

**Community Care Fund Assistance Programme**  
**Relaunching the One-off living subsidy for low-income households**  
**not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA**  
**Evaluation Report**

**Background**

On 2 January 2015, the Community Care Fund (CCF) relaunched the “One-off living subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA” programme (the Relaunched Programme) to relieve the financial pressure of low-income households. It is implemented by the CCF Secretariat (the Secretariat) with the assistance of 239 service units. The application period will end on 31 August 2015. As at 30 June 2015, the Secretariat has received around 54 200 applications and disbursed about \$264.05 million subsidy to 34 982 eligible households (69 766 persons).

2. The amounts of subsidy under the Relaunched Programme are \$4,000 for one-person households, \$8,000 for two-person households, \$11,000 for three-person households and a uniform \$13,000 for four-or-more-person households. From January to April 2015, a phasing arrangement was adopted to process applications under the Relaunched Programme. During the period, the households that have benefited from the programme first launched from December 2013 to August 2014 (the First-launched Programme) would have their eligibility confirmed (old applications) and new applications would be accepted in phases according to household sizes.

**Evaluation Results**

3. The Secretariat analysed and evaluated the Relaunched Programme according to the relevant information and data gathered (based on the data collected under the Relaunched Programme as at 30 June 2015).

**(A) *Statistics on Applications***

4. The Secretariat received about 54 200 applications, of which 35 501 have been vetted. Among these vetted applications, 34 982 households have been disbursed with a subsidy while 461 applications were considered unsuccessful and 58 applications withdrawn. The following analysis is based on the information of the 34 982 households (69 766 persons) which have been disbursed with the subsidy.

(a) Information of households

5. Application households came from various districts across the territory. In terms of district of residence, Sham Shui Po (6 934 applications/around 20%), Yau Tsim Mong (5 695 applications/around 16%) and Yuen Long (3 443 applications/around 10%) had the largest numbers of households. Among the beneficiary households, one-person households accounted for the largest share at around 37% (13 005 households), while two-person and three-person households accounted for around 31% (10 905 households) and 27% (9 571 households) respectively. The remaining share of some 4% (1 501 households) were four-or-more-person households.

6. As for the types of accommodation, most beneficiary households resided in rented private housing (29 929 households/around 86%) and temporary housing (3 969 households/around 11%). The rest accounted for around 3% of the beneficiary households, including those renting units in industrial buildings (210 households) and commercial buildings (96 households), renting bedspaces offered under the Singleton Hostel Programme of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) (142 households), living on board vessels (5 households) and homeless persons (631 households) (including persons residing in temporary shelters/street sleepers). Among the 29 929 households renting private housing, a majority resided in rented sub-divided units (16 352 households/around 55%) and rented independent units (7 289 households/around 24%), and the remaining 21% or so resided in rented rooms (cubicles/solid-partitioned cubicles) (5 716 households) and bedspaces/cocklofts (572 households). As for the 3 969 households residing in temporary housing, a majority resided in squatter structures (2 633 households/around 66%) and roof-top structures (574 households/around 15%), and the rest were residents of licensed structures (432 households/around 11%) and other temporary housing (330 households/around 8%). Among the 631 homeless persons, most were street sleepers (533 persons/around 84%) and the rest resided in temporary shelters (98 persons/around 16%).

7. In terms of income levels, the median income for households of different sizes amounted to about 62% to 71% of the income limit of the Relaunched Programme, of which one-person households accounted for the largest proportion (around 71%).

8. Among the 30 235 households paying rent for accommodation (including those in private housing, industrial buildings and commercial buildings), the median rents paid by one-person and two-person households accounted for a higher proportion of the relevant rental limit of the Relaunched Programme (around 58% and 48% respectively), while the corresponding figures for three-person to six-or-more-person households were about 39% to 44%. As for the rental level of various regions, the median rent for households of different sizes was higher on Hong Kong Island (from

\$3,000 to \$8,500)<sup>1</sup>. In addition, the median rent paid by households of various sizes represented about 30% to 40% of their relevant median household income (of which the proportions for one-person and two-person households were higher, accounting for 40% and 37% respectively).

9. Besides, the major reasons for the 461 unsuccessful applications were that those applicants and their household members (if applicable) were receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) (198 applications), owning properties in Hong Kong (64 applications), and the rent (66 applications) or income (83 applications) exceeding the specified limits.

(b) Information of applicants and household members

10. Among the 34 982 households, there were a total of 69 766 applicants and household members altogether, of which permanent residents and non-permanent residents accounted for 45 615 (around 65%) and 24 151 (around 35%) respectively. There were 54 078 persons aged 18 or above (around 78%) and the remaining 15 688 persons (about 22%) were household members aged under 18 including 10 366 persons aged under 11. About 6 persons were mentally incapacitated household members aged between 19 and 49.

11. Among the 461 unsuccessful application households, there were a total of 730 applicants and household members altogether, of which permanent residents and non-permanent residents accounted for 477 persons (about 65%) and 253 persons (about 35%) respectively. There were 613 persons (about 84%) aged 18 or above and 117 persons (about 16%) aged under 18 including 77 persons aged under 11.

**(B) *Views of Households/Stakeholders***

(a) Beneficiary households

12. The Secretariat and service units conducted a questionnaire survey with 1 557 beneficiary households (about 4.5%) by random sampling to understand their views on the subsidy amount, eligibility criteria, application procedures, publicity, implementation arrangements of the Relaunched Programme and the services provided by service units.

13. About 89% of the respondents agreed that the subsidy provided by the Relaunched Programme could relieve their financial pressure. However, some respondents hoped that the level of the subsidy could be raised and the subsidy be disbursed on a continuous basis, say more than once within a year or on a monthly basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> The median rental level in the New Territories was the highest for six-or-more-person households.

A vast majority of the respondents considered the eligibility criteria of the Relaunched Programme reasonable (about 96%) and its application procedures simple and convenient (about 96%). Most of them agreed that exempting the beneficiary households of the First-launched Programme from resubmitting applications could streamline the application procedures. Some respondents suggested that both the income and rental limits of the Relaunched Programme should be raised and the rental limit be close to market rental levels. About 93% of the respondents considered that the publicity for the Relaunched Programme was adequate. However, some said that its promotion to the ethnic minorities should be strengthened.

14. On the implementation arrangements, about 98% of the respondents were satisfied with them while some considered that the processing time was relatively long. About 97% of the respondents found the services provided by service units satisfactory and commended the staff for providing good services and being helpful in explaining the application details and offering assistance in applying for the subsidy. Nevertheless, some respondents pointed out that the locations of several service units were too remote or their opening hours were inconvenient for applicants. They hoped that the number of locations to receive application forms could be increased.

(b) Unsuccessful applications under the Relaunched Programme

15. The Secretariat also approached 25 unsuccessful application households (around 5.4%) for their views on the Relaunched Programme through a telephone survey. Some respondents considered that the income limit (about 12%) and the rental limit (about 12%) of the Relaunched Programme should be raised. Apart from this, a respondent expected flexibility from the Secretariat regarding the restriction on property ownership in Hong Kong.

16. In terms of application procedures under the Relaunched Programme, about 92% of the respondents agreed that they were simple and convenient. About 83% of the respondents agreed that the publicity for the Relaunched Programme was sufficient. About 70% of the respondents were satisfied with the Secretariat's arrangements for the Relaunched Programme while 75% of them found the service provided by service units satisfactory. On the whole, they expected that the CCF would implement the programme on an on-going basis to relieve the financial pressure of low-income persons.

(c) Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)/service units which assisted in implementing the Relaunched Programme/staff of the implementation team under the Secretariat

17. The Secretariat held an evaluation meeting on 9 June 2015 to collect views from NGOs/service units on the Relaunched Programme with a view to evaluating its

effectiveness. The NGOs/service units attending the meeting commented on the Relaunched Programme in the areas of eligibility criteria, income and rental limits, subsidy amounts, publicity, application arrangements, vetting procedures, administrative arrangements and prevention of abuse.

18. The NGOs/service units generally agreed that the subsidy provided under the Relaunched Programme could relieve the financial pressure of low-income households, and suggested that the programme be regularised. Some suggested that those households with financial needs should be allowed to apply for and benefit from the Relaunched Programme while waiting for the result of their CSSA applications. Also, some households who owned properties without commercial viability (e.g. waste land) should be allowed to apply for a subsidy under the Relaunched Programme. In addition, in view of the generally higher rental level in individual regions (e.g. Hong Kong Island), some NGOs/service units suggested that different limits should be set according to the different rental levels in various regions. In respect of the subsidy amounts, the NGOs/service units suggested that it should be raised (e.g. subject to the inflation rate) for all household sizes, and that one or two additional levels of subsidy should be provided for five-person and six-or-more-person households so as to strengthen the support for larger families.

19. Regarding publicity, the NGOs/service units considered that the promotion of the Relaunched Programme to the ethnic minorities should be strengthened. They suggested that publicity leaflets in languages of the ethnic minorities should be produced and distributed to them through service units and religious organisations.

20. Some NGOs/service units indicated that some old applicants mistook that no response was required after receiving the notification from the Secretariat and the subsidy would be disbursed to them automatically. They considered that it should be clearly stressed on the notification and during the publicity of the Relaunched Programme that old application households were required to complete the reply slips. They also suggested that households renting and residing in flats under the Home Ownership Scheme/Tenants Purchase Scheme should be required to specify clearly on the application form that their flats were no longer bound by alienation restrictions.

21. Regarding the vetting procedures and administrative arrangements, the NGOs/service units hoped that a dedicated staff member of the Secretariat should be assigned to follow up with the applications referred by the same service unit. Besides, for those old application households who have moved to other districts, the administrative fees and follow-up work of their applications should be transferred to the service units in their new districts of residence.

22. As for the prevention of abuse of the Relaunched Programme, some NGOs/service units considered that, for applicants or their household members who

were often away from Hong Kong for various reasons (e.g. working or studying in the Mainland), a set of uniform criteria should be set to determine whether such household members were deemed to be eligible “household members”. A set of uniform criteria should also be set to whether two households residing in the same flat were financially independent of each other. Some NGOs/service units pointed out that the requirement was too lax and might be abused if applicants who rented a property of their siblings were still eligible for a subsidy under the Relunched Programme.

23. In summary, the NGOs/service units were satisfied with the operational arrangements of the Relunched Programme and agreed that the Relunched Programme could help the needy low-income persons and allow follow-up action to be taken in response to their other welfare needs. The views given at the evaluation meeting by NGOs/service units that assisted in implementing the Relunched Programme are set out in the Summary of Discussion of the Evaluation Meeting as attached.

24. Furthermore, staff of the implementation team under the Secretariat pointed out that the arrangement of processing applications in phases according to household sizes could effectively speed up the application procedures and avoid confusion. With this arrangement, the Secretariat could process a large number of applications within a reasonable period of time and help application households to receive subsidy in time. Staff of the implementation team considered that under the existing collaborative arrangement, applicants could submit applications to the service units near their accommodations. This not only allowed the service units to handle their applications and enquiries professionally, but also made it more effective for the staff to identify ineligible applicants through home visits. On the whole, the collaboration between the implementation team and service units operated smoothly.

### **(C) *Public Enquiries and Views***

25. During the implementation of the Relunched Programme, the Secretariat had set up an enquiry hotline to provide necessary support and information to the public and the staff of service units. Owing to the positive public response to the Relunched Programme, over 10 000 enquiries were received through the enquiry hotline/the CCF’s standing hotlines for the first two weeks. As at 30 June 2015, the Secretariat received 66 800 enquiries, mostly about the eligibility criteria, application arrangements and progress. Besides, the Secretariat received 8 written comments/enquiries from the public/stakeholders.

26. Comments from the public and NGOs/service units mainly included the suggestions of increasing both the income and rental limits and extending the coverage of subsidy to Hong Kong citizens renting properties in the Mainland, low-income persons living in self-owned properties, persons temporarily lodging with their relatives

without paying a rent and persons renting properties of their parents. As regards application arrangements, the content of the reply slip should be simplified and efforts should be stepped up to prevent any abuses. As for the administrative arrangements, it was recommended that old application households with changes in their household situations should be allowed to submit application forms to the service unit at their own choice. On the whole, the views received were positive. Respondents found the application procedures and processing arrangements satisfactory, and wished that the subsidy would be disbursed on an on-going basis.

## **Conclusion**

### **(a) Number of households/persons benefited**

27. The Secretariat received a total of about 54 200 applications, among which some 37 100 were replies from old applicants confirming their eligibility and around 17 100 were new applications. About 11 400 old application households had yet to reply and the relevant service units were following up the matter.

28. The original estimated number of beneficiary households under the Relaunched Programme was around 53 140 (about 126 100 persons). Since the Relaunched Programme attracted more applications than expected, the Commission on Poverty endorsed at its meeting on 22 May 2015 an additional funding of about \$142.83 million for the Relaunched Programme to deal with the increased applications. The estimated total provision for the Relaunched Programme would amount to about \$610.95 million. According to the latest progress, it was estimated that the final total number of applications would be around 65 300. We have checked with the service units on the possible reasons for the increase in the number of the applications under the Relaunched Programme as compared to its original estimation. Their feedback was that it might be attributed to the enhanced publicity by both the Secretariat and the service units and the increase in public awareness of the programme after several launches. Furthermore, the simplified application procedures for the Relaunched Programme might also help to encourage more applications.

29. When the Secretariat estimated the number of beneficiary households under the Relaunched Programme, it based on the projected number of applications to be received in the First-launch Programme. Similarly, the projected number of applications to be received in the Relaunch Programme can also be served as a basis for estimating the number of beneficiary households under the programme to be launched for the third time (the Third-launch Programme).

(b) Household income and rental limits

30. As for eligibility criteria, while some respondents said that the income limits should be raised, the median income of the beneficiary households only represented some 62% to 71% of the income limits under the Relaunched Programme. For the Third-launched Programme, it was recommended that the requirement should continue to be based on the updated income limits set for public rental housing (PRH) applications (i.e. the 2015-16 PRH Waiting List), and reference should be made to the latest Median Monthly Domestic Household Income (MMDHI) of the relevant household size groups. If the income limit of any household size group is below 75% of the median income, a corresponding upward adjustment can be considered.

31. There were views that the rental levels on Hong Kong Island, generally speaking, were relatively higher. Therefore, it was recommended that, in the Third-launched Programme, different rental limits should be set subject to the rental differences in various districts. When considering the third launch of the programme, the CCF Task Force might make reference to the latest territory-wide statistics provided by the Census and Statistics Department on the median rent-to-income ratio of households residing in private housing and meeting the recommended income limits under the Third-launched Programme, in order to see whether the existing practice of setting the rental limit at 50% of the income limit was appropriate or not. According to the statistical analysis on households, the median rent paid by one-person to six-or-more-person households disbursed with subsidies represented 39% to 58% of the respective rental limits, and the median rent-to-income ratio was about 30% to 40%. As such, the rent paid by most households was still considerably below the respective rental limits under the Relaunched Programme.

(c) Enhancement of the application form and the notification letter

32. There were views that it was emphasised in the Relaunched Programme that old application households were not required to submit the application form again. Some of the old application households might mistake that no response was required after receiving the notification from the Secretariat and the subsidy would be disbursed to them automatically. In this regard, in the Third-launched Programme, we will improve the notification by making it clearly that old application households are required to complete the reply slips (resubmission of the application form is not required though). Moreover, some respondents considered that those application households residing in rented subsidised home ownership housing should be required to declare clearly that their flats were no longer bound by alienation restrictions when submitting applications. It is already specified in the existing application form and programme brief that, in the case of subsidised home ownership housing, only those flats with alienation restrictions removed will be considered as private housing. In this



connection, in the Third-launched Programme, the relevant requirement may be emphasised on the application form (e.g. highlighted in bold).

(d) Prevention of abuse

33. Some respondents pointed out that applicants or their household members would be often away from Hong Kong for various reasons (e.g. working or studying in the Mainland). Under the Relaunched Programme, the beneficiary households were required to reside in Hong Kong. However, no restriction was imposed on the number of days for applicants and their household members to reside in Hong Kong. Therefore, when processing the applications, it was hard to identify whether the household members who were often away from Hong Kong were eligible “household members”. The Secretariat was at present adopting a relatively lax arrangement when handling the relevant cases. If there were household members working or studying in the Mainland, those cases would be considered subject to individual situations (e.g. the period that the member works/studies in the Mainland, whether the member resides with the applicant while staying in Hong Kong and sharing living necessities with the applicant).

34. As there was no restriction on the relationship among household members under the Relaunched Programme, some NGOs/service units reflected that when two households resided in the same flat and each or one of them made the application, it would still be difficult for the service unit to identify whether the relevant household was financially independent after a home visit. According to the present arrangement under the Relaunched Programme, when conducting a home visit, the relevant service unit would investigate the financial and daily living situation of the household members (e.g. whether the household members are sharing household items and daily necessities (e.g. bedding, toiletries), whether the household members are having meals or sharing time together), so as to identify whether two households were financially independent of each other.

35. In addition, some NGOs/service units stated that some applicants rented and resided in a property of their siblings. However, under the Relaunched Programme, the requirement that only households renting properties of their father, mother, son, daughter, husband or wife were not allowed for application was too lax.

36. Regarding the existing arrangements under the Relaunched Programme, a more relaxed approach was adopted because, having considered its one-off nature and the need to reduce the risk of abusing the Relaunched Programme, it was hoped to help more low-income persons and keep the administrative procedures as simple as possible for meeting the CCF’s requirement. It was recommended that while considering intensifying the vetting procedures, a well-balanced approach should be adopted to streamline administrative arrangements and prevent any abuses.

(e) Enhanced publicity and promotion

37. When relaunching the programme in January 2015, the Secretariat made use of various promotion channels, including broadcasting on television and radio, uploading information to webpages, printing publicity posters/application forms/programme briefs, holding press briefings, issuing press releases, etc. The Secretariat also placed the publicity posters at the Public Enquiry Service Centres of the HAD, the District Social Welfare Offices of the Social Welfare Department and the “Support Service Centres for Ethnic Minorities” for information of applicants. An enquiry hotline was also set up by the Secretariat for applicants or other members of the public to seek information and make enquiries.

38. There were views that the promotion of the Relaunched Programme to the ethnic minorities should be stepped up. Actually, during the implementation of the Relaunched Programme, posters in six ethnic minority languages (i.e. Hindi, Indonesian, Nepali, Tagalog, Thai and Urdu) were prepared (for distribution to primary and secondary schools with ethnic minority students and the “Support Service Centres for Ethnic Minorities”). When the programme is launched for the third time, the publicity leaflets can also be translated into the six ethnic minority languages and uploaded to the CCF webpage for access by the public. Also, the leaflets can be distributed through service units and religious organisations.

(f) Streamlining the procedures and administrative arrangements

39. Some NGOs/service units suggested that for those old application households who have moved to other districts, the administrative fees and follow-up work of their applications should be transferred to the service units in their new districts of residence. Under the Relaunched Programme, different types of households should hand in their applications to the relevant service units near their districts of residence. All service units could, subject to the arrangement of their manpower resources, consider whether they should cope with other types of applications at the same time, or refer such applications to other respective service units.

(g) Overall effectiveness

40. As far as the overall effectiveness of the Relaunched Programme was concerned, the beneficiary households/beneficiaries or NGOs/service units all agreed that the Relaunched Programme could help to relieve the financial pressure of low-income persons who were not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA, and hoped that the CCF could launch the programme for the third time as soon as possible. The responses of most beneficiary households/beneficiaries were positive towards the

services provided by the service units and the Secretariat and agreed that the application procedures were simple and convenient.

41. A consolidated analysis of the above information and data collected showed that the feedback of the stakeholders were positive towards the Relaunched Programme and were generally satisfied with its existing operational arrangements. They supported to launch the programme for the third time so as to help more needy low-income persons. They also suggested that the CCF should consider relaxing the eligibility criteria, increasing publicity channels and enhancing the support to service units.

42. In conclusion, the programme, in the light of the Budget's various short-term relief measures and through the CCF's effective identification mechanism, was launched to provide a one-off subsidy to the "n have-nots" who could not benefit from those relief measures, so as to plug the gaps in the existing system. Therefore, it is not appropriate to consider regularising the programme.

Community Care Fund Secretariat  
July 2015

**Community Care Fund**  
**Relaunching the “One-off living subsidy for low-income households  
not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA” Programme**

**Evaluation Meeting**

**Summary of Discussion**

On 9 June 2015, the Community Care Fund (CCF) Secretariat (the Secretariat) held an evaluation meeting on the relaunched “One-off living subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA” programme (the Relaunched Programme) to collect views from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and service units assisting in the implementation of the Relaunched Programme on aspects such as its implementation arrangements and eligibility criteria for the purpose of evaluating its effectiveness. Views and recommendations from the participants are summarised below:

**Eligibility Criteria**

- Generally speaking, the rental levels in some districts such as the Hong Kong Island were relatively higher. It was recommended that different rental limits should be set subject to the rental differences in various regions.
- It was suggested that discretion might be exercised in processing applications of households owning properties without commercial viability (e.g. waste land) so that they could benefit from the Relaunched Programme.
- Households with financial needs should be allowed to apply for and benefit from the Relaunched Programme while waiting for the result of the CSSA applications.

**Subsidy Amount**

- It was recommended that the level of subsidy amounts for all household sizes should be raised (e.g. subject to the inflation rate) and that one or two additional levels of subsidy should be provided for five-person and six-or-more-person households so as to strengthen the support for larger families.

**Publicity**

- It was agreed that more people were aware of the Relaunched Programme following several launches of the programme and enhanced publicity.

- It was suggested that the promotion of the Relaunched Programme to the ethnic minorities should be strengthened, including producing publicity leaflets in languages of the ethnic minorities for distribution through service units and religious organisations.

### **Application Arrangements**

- As the application procedures were simple and convenient, it helped encourage more applications.
- As the Relaunched Programme stressed that old application households were not required to submit an application form again, some old application households mistook that no response was required after receiving the notification from the Secretariat and the subsidy would be disbursed to them automatically. It was suggested that it should be clearly stressed on the notification and during the publicity of the Relaunched Programme that old application households were required to complete the reply slips.
- The specified format for an address on the application form was too complicated. Such a requirement should be removed to make it more easy for applicants (especially those residing in squatter structures) to complete.
- Households renting flats under the Home Ownership Scheme/Tenants Purchase Scheme should be required to specify clearly on the application form that their flats were no longer bound by alienation restrictions.
- It was recommended that application forms and programme briefs should be translated into the languages of the ethnic minorities to facilitate their applications.
- In case those application households who had been ineligible under the Relaunched Programme turned to be eligible owing to subsequent changes of their household situations (e.g. leaving the CSSA net), they should be allowed to submit applications again.
- The section on declaration in the application form was too lengthy for some applicants to comprehend and its content should be simplified.

### **Vetting procedures and administrative arrangements**

- It was suggested that all applications referred to by the same service unit should be followed up by the same staff member of the Secretariat to facilitate communication.

- As some old application households have moved to other districts, it was difficult for the service units originally handling those applications to continue the follow-up. There were views that both administrative fees and the follow-up work should be transferred to the service units in their new districts of residence.
- Old applications involving street sleepers who have moved into fixed abodes should no longer be followed up by the service units handling applications of street sleepers. These applications should be referred to other service units for follow-up.
- It was suggested that the Secretariat should continue to deploy their staff to assist those service units with more applications in processing applications. The working period of these staff should also be extended to the end of the Relunched Programme.
- Emails should be sent regularly to inform service units of the date of application of the relevant application households when order cheques were distributed to the households through the service units. This was to facilitate the service units in handling enquiries about the progress of the subsidy disbursement.
- Regarding cases with applicants claiming to have no household income, service units should not be required to enquire the applicants about their financial situations again as it has already been done when the service units processed the applications.

### **Prevention of abuse**

- For applicants or their household members who were often away from Hong Kong for various reasons (e.g. working or studying in the Mainland), a set of uniform criteria should be set to determine whether such household members were deemed to be eligible “household members”.
- A set of uniform criteria should be set for the staff of service units to identify during home visits whether two households residing in the same flat were financially independent of each other.
- The requirement was too lax and might be abused if applicants who rented a property of their siblings were still eligible for a subsidy under the Relunched Programme.

## **Other views**

- The Relaunched Programme was considered useful in helping those in financial needs and should be regularised.
- Despite the launch of the Low-income Working Family Allowance Scheme (the Scheme), some households who have already benefited from the Relaunched Programme (e.g. one-person households and households with an income of 60% to 75% of the MMDHI) would not benefit from the Scheme. The CCF should continue to launch the programme to provide them with assistance.
- The application vetting time of the Relaunched Programme was rather long.
- It was suggested inviting households in sub-divided units to give views in the evaluation of the Relaunched Programme.
- The information provided by the households in their application forms involved privacy concerns. Some eligible households residing in industrial buildings did not apply for the Relaunched Programme for fear that the Secretariat would report their cases to relevant departments.
- It was suggested that the Secretariat should provide the latest analysis data of households for service units to help study the ways of providing appropriate assistance to low-income households.