, case managers would be assigned to take care of the welfare needs of persons with special needs.

#### Eligibility of Beneficiaries for social security assistance

19. The Deputy Chairman and Dr Fernando CHEUNG urged the Administration not to count the Settlers' assets as the income of Beneficiaries when the latter applied for Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA"). Dr CHEUNG and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung expressed a similar view that many parents hoped that the trust fund could enable their children to receive special care services on top of the basic services provided under the social welfare system.

20. SLW said that assets of the Settlers would be counted towards the assets of the Beneficiaries in assessing the eligibility of the Beneficiaries for CSSA. The Beneficiaries' living expenses would be borne by CSSA as the safety net when the funds in the SNT accounts were used up. SLW also said that it was very likely that most Beneficiaries would be admitted to subvented residential care homes ("RCHs") after their parents had passed away, and services provided by these RCHs would be adequate to meet their care needs.

### Management of funds

21. Mr LUK Chung-hung enquired whether the Settlers had to make contributions to the trust accounts on a regular basis and what investment options were available for them. SLW responded that the First Payment in the trust accounts should be sufficient to cover the living expenses of the Beneficiaries for at least 12 months and further payment would be transferred to SNT to activate the trust accounts through execution of the Settlers' will. Other than the two payments mentioned above, the Settlers were not required to contribute to the trust accounts on a regular basis. The Director of Social Welfare Incorporated would invest the funds in SNT in low-risk investment products.

22. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that given that the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") did not have the expertise in fund management and investment, the Administration should consider entrusting the Hong Kong Monetary Authority ("HKMA") to manage the funds in SNT or depositing the funds in savings account, so as to minimize the management costs.

23. SLW responded that HKMA was not a suitable body to manage funds of SNT as the funds it managed were mostly public money and could not be withdrawn on a monthly basis. Besides, the amount of funds in SNT did not meet the minimum asset threshold set by HKMA. SLW added that the Administration would adhere to established principles and engage appropriate parties to manage the funds in SNT.

### Motion

24. The Deputy Chairman moved the following motion:

"鑒於協助家長離世後照顧仍然在世的特殊需要子女是政府和香港社會應有的責任，本委員會促請政府資助'特殊需要信託'的管理費及行政費用，資助九成信託年費。"

(Translation)

"Given that it is a due responsibility of the Government and the society of Hong Kong to help parents, after their passing, take care of their children with special needs who are still alive, this Panel urges the Government to subsidize 90% of the annual fee charged by the Special Needs Trust to cover its management and administrative expenses."



25. The Chairman put the motion to vote. All members present voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

#### **IV. Provision of relocation allowance for poor households**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)924/18-19(05) to (06)]

26. At the invitation of the Chairman, SLW briefed members on the two types of relocation allowance related to SWD, namely the Pilot Scheme on Relocation Allowance for Beneficiaries of the Community Housing Movement ("Pilot Scheme") and the domestic removal grant under the CSSA Scheme.

##### Beneficiaries of relocation allowance

27. The Chairman and Mr LUK Chung-hung said that many tenants of inadequate housing, such as sub-divided units, had to move once or twice in a year due to rental increases. They called on the Administration to extend relocation allowance to such tenants and to the waitlistees for public rental housing ("PRH"), so as to alleviate their financial burden. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that as some needy families (e.g. single parent families living in sub-divided units) were worse off than the beneficiaries of the Community Housing Movement ("CHM"), the Administration should also provide relocation allowance to these needy families.

28. SLW responded that the Administration would take into account various factors, such as the income level of the recipients and the accommodation concerned, in determining the level of relocation allowance.

##### Domestic removal grant

29. The Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and Dr Fernando CHEUNG urged the Administration to resume the provision of domestic removal grant for able-bodied adult CSSA recipients, which had been suspended since 1999. SLW responded that the review of supplements and special grants (including domestic removal grant) under the CSSA Scheme would be completed by the end of 2019. Members would be briefed on the findings of the review when available. SLW further said that domestic removal grant might be provided at the discretion of the Director of Social Welfare under exceptional circumstances on the merits of individual cases.

Pilot Scheme on Relocation Allowance for Beneficiaries of the Community Housing Movement

Admin

30. Noting that only 180 out of the 210 applications received under the Pilot Scheme were confirmed as eligible, the Deputy Chairman and Mr POON Siu-ping enquired about the status and outcome of the remaining applications. They also asked whether any of these remaining applications were rejected, and if so, the reasons for rejection. SLW undertook to provide the required information after the meeting.

31. Mr POON Siu-ping further said that the Pilot Scheme was expected to benefit about 1 000 households but only 210 applications had been received under the Scheme. He enquired about the reasons for the small number of applications. SLW responded that the Pilot Scheme was launched in December 2017 for a period of three years. It was estimated that about 1 000 households would benefit from the Pilot Scheme.

32. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung took the view that the number of families/individuals in need of the relocation allowance under the Pilot Scheme should be far more than 1 000. He called on the Administration to increase the quota of the Pilot Scheme. SLW responded that as only families/single persons benefiting from CHM were eligible to receive the relocation allowance under the Pilot Scheme, the number of applications for the Pilot Scheme was estimated according to the number of beneficiaries of CHM. If the number of applications received under the Pilot Scheme exceeded 1 000, the Administration would seek additional funding from the Community Care Fund ("CCF"), if necessary.

33. In response to Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's suggestion of expanding CHM to benefit more people in need of transitional housing, SLW said that whether the scale of CHM could be expanded depending on the supply of private housing units which could be used for short-term accommodation.

34. Mr POON Siu-ping and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the timetable for conducting the evaluation on the effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme and the scope of the evaluation. SLW responded that the evaluation was expected to commence in early 2020 and would cover, amongst others, the amount of allowance.

Amount of relocation allowance

35. The Deputy Chairman sought the basis for setting the amount of relocation allowance under the Pilot Scheme and that under the scheme entitled "Relocation Allowance for Residents of Illegal Domestic Premises in Industrial Buildings who Have to Move Out as a result of the Buildings Department's Enforcement Action" launched by CCF. SLW responded that in considering the amounts of relocation allowances for these two schemes, CCF had made reference to the domestic removal grant under the CSSA Scheme. Mr POON Siu-ping called on the Administration to increase the amounts of relocation allowances for needy families.

Admin

36. At the Deputy Chairman's request, SLW undertook to explain in writing why the amounts of relocation allowances under the above-mentioned schemes were more than the amount of domestic removal grant for CSSA recipients who had moved into private housing.

**V. Community Investment and Inclusion Fund**  
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)924/18-19(07) to (08)]

37. At the invitation of the Chairman, SLW briefed members on the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund ("CIIF").

38. Five deputations had attended the meeting at the invitation of the Panel to give views on CIIF. Their views were summarized in the **Appendix**.

The Administration's response to deputations' views

39. Regarding the duration of funding for Community Support Programmes for new PRH estates ("CSPs") under CIIF, SLW said that the Administration would regularize CSPs and the duration of funding for CSPs under this regularization initiative would be extended to "N+36 months", in which "N" represented the time required for resident-intake of the new PRH estates concerned and "36 months" represented the maximum duration of approval.

40. As regards the provision of dedicated offices for the social worker teams serving the residents of new PRH estates ("social worker teams") under CSPs, SLW said that as most of the space in new PRH estates had already been taken up by domestic units and various facilities, it would be

difficult to find any new space to be used as social worker teams' offices. That said, LWB would explore with relevant government departments the feasibility of identifying temporary space in new PRH estates for such purpose.

41. With respect to the insufficient provision of various community services in new PRH estates at the time of resident-intake, SLW advised that in order to facilitate residents to move into new PRH estates as early as possible, priority was accorded to the provision of domestic units in new PRH estates. In December 2018, the Administration stipulated population-based planning ratios in respect of elderly services and facilities into the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"). As regards child care facilities, the Administration would also stipulate the relevant planning ratio into HKPSG. These planning ratios would help to expedite the provision of such facilities in newly built PRH estates. However, some facilities, such as public market, could not be provided in some new PRH estates due to space constraints.

42. In respect of the service scope of CSPs, SLW said that CIIF did not impose restrictions on the service scope of CSPs provided that they met the objectives of CIIF, and the Administration would consider how it could assist social worker teams of CSPs in better delivering their services to residents of new PRH estates. Regarding the number of social workers providing services under CSPs in a new PRH estate, SLW said that in addition to the number of residents, the speed of resident-intake in the new PRH estate would also be one of the main considerations in determining the number of social workers working in the PRH estate.

43. SLW further said that the Administration would consider whether the existing arrangements of CIIF projects would be enhanced having regard to deputations' views. At Dr Fernando CHEUNG's request, SLW undertook to provide a written response to deputations' views.

Admin

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1325/18-19(01) on 30 April 2019.)*

## Discussion

*Provision of dedicated offices in new public rental housing estates for social worker teams*

44. The Deputy Chairman said that some social worker teams had used the offices of Mutual Aid Committee as temporary work bases at the resident intake stage of new PRH estates. As these offices were not equipped with basic facilities, such as toilets and facsimile lines, such an arrangement was highly undesirable. The Chairman added that while some social worker teams were provided with temporary offices, they could not use the premises throughout the entire funding period of CSPs. The Chairman and the Deputy Chairman called on the Administration to reserve suitable premises for social worker teams to use as offices in the planning stage of new PRH estates.

45. SLW responded that the Hong Kong Housing Authority would optimize the use of space in new PRH development projects for building rental domestic units and providing facilities for permanent services. In the light of the time-limited nature of CSPs, it was difficult for the Administration to provide social worker teams with dedicated offices in new PRH estates. Nevertheless, the Administration would explore with relevant government departments the feasibility of identifying temporary premises for social worker teams to use as temporary offices during the funding period.

*Extending the duration of funding for community support programmes for new public rental housing estates*

46. The Deputy Chairman enquired whether "N" represented the time required for 100% resident-intake of a new PRH estate. SLW responded that according to past experience, around 80% of residents would move into a new PRH estate soon after its completion. The Administration had therefore set "N" as the time required for 80% of resident-intake and this percentage could be adjusted if necessary. SLW further said given that CIIF projects sought to help building mutual support network in the community, it was hoped that the residents who had adapted to the new environment might be able to help incoming residents through the support network.

47. Dr Fernando CHEUNG was of the view that building of social capital relied on mutual trust between NGOs and residents, and mutual trust could only be established if NGOs' services could last for a sufficiently long period. Taking the view that the proposed duration of funding (i.e. N+36 months) was still too short, Dr CHEUNG and the Chairman called on the Administration to extend the maximum duration of approval to beyond 36 months to facilitate building of social capital.

48. SLW responded that currently, duration of funding for CSPs was two to three years. By extending the duration of funding to N+36 months, residents who moved into a new PRH estate two or three years after its completion could still receive services under CSPs. The duration of funding might be longer than three years if it took longer time for 80% of residents to move into a new PRH estate. The Administration would keep in view the development of CSPs and consider reviewing the duration of funding after the initiative had been implemented for a period of time.

49. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about the timetable for regularizing CSPs and the implementation details, SLW said that more information on CSPs would be provided on the CIIF website in April 2019.

*Timely provision of community services in new public rental housing estates*

50. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that various services (including social welfare, education, transport and health care) were not available in new PRH estates at the time of resident-intake. He recalled that the Administration had previously adopted a community-based and integrated service model ("the service model") to provide services in Fu Tung Estate, the first phase development of Tung Chung, some two decades ago. Under this model, the social worker teams concerned had contacted prospective residents of Fu Tung Estate with a view to providing them with timely community services at resident-intake stage. Dr CHEUNG questioned why the service model had not been adopted in the provision of community services for residents of new PRH estates since then.

51. SLW recalled that two integrated service teams were set up to provide services in Fu Tung Estate, and based on the findings of the evaluation of the service model conducted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, integrated service teams were also set up to service Yat Tung Estate. SLW said that the Administration adopted an open attitude towards the provision of social welfare services in new PRH estates in an integrated approach and was willing to explore the subject matter with the welfare sector if necessary.

*Positioning of Community Investment and Inclusion Fund*

52. Dr CHENG Chung-tai said that according to the latest issue of CIIF's newsletter, the Chairman and nine members of the CIIF Committee (including the Chairman and Vice-chairman of the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-Committee ("AESC") under the CIIF Committee) would

retire from the Committee on 30 April 2019 and 31 March 2019 respectively, which represented a change in about half of the membership of the CIIF Committee. He asked whether the Administration would take this opportunity to review the positioning of CIIF in order to enhance the engagement of NGOs in CIIF projects. He also expressed concern as to whether the retirement of the Chairman and Vice-chairman of AESC, who had both served on AESC for many years, would have an impact on the assessment and evaluation of CIIF applications.

53. SLW responded that since some members of the CIIF Committee who also served on its Subcommittees were appointed at the same time, it was inevitable that some of them would retire from the Committee/Subcommittees at the same time. To maintain certain degree of continuity of the membership of the CIIF Committee and its Subcommittees, a member might be appointed to a different position as appropriate over time, for example, as Chairman or Vice-chairman, so that members could serve on the CIIF Committee and its Subcommittee for a longer period.

Admin

54. SLW further said that CIIF was set up to promote social capital development through encouraging mutual support in the neighbourhood, community participation and cross-sectoral partnership. The majority of the CIIF projects were community-led and the Administration welcomed proposals on social capital development in the community. At the request of the Deputy Chairman, SLW undertook to provide information on the themes of previous CIIF projects which were launched since the establishment of CIIF in 2002 to facilitate members' understanding of the scope of CIIF projects.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1325/18-19(01) on 30 April 2019.)*

### Motion

55. The Deputy Chairman moved the following motion:

"政府在《2018年施政報告》中提出，將會透過'社區投資共享基金'資助建立社區支援網絡項目，使新屋邨社區支援計劃常規化。本委員會促請政府盡快落實'社區投資共享基金'常規化新屋邨社區支援計劃的細節及公布時間表，推行整全新公屋邨服務規劃，並為新屋邨社工隊服務計劃預留足夠項目服

務年期的合適邨內服務單位，以及把現時的服務計劃年期 (N+36 個月) 增至 6 年，以便支援居民需要。"

(Translation)

"The Government announced in the 2018 Policy Address that it would provide funding for the community network building projects through the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund ("CIIF") to regularize the community support programmes for new public rental housing estates ("PRHs"). This Panel urges the Government to expeditiously draw up the implementation details of the community support programmes for new PRHs to be regularized under CIIF and announce the timetable concerned, conduct an integrated service planning for new PRHs, and reserve suitable service units in PRHs for social worker teams serving new PRHs throughout the funding period of the projects, as well as to extend the current duration of funding for the projects (N+36 months) to six years, so as to provide support to meet residents' needs."

56. The Chairman put the motion to vote. All members present voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

## **VI. Any other business**

### Special meeting

57. The Chairman reminded members that a special meeting would be held on 2 April 2019 to receive public views on "Review of Hong Kong's poverty situation and setting of a target for poverty elimination".

58. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:49 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
8 May 2019



**Panel on Welfare Services**

**Meeting on Monday, 11 March 2019, at 10:15 am**

**Community Investment and Inclusion Fund**

**Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations**

No.	Name of deputation	Views
1.	監察公共屋邨福利 規劃聯盟	LC Paper No. CB(2)924/17-18(09)
2.	HKSKH Lady MacLehose Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope of service of community support programmes for new public rental housing ("CSPs") under the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund should be reviewed to better meet residents' needs. CSPs should also cover the provision of information on various services and facilities (e.g. information on transportation, schools and shops) available in the community.</li> <li>• Social worker teams serving the residents of new public rental housing ("PRH") estates ("social worker teams") should be provided with dedicated offices in the new PRH estates throughout the funding period of the programmes.</li> <li>• A ratio of social workers to residents in new PRH estates should be formulated.</li> </ul>
3.	Community Development Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In view of the long resident-intake time of new PRH estates, the duration of funding for CSPs should be extended to six years.</li> </ul>
4.	Christian Family Service Centre Jockey Club New Estate Support Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In view of the long resident-intake time of new PRH estates, the duration of funding for CSPs should be longer than 36 months. Social worker teams should be provided with dedicated offices in the new PRH estates.</li> <li>• The Administration should consider providing referral and support services as well as services to assist residents in adapting to the new community under CSPs.</li> </ul>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name of deputation</b>	<b>Views</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Labour and Welfare Bureau or the Transport and Housing Bureau should provide social worker teams with basic background information of residents, so that the teams could draw up suitable service plans and provide services for them in a timely manner.</li></ul>
5.	Hong Kong Evangelical Church Yan Lam Community Service Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The duration of funding for CSPs should be extended to allow more time for social worker teams to assist the build-up of self-support groups in new PRH estates.</li><li>• The Administration should provide a timetable for extending the duration of funding for CSPs.</li></ul>

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
8 May 2019