

**Assistance Programme under the Community Care Fund
Evaluation Report on Subsidy for Elders who are on the Waiting List
of
Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases) for
Household Cleaning and Escorting Services for Medical Consultations**

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 can 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. Ex-Steering Committee on CCF at its meeting on 20 April 2011 to launch this assistance programme in 2011-12 for subsidizing elders from low income families who, as at 31 July 2011, had applied for and were waiting for the "Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)" to receive household cleaning and escorting services for medical consultations during the waiting period for the subvented services, so as to enable the elderly beneficiaries to maintain household hygiene and attend medical consultations as scheduled. Eligible elder can receive \$480 at maximum per month with hourly subsidy capped at \$60 for the subsidized services, for not more than 12 months.

3. The programme, with budget of \$24.19 million (including administrative costs of \$1.15 million), is administered by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and estimated to benefit not more than 4 000 elders.

Implementation of Assistance Programme

4. In August 2011, SWD organised a briefing session for agencies interested in providing services for this programme and invited them to apply for joining this programme as authorised service providers (SPs). SPs approved for providing services in this programme must be an organization or a body exempted from tax under Inland Revenue Ordinance, Cap. 112, Section 88, with at least one-year experience in providing subvented or self-financing household cleaning and/or escorting services for medical consultations (depending on the type of service to be provided

by the organisation under this programme). Upon vetting, SWD approved 26 SPs with a total of 45 service units in October 2011 and the service boundaries covered all over Hong Kong.

5. SWD announced the details of this assistance programme and arranged publicity¹ in October 2011, and subsequently issued letters to 1 669 elders based on the lists of potentially eligible elders provided by Integrated Home Care Service (IHCS) teams². Each letter was enclosed with a programme brief, a list of SPs and an application form. Eligible elders were invited to submit applications by 31 January 2012 (for the first round of application), and SWD would assess their eligibilities according to the information provided in their application forms. To benefit more eligible elders, SWD announced in May 2012 that the application period would be extended until 31 July 2012, and that the specified date for the elders applying for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” was changed to 31 March 2012 accordingly. In the new round of application (the second round of application), SWD issued letters to 1 321 elders based on the lists of elders newly referred by IHCS teams³, and invited eligible elders to submit applications.

6. The CCF Team of SWD was responsible for vetting the applications and arranging for eligible applicants to receive services provided by SPs according to their preferences. The subsidy would not be released to the elders directly and the SPs had to apply for release of subsidy from SWD according to the actual service hours they had provided to each beneficiary. So far, SWD had received 1 111 applications among which 1 076 applications fulfilled the eligibility criteria. The subsidy claimed by the SPs was about \$1.23 million.

Results of Analysis

7. SWD has analysed the collected information and data for the evaluation as follows:

¹ Besides distributing programme briefs at its District Social Welfare Offices, Integrated Family Service Centres, the Home Affairs Department, IHCS teams, etc, SWD also uploaded relevant information on the SWD homepage.

² As information on household income of elders on the waiting list for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” was not available, SWD issued letters to all the elders preliminarily identified by IHCS teams as potentially eligible for the programme and referred to SWD, in which they were invited to submit applications.

³ Including eligible elders who did not submit applications in the first round but were reviewed by IHCS teams that they might still be eligible, and those who applied for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” during the period after 31 July 2011 until 31 March 2012 and were preliminarily identified by IHCS that they might meet the eligibility criteria.

(a) Statistical Data on Applications and Service Arrangement

8. SWD received 681 and 430 applications in the first and second rounds of application respectively (1 111 applications in total). Out of the number of invitation letters issued in the two rounds (i.e. 1 669 and 1 321 correspondingly), the response rates were 40.8% and 32.6% respectively. Among the 1 111 applications, except the 20 applications withdrawn by the applicants, 98.6% (1 076 applications) met the eligibility criteria, whereas 1.4% (15 applications) were not eligible. Among the applications found ineligible, 7 had household income exceeding the required limit, and the remaining applications were rejected due to reasons such as the applicant did not reach the age of 65, the applicant had not applied for and was not waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” as at the specified date, the applicant was no longer living at home or had already been receiving community care services for the elderly, etc. Please see Appendix I(a) for the statistical figures.

9. Most of the eligible applicants fell within the age group of 80-84, taking up 28.0% (301 persons) of the total number of eligible applicants. The second largest age group was 75-79, taking up about 25.7% (276 persons) of the total number of eligible applicants. Most of them (62.9%, 677 persons) needed household cleaning service only, whereas less than 1% (8 persons) needed escorting service for medical consultations only and 36.3% (391 persons) needed both. Please see Appendices I(b) and I(c) for the statistical figures.

(b) Information from the Approved Service Providers

10. Among the 45 service units under all approved SPs, 77.8% (35 service units) could provide both the household cleaning service and the escorting service for medical consultations, 17.8% (8 service units) provided the escorting service only, and only 4.4% (2 service units) provided just the household cleaning service. For details, please see Appendix I(d).

11. Among the 1 074 beneficiaries assigned to SPs under this programme as of today, most of them (1 023 persons, 95.2%) have been allocated to SPs of their first three choices. A high percentage of beneficiaries (841 persons, 78.3%) have been allocated first choices. For details, please see Appendix I(e).

12. A majority of beneficiaries could be referred to SPs for service within 30 days (745 persons, taking up 69.4% of the total number of cases

assigned to SPs)⁴. However, some cases took a longer time to process because of special circumstances, such as incomplete information submitted for the application, failure to contact the applicant to follow up on the application for the applicant was out of town, etc. For details, please see Appendix I (f).

(c) Survey on beneficiaries

13. SWD has conducted an opinion survey on 56 randomly selected beneficiaries (5.2% of the total) to know more about their family circumstances, daily care, status of waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” and their opinions on the programme.

(i) Family condition and daily care

14. A larger share of the surveyed beneficiaries was singletons, taking up 62.5% (35 persons) of the total number of interviewees. The remaining 37.5% (21 persons) were living with family member(s), among which 95.2% (20 persons) were living with one family member. Among these surveyed beneficiaries, 19 were living with their spouse, taking up 90.5% of the interviewees living with family member(s). There were 52 interviewees being non Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) recipients. Most of them had a monthly household income (including earnings from all the family members) below \$5,000 (29 persons, taking up 55.8% of all the interviewees who were non-CSSA beneficiaries), whereas the remaining interviewees had a monthly household income not exceeding \$10,000 (23 persons, taking up 44.2% of all the interviewees who were non-CSSA recipients). For details, please see Appendix II(a).

15. Most of the interviewees could handle household cleaning (74.6%) and attend medical consultations (87.5%) on their own or with the assistance of their friends and relatives. For details, please see Appendix II(b).

(ii) Status of waiting for “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”

16. While a majority of the interviewees (73.2%, 41 persons) stated that they were waiting for the household cleaning service under the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”, only 7.14% (4 persons)

⁴ The time required for assigning service refers to the number of days it takes from the day on which an application is received until an eligible elder confirms with the service unit allocated, including Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays.

were waiting for the escorting service for medical consultation and 5.4% (3 persons) were waiting for other care services. The remaining interviewees (10 persons, about 17.9%) were not sure what service they were waiting for. Many interviewees stated that they were not sure how long they had been waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” before receiving the subsidised service under this programme (21 persons, 37.5%). Some of them stated that they had been waiting for 2 years or above (18 persons, 32.1%) or less than 1 year (13 persons, 23.2%). For details, please see Appendix II(c).

(iii) Opinions on this programme

17. All the interviewees agreed that this programme could help them maintain household cleanliness and attend medical appointments as scheduled. They were satisfied with the overall arrangement of the programme. Most of them were also satisfied with the services provided by the service units (52 persons, 92.9%). For details, please see Appendix II(d).

(d) Survey on Invitees who have not submitted Applications

18. SWD also conducted a phone survey to 36 randomly selected elders who were invited but had not submitted applications (about 2.8% of the total number of invitees who had not submitted applications⁵) to understand the reasons for not submitting applications and their opinions on this programme.

19. Most of the interviewees stated that they did not submit application because they did not have such a need (20 persons, 55.6%). The second largest reason was that they did not meet the eligibility criteria (11 persons, 30.6%) due to reasons such as having received subvented services, not living in a household, having withdrawn from the waiting list for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”, etc. Some interviewees said that they did not know how to complete the application form (5 persons, 13.9%)⁶. Moreover, most of the interviewees stated that they had no comment on this programme. For others who expressed their

⁵ A total of 2 365 elders were referred to SWD by IHCS teams in the two rounds of application. With 1 111 applications received, the total number of the referred elders who had not submitted applications was 1 254.

⁶ For elders who indicated that they did not know how to complete the application form, interviewers suggested immediately that they could approach their friends and relatives or any nearby service centre for the elderly for assistance in completing the application form if necessary or call the CCF Team for enquiry in case of doubt. Meanwhile, SWD had also informed the relevant IHCS teams of the situation of such elders and asked them for provision of follow-up assistance.

opinions, they (2 persons, 5.6%) agreed that the programme was useful to the beneficiaries. For details, please see Appendices III(a) and III(b).

(e) Survey on Service Providers

20. SWD also conducted a survey on the 26 approved SPs by questionnaire and all the invited SPs have completed the questionnaires. Some SPs expressed opinions such as relaxing the eligibility criteria, raising the subsidy amount, allowing their fee adjustment according to the market situation, strengthening publicity of the programme, etc. Some SPs pointed out that the administrative work required by this programme was comparatively more and had increased the operating cost. Most of the SPs opined that this programme could help beneficiaries maintain household hygiene and attend medical consultations as scheduled, and were satisfied with SWD's preparations and arrangements for SPs participating in this programme, including the arrangement for disbursing the subsidy. Generally speaking, SPs were satisfied with the operational arrangement of this programme and expressed willingness to continue participating in similar programmes. For details, please see Appendix IV.

(f) Survey on IHCS teams

21. SWD has also conducted a survey on the 60 IHCS teams which have assisted in identifying potential eligible elders by questionnaire. There were 28 IHCS teams (surveyed teams) returned the completed questionnaires. Some surveyed teams expressed opinions on this programme such as relaxing the eligibility criteria, extending the subsidised services types, strengthening publicity of this programme, etc. Some surveyed teams stated that it took a considerable time to identify potential eligible elders and consolidate a list for submission to SWD. It was also mentioned by some surveyed teams that more support should be provided to elders in completing application forms. In general, most of the surveyed teams were satisfied with the arrangement of this programme and indicated that they would be willing to continue to assist in similar programmes.

22. To ensure that the application materials of this programme could reach all the target beneficiaries, SWD invited IHCS teams to refer the potential eligible elders on their waiting lists for the "Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)" to SWD. The number of elders referred in the two rounds of application was only 1 669 and 1 321 respectively, showing a significant discrepancy with the number of cases waiting for the "Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)" (about 4 200 applicants)

as reported by non-governmental organizations rendering integrated home care services. In this regard, IHCS teams' views were collected through this questionnaire. Surveyed teams pointed out that the main reason for this was due to the ineligibility of many applicants on the waiting lists of the "Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)", such as not reaching the age of 65, not waiting for the "Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)" as at the specified date, household income exceeding the specified ceiling, etc. The second reason was that some applicants had already received subvented community care service or services provided by other agencies, while the third reason went to the change in the waiting status of applicants, such as having withdrawn from the waiting lists for the services or switched to waiting for other services, etc. For details, please see Appendices V(a) and V(b).

(g) Public enquiries

23. In the course of implementing this programme, SWD has set up an enquiry hotline to provide support and information regarding the programme to the public. From November 2011 till present, SWD received about 1 013 enquiries on this programme, the majority of which were concerned about the eligibility criteria, completion of forms and service arrangement, etc. For details, please see Appendix VI.

Conclusion

24. SWD issued letters for inviting applications according to the information provided by IHCS teams in order to ensure that all the potential eligible elders were aware of this programme. The number of applications received in the first and second rounds of application of this programme was 681 and 430 respectively, while the number of eligible applications was 660 (about 96.9% of the number of applicants) and 416 (about 96.7% of the number of applicants) respectively. The total number of applicants for this programme (1 111 persons) was about 37.2% of the number of invited elders (2 990 persons), and most of the beneficiaries needed household cleaning service only.

25. Moreover, this programme has a very high approval rate of applications that 98.6% of the applications processed had been approved. It proves that the publicity work (such as issuing invitation letters to potential eligible elders, introduction by IHCS teams to elders, etc) could help the applicants to understand the contents and details of the programme. Furthermore, experience shows that the assigned SPs of this programme could offer speedy services for eligible elders who did not have to be put on

the waiting list during the course of application. As stated in paragraph 17 above, all the surveyed elders agreed that the programme could help them maintain household cleanliness and attend medical consultations as scheduled, and were satisfied with the overall arrangement of this programme. A vast majority of them were satisfied with the performance of the SPs. Given the above, the subsidised services under this programme have served the intended purpose, and the selection criteria set by SWD were effective in selecting suitable SPs.

26. However, as shown in Appendix I(f), the second round of application took a longer time to assign SPs than in the first round. In the first round, about 26.2% of the beneficiaries could be matched with SPs within 14 days⁷, whereas the percentage dropped to 18% in the second round⁸. This is because five of the service units were not able to accept new cases in the second round due to problems in administrative cost, manpower resources, etc, leading to a drop in the number of SPs available. Although the overall service arrangement has not been affected significantly, the situation should be of concern.

27. On the other hand, some SPs reflected in the opinion survey that the programme involved heavy administrative work and very high costs, and that the original maximum hourly subsidy (\$60) was lower than the fee for similar services in the private market. If SPs set their service fees according to the market price, the charges would be higher than the maximum subsidy and would discourage elders from using the service. If SPs follow the existing maximum hourly subsidy in setting service fees, it might be difficult to employ sufficient manpower to maintain the service. Some surveyed SPs and IHCS teams even indicated that they might not participate in other similar programmes because of insufficient resources. However, the administrative procedures laid down by SWD for this programme, including referring potential eligible elders to SWD by IHCS teams, requiring the beneficiaries to sign for confirmation of service hours received each time, requiring SPs to submit reports to SWD for verification of the amount of subsidies claimed, requiring SPs to conduct service users satisfaction surveys, etc, were deemed pragmatically necessary to ensure the smooth and effective operation of the programme. SWD has already minimised the administrative procedures as far as practicable, such as requiring the applicants to provide only the most basic information for

⁷ The percentage is calculated as follows: $173 \div 660$ (the number of beneficiaries arranged with SPs in the first round) = 26.2%

⁸ The percentage is calculated as follows: $75 \div 416$ (the number of beneficiaries arranged with SPs in the second round) = 18.0%

vetting. Therefore, there is not much room left for further streamlining of the administrative procedures under this programme.

28. Since the programme has proved to be useful to the elderly beneficiaries, SWD had proposed to extend the programme, and the proposal was endorsed by the ex-Steering Committee on CCF. To benefit more elders, the specified date for the elders applying for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” had been changed from 31 March 2012 to 31 October 2012, and the eligible elders could receive subsidised service until 31 March 2014 the latest. Meanwhile, given the significant increase in wages and price accumulated previously, in order to enable this programme to continue with smooth implementation, the maximum hourly subsidy under this programme has been adjusted upward from \$60 to \$70 (that is, the maximum monthly subsidy is increased from \$480 to \$560)⁹.

29. Opinions have been expressed in the opinion surveys of SPs and IHCS teams that the age restriction on the elders should be relaxed for the programme. However, it is shown in the age distribution of beneficiaries provided in Appendix I(b) that most of the beneficiaries were aged 70 to 89 (87.6%) and only a small percentage of beneficiaries (7.2%) were aged 65 to 69. Besides, people who are relatively younger generally have better health and self-care ability, thus a lower service need.

30. There are also suggestions that elders who are not waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” and those who are using such services but have not yet been given the household cleaning service and escorting service for medical consultations should be allowed to apply for the subsidised services under this programme. However, this programme should not replace the existing services. Elders in need of services should apply for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” or discuss with relevant IHCS teams for appropriate service arrangement.

31. It was raised in the opinion survey that consideration could be given to extend the subsidised services type. However, it would result in overlapping with the existing “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” and other community care services if subsidies were provided to cover too many care services under this programme. This would go against the objectives of CCF.

⁹ The proposal for the adjustment was made taking into account a basket of factors, including the existing operation of the SPs, fees for similar services provided by the market, upward adjustment of wages and inflation.

32. Eligible elders living in the community at present can apply for a series of services under the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”, including home care, cleaning and escorting services (including escorting service for medical consultations). Compared with personal care and meal services, home care and escorting services are items of lower priorities. Besides, it was found in the survey that a vast majority of the beneficiaries used the subsidies on home cleaning service (95.6% of the total subsidies claimed¹⁰), whereas only a small percentage was on the escorting service for medical consultations (4.4% of the total subsidies claimed¹¹).

33. The low utilisation of the subsidies under this programme is also a matter of concern. From the data listed in Appendix VII, the monthly subsidy used for each elder was about \$292, which was about 61% of the maximum monthly subsidy of \$480. Although publicity was strengthened through SPs and IHCS teams when the programme was launched, only about 37.2% of the elders invited to apply did join the programme, which was a comparatively low percentage. Most of the invited elders who did not submit applications stated that the reason for not submitting applications was that they did not have such a need. This could possibly be attributed to their self-care ability and family support. Apart from this, the operating and administrative costs of this programme are comparatively high and may cause overlapping in resources with the existing “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”. Based on the above analysis, this programme needs not be incorporated into a regular service of the Government.

Social Welfare Department
February 2013

¹⁰ The percentage is calculated as follows: \$1,173,418 (subsidies for home cleaning service) ÷ \$1,227,737 (total subsidies claimed) = 95.6%

¹¹ The percentage is calculated as follows: \$54,319 (subsidies for escorting service for medical consultations) ÷ \$1,227,737 (total subsidies claimed) = 4.4%

**Statistical Data on Application and Service Arrangement and
Profile of Approved Service Providers (SPs)**

(a) Reasons for Not Eligible

Reasons	No. of Persons	%
Household income exceeded the respective limit	7	46.67%
Not reaching the age of 65	3	26.67%
Had not applied for and was not waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” on or before the specified date	2	13.33%
Not living at home	1	6.67%
Has been receiving government-subsidized community care services for the elderly	1	6.67%
Total	15	100.00%

(b) Age Distribution of Beneficiaries (Note 1)

Age Group	No. of Persons	%
65 to 69	77	7.15%
70 to 74	210	19.52%
75 to 79	276	25.65%
80 to 84	301	27.97%
85 to 89	156	14.50%
90 to 94	43	4.00%
95 or above	13	1.21%
Total	1 076	100.00%

Note 1: The age of an elder is calculated as at the date of receiving his/her application documents.

(c) Services Chosen by Beneficiaries

Type of Service	No. of Persons	%
Household cleaning service only	677	62.92%
Escorting service for medical consultations only	8	0.74%
Both household cleaning service and escorting service for medical consultations	391	36.34%
Total	1 076	100.00%

(d) **Types of Services Provided by Units under SPs (for First Round of Application)**

Type of Service	No. of Units	%
Household cleaning service only	2	4.44%
Escorting service for medical consultations only	8	17.78%
Both household cleaning service and escorting service for medical consultations	35	77.78%
Total	45	100.00%

(e) **Assignment of Service Units for Beneficiaries**

	No. of Persons	%
Service unit of first choice	841	78.16%
Service unit of second choice	154	14.31%
Service unit of third choice	28	2.60%
Service units out of the first three choices	51	4.74%
Pending for assignment of service unit	2	0.19%
Total	1 076	100.00%

(f) **Time for Assigning Service Units for Beneficiaries**

Time	No. of persons (First round)	No. of persons (Second round)	% (in total)
Within 14 days	173	75	23.05%
From 15 to within 30 days	313	184	46.19%
More than 30 days	174	155	30.57%
Matching in progress	0	2	0.19%
Total	660	416	100.00%

Survey on Beneficiaries**(a) Family Condition of Beneficiaries**

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. All the family member(s) living with the recipient include: (<u>more than one option can be chosen</u> , Note 1)		
- Parents	1	4.76%
- Siblings	1	4.76%
- Spouse	19	90.48%
- Daughter-in-law and/or son-in-law	1	4.76%
- Household size of beneficiaries (including the beneficiaries)		
- Living alone	35	62.50%
- 2 persons	20	35.71%
- 3 persons	1	1.79%
2. Total income of all the family members living with the beneficiaries:		
- < \$5,000	29	51.79%
- \$5,000 - < \$10,000	23	41.07%
- Receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance	4	7.14%

Note 1: The percentage of each option takes the number of elders living with family members, that is, 21, as the base in calculation. As more than one option could be chosen, the total percentage may not be equal to 100%.

(b) **Household Cleaning/Attending Medical Consultations before Receiving Subsidy**

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. Which subsidised service(s) under the Community Care Fund (CCF) is/are being received by the beneficiaries?		
- Household cleaning service	48	85.71%
- Escorting service for medical consultations	1	1.79%
- Both of the above	7	12.50%
2. (Only applicable to elders receiving household cleaning service) <u>Before</u> receiving the subsidised service under CCF, how did the beneficiaries clean his/her home? (<u>More than one option can be chosen</u> , Note 1)		
- Cleaned on his/her own	38	69.09%
- Assisted by family members/friends and relatives	14	25.45%
- Cleaned by the domestic helper (including part-time maid)	0	0.00%
- Service provided by other agencies	13	23.64%
- free-of-charge (5)		
- average monthly fee of \$50 or below (7)		
- Unable to provide information on monthly fee (1)		
- Others	1	1.82%
- No household cleaning (1)		

Note 1: The percentage of each option takes the number of elderly persons receiving household cleaning subsidised service under CCF in this survey, that is, 55, as the base in calculation. As more than one option could be chosen, the total percentage may not be equal to 100%.

(b) Household Cleaning/Attending Medical Consultations before Receiving Subsidy (Cont'd)

Questions and Comments	No.	%
3. (Only applicable to elders receiving escorting service for medical consultations) <u>Before</u> receiving the subsidised service under CCF, how did the beneficiaries attend medical consultations? (<u>more than one option can be chosen</u> , Note 2)		
- Attended on his/her own	5	62.50%
- Accompanied by family members/friends and relatives	3	37.50%
- Accompanied by the domestic helper (including part-time maid)	0	0.00%
- Service provided by other agencies	1	12.50%
- Paid only the transportation fees for the escort worker		
- Others	0	0.00%

Note 2: The percentage of each option takes the number of elders receiving escorting service for medical consultations under CCF in this survey, that is, 8, as the base in calculation.

(c) **The Situation of Beneficiaries Waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”**

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. Service that the beneficiaries are waiting under the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)”: <u>(more than one option can be chosen, Note 1)</u>		
- Household cleaning	41	73.21%
- Escorting service for medical consultations	4	7.14%
- Others	3	5.36%
- Not known/not sure	10	17.86%
2. Waiting time for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” as at the date when the beneficiaries started to receive the subsidised service under CCF:		
- Less than 1 year	13	23.22%
- 1 year or above	4	7.14%
- 2 years or above	18	32.14%
- Not known/not sure	21	37.50%

The percentage of each option takes the total number of respondents, that is, 56, as the base in calculation. As more than one option could be chosen, total percentage may not be equal to 100%.

(d) Satisfaction and Comments of Beneficiaries on the Programme

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. Do you agree that this assistance programme can help beneficiaries to maintain household hygiene and/or to attend medical consultations as scheduled?		
- Yes	56	100.00%
- No	0	0.00%
2. Are you satisfied with the service provided by the service provider?		
- Very satisfactory	5	8.93%
- Satisfactory	47	83.93%
- No comment	3	5.36%
- Unsatisfactory	1	1.78%
- Very unsatisfactory	0	0.00%
3. In general, are you satisfied with the arrangements under this assistance programme?		
- Yes	56	100.00%
- No	0	0.00%
4. Do you have any comment on this assistance programme?		
- No comment	54	96.43%
- Period of subsidy	2	3.57%
- Extending the subsidising period (2)		

Survey on Invitees who have not submitted Applications**(a) Reasons for not Applying for Subsidy**

Reason	No.	%
No subsidy need	20	55.56%
Not meeting the criteria for eligibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has been receiving/will receive subvented services (9) - Not living at home (1) - Has withdrawn from the waiting list for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” (1) 	11	30.56%
Others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not know how to complete the application form (5) (Note 1) 	5	13.88%

Note 1: Interviewers have suggested to the elders that they can approach their friends and relatives or any nearby service centre for the elderly for assistance in completing the application form if necessary or call the CCF Team for enquiry in case of doubt.

(b) Views of Invitees

Views	No. of Persons	%
No comment	34	94.44%
Helpful to beneficiaries	2	5.56%

Survey on Service Providers**Satisfaction and Comments of Service Providers on the Programme**

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. Do you agree that this assistance programme can help beneficiaries to maintain household hygiene and/or to attend medical consultations as scheduled?		
- Yes	25	96.15%
- Elders can obtain appropriate services as soon as possible without having to wait. (9)		
- The financial burden of beneficiaries can be reduced. They can obtain regular service. (4)		
- Improvement on elders' household hygiene is shown. Escorting service can also ease the burden on the carers. (2)		
- No	1	3.85%
- The subsidy is not sufficient to meet the necessary service need. (1)		
- No comment	0	
2. Is the arrangements and preparations of this programme (including briefing sessions, guideline of service requirement, application form, notification etc.) appropriate for the service providers interested in joining this programme?		
- Yes	23	88.46%
- Clear arrangement, sufficient support and information (8)		
- No	1	3.85%
- Regular consultations should be conducted in reviewing the Programme (1)		
- No comment	2	7.69%

Satisfaction and Comments of Service Providers on the Programme (Cont'd)

Questions and Opinions	No. of Persons	%
<p>3. Is the arrangement on assigning service providers for the beneficiaries appropriate?</p> <p>- Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beneficiaries can choose freely and be referred to service providers according to their needs. (6) - Suggest providing service providers with more information on the relevant elders during referral. (1) - Should group cases into one batch of referrals for easier calculation based on the same period of subsidy. (1) - The caseload capacity of service providers and their requirements have been duly considered (2) <p>- No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficult for illiterate elderly persons (1) <p>- No comment</p>	<p>20</p> <p>1</p> <p>5</p>	<p>76.92%</p> <p>3.85%</p> <p>19.23%</p>
<p>4. Is the arrangement of disbursing subsidies to service providers appropriate?</p> <p>- Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procedures are concise, reducing the needs for the beneficiaries to handle the money (4) - Suggest shortening the quarterly period for collecting subsidies (2) - The three-month accumulation period for the unused subsidy is complicated (1) <p>- No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggest allowing service providers to receive subsidies through more than one bank account (1) - Suggest simplifying the information required to be submitted for claiming subsidies (1) <p>- No comment</p>	<p>20</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p>	<p>76.92%</p> <p>7.69%</p> <p>15.39%</p>

Satisfaction and Comments of Service Providers on the Programme (Cont'd)

Questions and Comments	No.	%
<p>5. In general, are you satisfied with the arrangements of this assistance programme?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient support is provided by the Social Welfare Department (3) - Useful to elders in need (1) - The operation is smooth. (1) - No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient subsidy. Should be adjusted according to market price. (1) - No comment 	<p>24</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>92.30%</p> <p>3.85%</p> <p>3.85%</p>
<p>6. Are you willing to join similar programmes in the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It helps elders in need. (10) - Will consider the details before making a decision. (2) - Will consider the manpower resource condition at the time before making a decision. (1) - Hope that administrative procedures can be streamlined. (1) - No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient human resources to dovetail with the demand. (1) 	<p>25</p> <p>1</p>	<p>96.15%</p> <p>3.85%</p>

Survey of Integrated Home Care Service (IHCS) Teams

(a) Satisfaction and Comments of IHCS Teams on the Programme

Questions and Comments	No.	%
1. In general, are you satisfied with the arrangements of this assistance programme?		
- Yes	18	64.29%
- Staff of the Social Welfare Department are helpful. (1)		
- The programme can help more individuals in need. (3)		
- Simple and convenient. (1)		
- No	8	28.57%
- Insufficient planning and wrongly anticipated the response of the sector. (1)		
- The administrative work is time-consuming, while only a limited number of elders can benefit. (2)		
- A number of elders did not know how to handle their applications. (3)		
- No comment	2	7.14%
2. Are you willing to join and/or continue to provide assistance in implementing similar programmes in the future?		
- Yes	26	92.86%
- It can help elders in need. (12)		
- Subject to the situation. (2)		
- Subject to the availability of sufficient administrative resources support (3)		
- No	1	3.57%
- No comment	1	3.57%

(b) Reasons for discrepancy Between the Number of Referrals and the Number of Waiting Cases as Considered by the IHCS Teams

Questions and Comments	No.	%
3. What do you think are the main reasons for the significant discrepancy between the number of elders waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” and the actual number of referrals? (Note 1)		
- They have been receiving subvented community care services or services provided by other agencies.	27	32.14%
- They are not in need of cleaning or escorting service (e.g. they are capable to do it themselves or are assisted by family members)	21	25.00%
- There is a change in the waiting situation (e.g. the application has been cancelled, the elders have switched to waiting for other services, etc.)	26	30.95%
- They are not eligible for the programme (e.g. has not reached the age of 65, not waiting for the “Integrated Home Care Services (Ordinary Cases)” as at the specified date, household income exceeding the specified ceiling.)	51	60.71%
- They cannot be reached (e.g. they have moved, full contact details unavailable, incorrect contact information, etc.)	16	19.05%
- Other reasons	8	9.52%
- They are not willing to complete the form or participate in the assistance programme. (3)		
- The IHCS team has provided them with the required services. (3)		
- They want the services to be provided by the IHCS teams that they are waiting for. (2)		

Note 1: IHCS teams were asked to list their reasons in a priority of importance. Since the IHCS teams were asked to give at least three

reasons, in order to reflect more accurately the importance of each reason they gave, the first listed reason would be awarded 3 marks, the second 2 marks and the third 1 mark, whereas the others would not be awarded any mark. With a total of 28 IHCS teams taking part in this survey, the highest mark was 84. The marks listed in this table are the total marks obtained by each reason, and the percentage reflects the ratio of the total marks of the items to the highest mark.

Summary of Public Enquiries

Numbers and Nature of Enquiries for this Assistance Programme (Note 1)

Item of Enquiry	Number of Enquiry
Criteria for Eligibility	250
Application Procedure	43
Completion of Application Form	180
Supporting Documents for Application	81
Submission of Application Form	105
Progress of Application	46
Arrangement of Services	228
Others	80
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enquiries from the service providers about the operation of this programme (20) - Update of Information (10) - Content of notification letters for application result (30) - Enquiries on whether the subsidised service will be extended (20) 	

Note 1: If an enquiry involved more than one subject nature, each subject would be categorised and summarised in this table.

Utilisation and Claiming of Subsidies

Year/ Month (Note 1)	No. of cases	Fees for cleaning service	Fees for escorting service	Total subsidies claimed	Average subsidies claimed	Utilisation rate (Note 2)
2011 / 11	6	\$650	\$0	\$650	\$108.33	22.57%
2011 / 12	168	\$37,050	\$765	\$37,815	\$225.09	46.89%
2012 / 1	404	\$93,268	\$3,636	\$96,904	\$239.86	49.97%
2012 / 2	529	\$144,563	\$7,268	\$151,831	\$287.01	59.79%
2012 / 3	596	\$174,785	\$8,479	\$183,264	\$307.49	64.06%
2012 / 4	600	\$160,208	\$6,945	\$167,153	\$278.59	58.04%
2012 / 5	612	\$170,955	\$9,356	\$180,311	\$295.41	61.38%
2012 / 6	629	\$174,740	\$8,977	\$183,717	\$326.90	60.85%
2012 / 7	772	\$217,200	\$8,894	\$226,094	\$328.62	61.01%
Total		\$1,173,419	\$54,320	\$1,227,739		

Note 1: The table covers only the months in which subsidies were released to service providers at the quarterly settlements.

Note 2: Utilisation rate is the percentage calculated by dividing the average subsidies claimed by the maximum monthly subsidy, i.e. \$480.