Minutes of 45th Meeting of
Lump Sum Grant Steering Committee (LSGSC)

Date   **:**   18 September 2019 (Wednesday)
Time   **:**   9:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Venue   **:**   Room 918, 9/F Wu Chung House, 213 Queen's Road East,
                   Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Present

Chairman
 Ms Carol Yip, JP   Director of Social Welfare,
                                         Social Welfare Department (SWD)

Members
Ms Ann Au Chor-kwan
Ms Anna May Chan Mei-lan, MH, JP
Ms Tammy Chan Yee-ching
Mr Francis Chau Yin-ming, BBS, MH
Mr Chua Hoi-wai, JP
Mr Stephen Hung Wan-shun
Miss Cynthia Lam Ming-wai
Mr Armstrong Lee
Dr Jane Lee Ching-yee, JP
Mr Matthew Lee Siu-chung
Ms Teresa Lee Siu-hong
Mr Lun Chi-wai
Ms Rebecca Ng Pui-ling
Mr Sin Kin-ming
Dr Ricky Szeto Wing-fu
Mr Andrew Tsang   Principal Assistant Secretary (Welfare) 1,
                                         Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB)
Mr Alex Wong   Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions), SWD

Secretary
Ms Lam Bun-ngee   Chief Social Work Officer (Subventions), SWD

Absent with Apologies
Ms Irene Leung Pui-yiu, JP
Ms Alice Lau Oi-sze

In Attendance

Mr Lam Ka-tai, JP	Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services), SWD
Ms Cherry Tsui	Senior Social Work Officer (Subventions)1, SWD
Ms Law Miu-sheung	Senior Social Work Officer (Subventions)2, SWD
Miss Chow Mei-yee	Senior Social Work Officer (Subventions)3, SWD
Ms Dorothy Siu	Social Work Officer (Subventions)4, SWD

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed the following persons who attended the meeting for the first time –

- Three new members, namely Mr Armstrong Lee, Mr Lun Chi-wai and Miss Cynthia Lam Ming-wai;
- Mr Andrew Tsang, who took over the post of Principal Assistant Secretary (Welfare)1 from Ms Vivian Ko; and
- Ms Law Miu-sheung, who took over the post of Senior Social Work Officer (Subventions)2 from Mr Daniel Wong.

She also thanked Ms Michelle Cheng, Mr Li To-sang and Mr Yip Kin-chung for their valuable contributions to the development and enhancement of the Lump Sum Grant Subvention System (LSGSS) in LSGSC.   Their tenure of membership expired on 21 April 2019.

Declaration of Interests

2.   **Ms Lam Bun-ngee** informed the meeting that LSGSC adopted the One-tier Reporting System.   She reminded Members of the need to make a full disclosure when perceiving a potential conflict between their own interests and any matter placed before LSGSC.   **The Chairman** considered that some members being board members or staff of relevant non-governmental organisations (NGOs)

could remain in the meeting and speak on the issues insofar as sector-wide policies were concerned.

Agenda Item 1 - Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

3.   Members confirmed the minutes of the 44th meeting without amendment.

Agenda Item 2 - Matters Arising

4.   **The Chairman** informed that outstanding matters on "Progress of Implementation of the Updated Government Guidelines for the Control and Monitoring of Remuneration Practices in respect of Senior Staff in Subvented Organisations", "Mechanism for Monitoring NGOs with Late Submission of Annual Financial Reports/Accompanying Financial Statements" and "Progress of Implementation of the Best Practice Manual" would be discussed under respective agenda items of the meeting.

Agenda Item 3 – Progress of Review on Enhancement of Lump Sum Grant Subvention System (Paper LSGSC 1/2019)

5.   **Ms Lam Bun-ngee** briefed Members that set up in November 2017, the Task Force for Review on Enhancement of Lump Sum Grant Subvention System (Task Force) had thorough examination of the views of different stakeholders and reached consensus on the scope of the review on 29 June 2018 as follows –

(a) Operating environment of NGOs under LSGSS;
(b) Review of staffing establishment and subvention benchmarks;
(c) Use of Lump Sum Grant (LSG)/ Provident Fund (PF) reserve and financial planning;
(d) Pay structures, staff turnover rate and vacancies;
(e) Funding and Service Agreement (FSA)-related activities and flexibility provided for NGOs;
(f) Mechanisms for reviewing FSAs and NGOs' service performance assessment;
(g) Transparency and public accountability; and
(h) Communication and participation of stakeholders.

6.   To carry out the review per the scope set out above, it was necessary to collect sufficient data from NGOs to facilitate and support the Task Force's analysis and recommendations.   As items (a), (b), (c) and (d) under the scope of the review required collection and analysis of a large amount of data, SWD

engaged a consultancy firm in October 2018 to provide assistance. For the remaining items (e), (f), (g) and (h) which involved less data, the Task Force constructed a questionnaire to collect relevant data from subvented NGOs.

Progress of the Review

Review Areas (e), (f), (g) and (h)

7.   On review areas (e), (f), (g) and (h), the Task Force sent out a questionnaire to all the 164 NGOs subvented under LSGSS in July 2018 to collect relevant management information and views.   136 NGOs (83%) responded.   The Task Force subsequently conducted two rounds of sector consultation sessions and focus groups to collect views from different stakeholders, including NGO frontline staff and service users.   In addition, on review areas (e) and (f), the Joint Platform (三會一方) composed of The Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS), Hong Kong Social Workers Association (HKSWA), Hong Kong Social Workers' General Union (HKSWGU) and Shiu Ka Chun Legislative Councillor's Office (SKCLCO), invited SWD and the Task Force to attend an "in-depth sharing session" (深度交流會) with different stakeholders on 18 October 2018.   The views collected were further deliberated in relevant Task Force meetings during September 2018 and January 2019.   The deliberations on review areas (e) to (h) were completed with 33 recommendations made for enhancement of LSGSS *at Annex I*.

Review Areas (a), (b), (c) and (d)

8.   On review areas (a), (b), (c) and (d), SWD engaged a consultancy firm to assist the Task Force in collecting data and opinions from relevant stakeholders (i.e. NGO management, NGO staff and service users).

(i)   NGO Management Survey

9.   For the NGO management survey, the consultant invited all the 164 NGOs subvented under LSGSS to complete a questionnaire in April 2019, with 132 (80%) NGOs returned their replies by 31 May 2019.   After preliminary analysis on the data collected, the consultant conducted seven focus groups for NGO management in July 2019 and three follow-up in-depth interviews in August 2019, with a total of 50 participants.   The consultant reported the findings from the NGO management survey via a draft report submitted to SWD on 30 August 2019.

(ii)   NGO Staff Survey

10.   For the NGO staff survey, the consultant randomly drew 2 000 staff from 51 randomly selected NGOs (about 30% of the 164 subvented NGOs) to complete

a staff questionnaire, in the form of e-questionnaire or paper-questionnaire, in July 2019. As at the cut-off date of 16 August 2019, a total of 838 responses were received. The consultant would further conduct four focus groups for staff according to four major types (i.e. social workers, para-medical professionals, frontline care workers and others) in September 2019, analyse the data and report their findings from the NGO staff survey in the form of a draft report by 30 September 2019.

(iii) *Service User Survey*

11. As for the service user questionnaire, the consultant collected feedback from 432 service users through visits to 40 service units randomly sampled under four major service types (i.e. family and child welfare services, elderly services, rehabilitation services and youth and corrections services) by end of August 2019. The consultant would further conduct four focus groups for service users according to the four service types mentioned above in September 2019, analyse the data and report their findings from the service user survey in the form of a draft report by 30 September 2019.

12. Members raised the following concerns -

(a) **Mr Matthew Lee** referred to recommendation (31) at *Annex I* and enquired if the NGO's staff union would be included as one of the stakeholders to participate in the communication platform with the NGO Board. Regarding review areas (a) to (d), he asked about the preliminary observations from the data collected from staff side and service users.

(b) **Mr Lun Chi-wai** echoed Mr Matthew Lee's concern in respect of recommendation (31). As the consultant had already collected data from relevant stakeholders, Mr Lun asked if there were any preliminary recommendations for review areas (a) to (d) available, as well as the progress of the whole review work.

(c) **Ms Rebecca Ng** enquired if there was any channel to provide comments on the recommendations made by the Task Force. For recommendation (27) at *Annex I*, she enquired if consensus had been reached in the sector regarding the transition period of five years for NGOs to enhance the transparency of the salary structure, and regarded that the recommendation might not be in accordance with the relevant guideline of the Best Practice Manual (BPM).

(d) **Mr Francis Chau** enquired if the preliminary recommendations could be openly disclosed so that he might further consult the management of

some NGOs on the feasibility of implementing the recommendations. For example, regarding recommendation (27) to enhance the transparency of the salary structure, some NGOs had to check if the recommendation was in accordance with the terms set out in their Articles of Association.

13.   **The Chairman** reiterated that the recommendations in respect of review areas (e) to (h), including recommendation (27), had been deliberated after rounds of consultations among NGO management, staff representatives and service users. For recommendation (27), since the Task Force had reached consensus on the relevant discussion and recommendation, it would not be further deliberated at the Working Group on Implementation Details of BPM.   For recommendation (31), she agreed to reflect Members' views to the Task Force for further deliberation. If Members had further comments on the recommendations, they were welcome to provide their views through the upcoming consultation sessions or the Secretariat of the Task Force/LSGSC, etc.   Information in respect of the review was also uploaded onto SWD website for public viewing.   The progress of the review was smooth so far, despite minor complications on data collection and analysis during the process.   The whole review was expected to be completed by mid-2020. The preliminary data analysis results for review areas (a) to (d) would be deliberated at the Task Force meeting of 24 September 2019.

*[Post-meeting note: Members' views on recommendation (31) were reflected to the Task Force at the meeting of 24 September 2019.   As agreed in the Task Force meeting, "staff association" was added as one of the examples of communication platform between NGO Board and relevant stakeholders.   The updated recommendations for review areas (e) to (h) are at **Annex II**.]*

Agenda Item 4 – Progress of Implementation of the Best Practice Manual (Paper LSGSC 2/2019)

14.   **Ms Cherry Tsui** briefed the meeting that upon completion of the initial three years of implementation of the BPM from 2014-17, NGOs were required to continue submitting the self-assessment checklists (checklists) of both Level One and Level Two annually.   For the checklists of the latest reporting year of 2017-18, the major observations were set out as follows –

    (i)   All NGOs complied with the requirements of Level One guidelines;

    (ii) Of the 164 NGOs which were required and had submitted Level One

checklists, 160 (around 98%) had submitted <u>Level Two</u> checklists, indicating that almost all NGOs were ready to implement some or all of the <u>Level Two</u> guidelines. There had been much progress as compared with the previous years;

(iii) Of the <u>Level Two</u> guidelines, about <u>66</u> (41%) NGOs had already implemented all the seven guidelines while <u>92</u> (57.5%) had implemented some <u>Level Two</u> guidelines; and

(iv) Around <u>132</u> (83%) NGOs achieved the Level Two guideline on "Communication" while <u>90</u> (56%) had worked out their optimal level of LSG Reserve (Level Two guideline).

15. In response to a recommendation in Chapter 1 of Audit Report No. 69 regarding the need to ensure accuracy of the checklists, two enhanced monitoring measures were carried out in 2017-18 as listed below –

(i) Annual On-site Assessment was carried out and completed in the first quarter of 2019 and 5% of the NGOs (i.e. nine NGOs) were randomly selected for the assessment. All of the selected NGOs were found to have fully complied with the requirements of <u>Level One</u> guidelines and five out of the nine selected NGOs had also fully implemented <u>Level Two</u> guidelines; and

(ii) All NGOs were required to submit the revised checklist for <u>Level One</u> guidelines in which NGOs were required to report the implementation information pertaining to the criteria and procedures of <u>Level One</u> guidelines. 120 (73%) NGOs submitted their checklists on time (with submission deadline on 30 November 2018) and the remaining 44 (27%) NGOs submitted their checklists by 1 February 2019.

16. Three new guidelines of BPM were endorsed at the 44th meeting of LSGSC with an initial implementation period of 2.5 years (i.e. 30 months) with effect from 1 October 2018 so as to allow sufficient time for the NGOs to review their existing policies and procedures and to make necessary amendments and proper arrangements. The three guidelines were –

<u>Level One Guidelines</u>
Handling of Internal Transfer and Contract Termination
(調職及終止合約的處理); and

NGOs' Decision Making on Employment Contracts
(僱傭合約的決策)

Level Two Guideline
Disclosure of Remuneration Policy
(披露薪酬政策)

17.   A briefing session for NGO Board members and management was held on 26 September 2018 to introduce the implementation of the three new guidelines of BPM and the enhanced monitoring measures in respect of the requirement to list out supporting documents of implementation in the checklist of <u>Level One</u> guidelines. Some NGOs were also invited to share their good practices in the implementation of <u>Level Two</u> guidelines (such as the planning of LSG reserve level and their measures to promote corporate governance and accountability, etc.).

18.   For the outstanding item on "staff remuneration"（薪酬福利）, Members had not reached consensus on the level and content of "Principles, Criteria and Procedures" at the 44th meeting of LSGSC, especially on the principle of "allowing staff salary to go beyond the equivalent rank's mid-point of civil service pay scale".

19.   **The Chairman** shared that while the management side positioned the item on "staff remunueration" as a <u>Level Two</u> guideline, providing that many NGOs had already developed their own salary scales (i.e. delinked from the Master Pay Scale) under LSGSS, the staff side expressed support to put it as a <u>Level One</u> guideline. She added that staff salaries had been the major concern among different stakeholders in the sector.

20.   Members raised the following concerns -

(a)   **Mr Matthew Lee** opined that the outstanding guideline should be classified as <u>Level One</u> instead of <u>Level Two.</u> If the outstanding guideline was classified as <u>Level Two</u>, a time frame (say about five years) could be set to upgrade it to <u>Level One</u>. He also suggested that an exemption period like three to five years be allowed for NGOs with genuine difficulties to implement it as a <u>Level One</u> guideline.

(b)   **Mr Lun Chi-wai** viewed that there was relatively high percentage of NGOs having implemented some of the <u>Level Two</u> guidelines. He enquired if some <u>Level Two</u> guidelines could be upgraded to <u>Level One</u>. If there was a review mechanism to upgrade the guidelines from <u>Level Two</u> to <u>Level One</u>, the outstanding item could be considered as a <u>Level Two</u> guideline.

(c)   **Mr Chua Hoi-wai** opined that the outstanding item should be further

deliberated in the Working Group on Implementation Details of BPM. He generally agreed that the outstanding item could be classified as <u>Level Two</u> as some NGOs were not able to implement it for the time being. Moreover, he doubted if all <u>Level Two</u> guidelines could eventually be upgraded to <u>Level One</u> guidelines, for example, some NGOs under church bodies might have difficulties to fulfil some BPM requirements such as governance structure and Board's succession plan for historical or religious reasons.

(d) **Mr Francis Chau** considered that some NGOs would have difficulties to fulfil some <u>Level Two</u> guidelines as some of the <u>Level Two</u> guidelines were not compatible with NGOs' Articles of Association, and that setting a definite time frame to upgrade guidelines from <u>Level Two</u> to <u>Level One</u> would not be feasible. For the outstanding item, he agreed to put it at <u>Level Two</u> first. He was also of the view that depending on the review of subvention benchmarks on salary under the Review on Enhancement of LSGSS, if the maximum subvention benchmarks were capped at mid-points of the Master Pay Scale (MPS), some NGOs might be reluctant to implement the guideline-in-question, i.e. to allow the salary to go beyond the mid-points of MPS across all positions.

(e) **Ms Anna May Chan** considered that some NGOs might require more time to comply with the outstanding guideline but the public's quest for NGOs to enhance transparency was increasing. She suggested classifying this item as <u>Level Two</u> guideline first so that the sector could kick start the implementation and move towards its future implementation as <u>Level One</u> guideline.

(f) **Mr Sin Kin-ming** shared that having consulted the staff side, some supported the outstanding guideline being classified as <u>Level Two</u> first. However, there should be a review mechanism (say about two years) to upgrade this item to <u>Level One</u> if a certain percentage of NGOs had implemented this item.

(g) **Ms Teresa Lee** agreed that the outstanding guideline could be put at <u>Level Two</u> first. When about 70% to 80% of NGOs achieved this item successfully, it could be considered for upgrading to <u>Level One</u>.

(h) **Dr Jane Lee** opined that some NGOs might still have difficulties to comply with some <u>Level Two</u> guidelines despite the fact that 80% NGOs had implemented them successfully. NGOs should be allowed more flexibility and given more allowance in case they failed to fulfil some <u>Level Two</u> guidelines. She suggested that the

Working Group on Implementation Details of BPM study their difficulties of implementating <u>Level Two</u> guidelines and draw up solutions to handle their situation. For the outstanding guideline, she did not agree to put it at <u>Level Two</u> seeing its ineffectiveness to remunerate all staff beyond the mid-points of MPS.

(i) **Ms Rebecca Ng** considered that the outstanding guideline could be classified as <u>Level Two</u> first and move it towards <u>Level One</u> in the future. She also suggested that those NGOs having implemented this guideline might share their experiences with other NGOs, and the Working Group on Implementation Details of BPM might deliberate further.

21.   **The Chairman** reiterated that BPM was jointly developed by the government and the sector, and NGOs had the responsibility and obligation to comply with the guidelines included with a view to enhancing corporate governance. The BPM was devised in accordance with the spirit of LSG in upholding corporate governance and accountability, as well as preserving its flexibility. Regarding NGOs' capping staff salary at midpoints of MPS, the government had all along considered such an arrangement undesirable. While the salary benchmark would be further reviewed under the Review on Enhancement of LSGSS, **the Chairman** suggested that the staff side could consider putting the outstanding guideline at <u>Level Two</u> first, and the issue would be further deliberated at the Working Group on Implementation Details of BPM. The Working Group was encouraged to deliberate on the mechanism of reviewing and upgrading <u>Level Two</u> guidelines to <u>Level One</u>, including but not limited to the criteria of identifying suitable guidelines, any exemption criteria on those NGOs with difficulties in the implementation, the tranisition period or any other special arrangement, etc.

Agenda Item 5 – Progress of Implementation of the Updated Government Guidelines for the Control and Monitoring of Remuneration Practices in respect of Senior Staff in Subvented Organisations (LSGSC 3/2019)

22.   **Ms Lam Bun-ngee** reported that on 27 August 2018, the Director of Administration promulgated the updated guidelines for the control and monitoring of remuneration practices in respect of senior staff in subvented organisations by Directors of Bureaux and their Controlling Officers. This superseded the earlier guidelines issued on 28 March 2003. While the fundamental principles set out in the earlier guidelines remained unchanged, major updates had been made on the calculation of the "50% operating income threshold" as explained below –

$$\frac{\substack{\textbf{\textit{Recurrent}}\text{ \textit{government subvention provided by}}\\\textit{a Controlling Officer}\\\textit{(e.g. Director of Social Welfare (DSW)/SWD)}\\\textit{to the subvented NGO}\\\textbf{\textit{(average over previous four years)}}^{1}}}{\substack{\textit{Operating income of the subvented organisation}\\\textbf{\textit{pertaining to services/programmes}}\\\textbf{\textit{within the policy purview (i.e. welfare purview)}}\\\textit{of the Controlling Officer (e.g. DSW)}\\\textit{who provides the subvention}\\\textbf{\textit{(average over previous four years)}}^{1}} = >50\%}$$

23.   With the help of HKCSS, SWD met with some NGOs on 3 October 2018 to collect views on the revised calculation method of the 50% operating income threshold in accordance with the updated guidelines. A briefing session for all subvented NGOs was also held on 6 November 2018 to explain the major changes under the updated guidelines. The revised Self Assessment Reports and Review Reports (RRs) for the reporting year of 2017-18 were subsequently provided to NGOs on 13 December 2018.

24.   The deadline for submission of reports was by end of February 2019 to allow NGOs sufficient time to complete the reports. All of the 165 NGOs subvented by LSG in 2017-18 completed the Self Assessment Reports, among which 77 NGOs (47%) were required to submit the RRs and 88 NGOs (53%) were exempted.

25.   As a result of the revised calculation of the 50% operating income threshold, the number of NGOs required to submit the RRs had increased from 67 (41%) in the reporting year of 2016-17 to 77 (47%) in the reporting year of 2017-18, whereas the remaining 88 NGOs were exempt from submitting the RRs.

26.   All the completed RRs for the reporting year of 2017-18 had been uploaded onto the SWD's website for public scrutiny by phases starting from March 2019. By 6 May 2019, 32 out of the 77 RRs were directly uploaded by SWD while the remaining 45 RRs were accessed through hyperlinks to the NGOs' websites.

---

[1] With regard to the remuneration review to be conducted for, say, the 2017-18 financial year, the previous four years are 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17. For a subvented NGO receiving government subvention for less than four years before the scheduled year of review, reference should be made to all of the preceding years concerned.

27.　　To assess the appropriateness in respect of the number and ranking of senior positions in individual NGOs, SWD conducted an assessment of the highest acceptable ranks for the top three-tier staff with reference to the following assessment parameters –

      (a)　the average amount of subventions received by individual NGOs in the preceding four-year period, i.e. from 2013-14 to 2016-17;

      (b)　the number of types of subvented services operated by individual NGOs;

      (c)　the number of subvented staff of individual NGOs; and

      (d)　the number of agreement service units of individual NGOs.

28.　　In order to evaluate the appropriateness of remuneration packages for senior positions of NGOs, the average total staff costs under SWD subventions for a tier of staff were compared with the staff costs of civil servants at comparable ranks.　Upon assessment, majority of the NGOs which submitted RRs were found to have reasonable remuneration policy for the top three-tier staff.　Follow-up actions were taken to request several NGOs to submit for further inspection supplementary information on the comparable civil service ranks of their top three-tier staff, justifications of their remuneration packages and issue of cash allowances, etc.　Individual meetings were arranged with the management board of three NGOs in view of the unfavourable assessment outcomes, and due advice was given on their staff remuneration policy for their follow-up on improvement measures.

29.　　The Social Welfare Organisations Employees Union (SWOEU) expressed continual concern over the remuneration packages of top three-tier staff of NGOs. In respect of RRs of the reporting year of 2017-18, SWOEU wrote to the Legislative Council (LegCo) on issues including late submission/uploading of some RRs, high remunerations of top three-tier staff in some NGOs, failure of some NGOs to report the comparable civil service ranks for public scrutiny, etc. Representatives from the Administration Wing and SWD attended a closed-door case conference with some LegCo Members on 25 June 2019 to discuss the matters in concern.　While noting the monitoring efforts of SWD on the ranks and remuneration packages of top three-tier staff of NGOs, LegCo Members requested SWD to continue to keep an eye on the remuneration systems of NGOs to avoid the occurence of excessive pay for senior executives and unreasonably low pay for the lower-ranked staff, as well as to remind the NGOs to make transparent such systems to the staff and the public.

30.　　At the 8th meeting of the Task Force held on 11 December 2018, Hon Fernando Cheung Chiu-hung raised his concern on the types of services to be covered in calculating "recurrent subvention from SWD" (the numerator) for the

50% operating income threshold. He opined that contract services awarded to subvented NGOs, such as contract homes and Enhanced Home and Community Care Service (EHCCS), should be included in order to reflect the overall subsidy amount that an NGO had received from SWD. At present, the annual operating cost of 32 contract homes was about $561 million, involving among others, 9 subvented NGOs operating 22 contract homes. Bidding of contracts was based on a 5-year plus 5-year renewal mechanism. As for EHCCS, the annual operating cost of 7 245 EHCCS places was about $562 million, involving 14 subvented NGOs. The bidding was based on a 3-year renewal arrangement.

31.   **Mr Lam Ka-tai** supplemented that invitation for proposals was the major mode for commissioning new services to the NGO operators nowadays. Another mode was tendering for services including the services of Contract Residential Care Services for the Elderly and EHCCS. Awardees from NGOs or the private sector would run the services through time-defined contracts. Re-tendering would be required upon the expiry of the contract term, i.e. after the 5-year plus 5-year renewal period.

32.   Members' concerns were summarised as follows -

(a) **Mr Francis Chau** asked, apart from the parameters mentioned in paragraph 27 (a) to (d) above, if there were any concrete benchmark criteria to define the appropriateness of remuneration packages for senior positions of NGOs.

(b) **Mr Chua Hoi-wai** enquired if there were any benchmark on the comparable ranks in the civil service to be set and any reference on the appropriateness of remuneration packages could be revealed.

33.   **Mr Alex Wong** shared that in the closed-door LegCo case conference held on 25 June 2019, LegCo Members found the parameters mentioned in paragraph 27 (a) to (d) above reasonable in assessing the appropriateness of the ranking of the top three-tier staff. For comparing the remuneration packages for the top three-tier staff with those of their comparable ranks in the civil service, it was under the "total concept" including basic salary and allowance, which also covered the one-off reward for motivating staff's good performance and lowering staff turnover rate.

34.   **Mr Lam Ka-tai** shared that as the revised guidelines issued by the Director of Administration were newly implemented, SWD would review the current parameters and shared the observations with the NGOs in due course. Where necessary, SWD would discuss with the NGOs in refining the parameters.

35.   **The Chairman** invited members to give views on the enhanced monitoring of staff remunerations of NGOs and the services to be included in calculating the "recurrent subventions of NGOs".   Members unanimously agreed to include contract services such as contract homes, etc. in the calculation of "recurrent subvention from SWD".

Agenda Item 6 – Mechanism for Monitoring NGOs with Late Submission of Annual Financial Reports / Accompanying Financial Statements   (LSGSC 4/2019)

36.   **Ms Law Miu-sheung** reported that NGOs receiving subventions from SWD under LSGSS were required to submit to SWD annually (i) two copies of the Annual Financial Reports (AFRs), together with the auditors' review report; and (ii) audited financial statements of the NGO as a whole, together with the auditors' management letter, no later than 31 October following the end of the financial year as stipulated in paragraph 3.29 of the LSG Manual (October 2016).   In parallel, NGOs receiving subventions under the conventional mode were required to submit to SWD (i) two copies of their audited accounts, together with the auditors' management letter; and (ii) Accompanying Financial Statements (AccFS) for each subvented service unit together with the auditor's certification, according to paragraph 7.6 of the Guide to Social Welfare Subventions (the Guide).   As an existing practice, SWD would write to all NGOs under the LSG mode or conventional mode in April/May each year to remind them of the submission of AFRs/AccFSs and related financial returns to SWD no later than 31 October following the financial year concerned.

37.   Along the recommendations on financial monitoring in paragraph 2.17 of Chapter One of Audit Report No. 69 dated 27 October 2017, SWD would examine NGOs' LSG Reserve and their financial position as shown in their audited financial statements to ascertain their ongoing financial viability.   To facilitate early detection of NGOs' financial irregularities (if any), timely submission of relevant financial reports/statements from NGOs was vital.   To ensure NGOs' compliance with the deadline for submitting AFRs/AccFSs, i.e. on or before 31 October following the financial year concerned, SWD had taken the following actions at specific point of time of each financial year:

(i)   <u>May</u>: sending letters to all subvented NGOs as a reminder of their submission of AFRs/AccFSs and other financial returns to SWD on or before 31 October of the same financial year;

(ii)   <u>July</u>: sending Advance Reminders to those NGOs with past record of

late submission of AFRs/AccFSs;

(iii) <u>November</u>: sending first and second Reminders to NGOs which had not yet submitted AFRs/AccFSs;

(iv) <u>December to February next year</u>: Liaising with NGOs on their outstanding AFRs/AccFSs by SWD's Liaison Officers through telephone calls, emails and/or letters until their submission of the required financial returns.

38.   It was observed that some NGOs had repeatedly failed to comply with the requirements on submission of AFRs/AccFSs in the past years though Advance Reminders were sent and repeated chasing efforts made by Liaison Officers.   As steered in the meeting of the Service Performance Monitoring Committee of SWD held on 2 May 2019, SWD would devise enhanced measures on top of the existing monitoring system from a forward looking perspective to ensure NGOs' strict adherence to the submission deadline.   The following enhanced measures were proposed -

(i) SWD would issue an Advance Reminder to the Board Chairmen and Agency Heads of NGOs with late submission of AFRs/AccFSs for the latest two consecutive reporting years (i.e. late submissions for both 2017-18 and 2018-19), in early 2020, with a view to reminding them to take necessary actions to ensure strict adherence to the submission deadline.   The NGOs would be alerted that –

❑ as AFRs were uploaded or hyperlinked to SWD's website, late AFR submissions would be subject to public attention and challenges; and

❑ if their submission of AFRs/AccFSs for 2019-20 was made beyond the deadline (i.e. late submissions for three consecutive reporting years), the records of their late submissions for three consecutive years would be shown on the SWD's website.

(ii) Starting from the reporting year of 2019-20, for NGOs with late submission of AFRs/AccFSs for three consecutive years (i.e. the earliest from 2017-18 to 2019-20), SWD would issue a Management Letter to the NGOs concerned in early 2021, requiring them to submit a rectification plan to ensure strict adherence to the submission deadline of AFRs/AccFSs.   SWD would also inform the NGOs concerned that their record of late submission would be shown on the SWD's website since a specific date in early 2021, until the next

submission deadline of AFRs/AccFSs.

     (iii) For NGOs with records of late submissions for three consecutive years, such information would be disclosed on SWD's website since a specific date in early 2021, until the next submission deadline of AFRs/AccFSs.

39.   **The Chairman** invited members to give views on the proposed enhancement measures.   Members' views were summarised as follows-

    (a) **Mr Chua Hoi-wai** enquired if there was any assistance to be provided to small NGOs with possible difficulties to submit timely financial returns owing to limited resources.

    (b) **Dr Ricky Szeto** supported the proposed enhanced measures and asked if there was any designated funding on accounting support for the NGOs concerned.   As NGO Boards should be accountable to the public on the use of public money, they had the responsibility to ensure NGOs' strict adherence to the financial reporting requirements.

    (c) **Dr Jane Lee** suggested that if some NGOs were found to have limited human and financial resources in accounting support, SWD should consider to strengthen their central administrative support.

40.   **The Chairman** remarked that NGOs were given central administrative and accounting support.   NGOs were reminded to have thorough planning to comply with the financial reporting requirements on time in future.   **Mr Alex Wong** informed that SWD could gather more information from the NGOs concerned on the reasons for their failure to submit the financial reports on time and provide suitable support to them as appropriate.   Members unanimously endorsed SWD's proposal.

Agenda Item 7 – Progress of Implementation of Social Welfare Development Fund (Paper LSGSC 5/2019)

41.   **Ms Cherry Tsui** reported that as at 31 March 2019, the Lotteries Fund Advisory Committee approved an accumulated total of $950 million to 161 subvented NGOs (with 9 NGOs not making any applications for religious reasons) for implementation of projects under the Social Welfare Development Fund (SWDF).   Among the three scopes, $496 million (52%) was allocated under Scope A on training and professional development (T&D) programmes; $344 million (37%) was allocated under Scope B on developing Information

Technology (IT) and non-IT projects to upgrade business systems; $88 million (9%) was allocated under Scope C on conducting studies to enhance service delivery; and $22 million (2%) was allocated for administrative support in implementing the applicant NGOs' projects under Phases 2 and 3.

42.　　For Scope A "T&D Programmes", among the 161 NGOs which had applied for SWDF under Phase 1 to Phase 3, 158 NGOs were granted funding support for 2 557 T&D programmes with the approved funds totalling $496 million.　As at 31 March 2018, there had been a total of 501 012 attendances since 2010 for such programmes.　Social work staff, non-social work staff and NGOs' board members accounted for 39.8%, 59.9% and 0.3% respectively.

43.　　For Scope B "Business System Upgrading Projects", among the 161 NGOs, 151 were granted funding support for business system upgrading projects.　The total amount of approved funds was $344 million, which included $311 million (90%) for 681 IT projects carried out by 149 NGOs and 34 million (10%) for 138 non-IT projects carried out by 64 NGOs.　Out of the 64 NGOs, 11 commissioned actuarial studies or related studies to facilitate their financial planning and forecast to underpin the implementation of the BPM.　The actuarial studies were reported to be useful for assisting NGOs to forecast their financial and human resource management, and set optimal level of PF reserve, etc.

44.　　For Scope C "Studies for Enhancing Service Delivery", among 161 NGOs, 74 utilised $88 million to conduct 330 studies involving evaluating the effectiveness of different types of services.　Among 161 NGOs, only 102 were granted $22 million for administrative support in implementing their projects under Phases 2 and 3.

45.　　As a monitoring and enhancement measure since the year of 2016-17, SWD started to randomly select eight NGOs receiving SWDF on an annual basis for on-site assessment of their compliance with relevant guidelines.　Based on the reviews of Phases 1 and 2 of SWDF, enhancement measures such as allowing virement of funds among IT and non-IT projects, increasing funding for administrative support to "5% of the NGO's funding cap for the phase or $680,000", allowing more non-subvented staff to attend training programmes, etc. were taken to facilitate the utilisation of the funds.

46.　　The effectiveness of SWDF was assessed with reference to the findings of the two reviews of Phases 1 and 2 of SWDF from February to September 2012 and September 2014 to October 2015 respectively.　Moreover, NGOs' views on self-assessment vide the Evaluation Reports were collected after their completion of the projects approved under Phases 1 and 2.　NGOs' feedback on SWDF was generally positive.

47. The positions of SWDF in 2019-20 and 2020-21 were summarised as follows –

   (a) The last round of funding allocation of Phase 3 had been distributed in October 2018, of which 152 NGOs were allocated funding for their applications. Among the 152 NGOs, 39 NGOs (26%) would have completed all their IT and non-IT projects by the end of 2019-20 and the remaining 113 NGOs (74%) would continue to take forward their IT and/or non-IT projects in 2020-21.

   (b) Among these 113 NGOs, 67 (44%) would have completed all their IT and non-IT projects by the end of 2020-21, whereas the expected project end-date for the remaining 46 NGOs (30%) would fall in 2021-22.

48. In July 2019, the Joint Platform (i.e. HKCSS, HKSWA, HKSWGU and SKCLCO) reported the welfare sector's view on SWDF. The sector recognised that SWDF had greatly facilitated the sector's overall quality improvement. For instance, it had positive influence on the service quality, increased the sense of belonging of staff, promoted the learning culture of staff, as well as helped to develop service measurement parameters, etc. The Joint Platform further proposed to extend the SWDF, with the existing scopes maintained and new scopes introduced to support the application of advanced information technology for the delivery of welfare services and the development of innovative services.

49. Members' views were summarised as follows-

   (a) **Ms Rebecca Ng** recognised the usefulness of SWDF in supporting professional social work development. She shared that the T&D programmes operated by her employing NGO and funded under SWDF would complete in 2019 and the IT projects would complete in 2022. In this light, she enquired if there would be another phase of SWDF, and if so, the feasibility of advancing the timing of commencement to 2020-21 without awaiting the existing IT projects to be completed in 2022 in order to provide continual support of T&D training for their frontline staff.

   (b) **Mr Chua Hoi-wai** echoed that most of the NGOs would complete the T&D programmes in 2020 and enquired if an extension of SWDF could be granted say in 2020 with allocations to start in 2021.

   (c) **Ms Ann Au** agreed that SWDF, which was not recurrent subvention, had effectively supported NGOs for three phases and it was time to

review how to enhance it in order to benefit the welfare sector. Review on the use of SWDF should be done before commencement of the new phase of SWDF.

(d) **Dr Jane Lee** asked if there was any bridging fund to meet the immediate training needs arising from the rapid changing needs of the society and recent social unrest as well as sustaining the continuity on professional training. Besides, she opined that the assessment process of SWDF applications was lengthy. Taking the example of IT projects which involved the adoption of latest IT technology, the actual implementation might lag behind the expectations of staff and service users.

(e) **Mr Francis Chau** enquired if there was any recurrent subvention to NGOs for strengthening their T&D training in case they would not apply for SWDF due to religious reasons.

50.   **The Chairman** thanked Members for their views and remarked that the review on SWDF and its way forward would be conducted and deliberated in the context of the Review on Enhancement of LSGSS by the Task Force. Progress of discussion would be reported as appropriate.

Date of Next Meeting

51.   There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:00 p.m. The date of the next meeting would be fixed in due course.

Social Welfare Department
April 2020

<u>檢討範疇 (e)、(f)、(g) 及 (h) 的初步建議</u>

(Chinese Version Only)

檢討範疇(e)－《津貼及服務協議》(《協議》)相關活動和非政府機構的靈活性

檢討內容	初步建議方案
釐定《協議》相關活動的考慮準則及《協議》相關活動的資源運用比例	(1) <u>釐定《協議》相關活動的考慮準則及運用整筆撥款的比例上限</u> (a) 若《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款 **10%或以下**，機構須確保這些活動符合(i)－(iv)四項準則： (i) 與《協議》有相同**目的及目標**； (ii) 與《協議》有相同**服務性質**； (iii) 與《協議》有相關**服務內容**；及 (iv) 與《協議》有相關**服務對象**。 (b) 如擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例介乎 **10%－20%**，機構除了須確保這些活動符合上述(i)－(iv)四項準則外，亦須採用以下較為審慎的原則： (v) 須經董事會／管理委員會先行討論及評估對機構服務、員工及服務使用者的影響並獲得支持； (vi) 須透過既定機制諮詢前線員工及服務使用者；及 (vii) 機構擬進行上述《協議》相關活動前，須取得社會福利署(社署)的同意。 (c) 不管擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例是多少，如該相關活動<u>不符合</u>《協議》列明的條款，機構須在進行**該《協議》相關活動前取得社署相關服務科的同意**： ➤ 如《協議》有<u>指明服務對象的規限</u>，而擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動涉及超出既定的服務對象（例如：改變服務對象年齡的上、下限）；及 ➤ 如《協議》有<u>指明服務地域</u>，而擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動超越／改變既定服務地域。
	(2) <u>制定推行《協議》相關活動的工作指引(「工作指引」)</u> ● 建議制定推行《協議》相關活動的工作指引，列明釐定《協議》相關活動的準則，讓機構有所依從，以減少因推行《協議》相關活動而可能出現的不明確性或不必要爭議。「工作指引」應定時更新，以

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	適時優化準則。
	(3) 在進行服務檢討時，評估是否將《協議》相關活動納入為《協議》規定服務 ● 建議社署及業界在進行服務檢討時，亦同時檢視《協議》相關活動的資料及成效，並評估是否將它們納入為《協議》常規化的規定服務。
曾/擬舉辦的 《協議》 相關活動	(4) 在「工作指引」臚列《協議》規定服務、《協議》相關活動及非《協議》規定服務的例子 ● 建議在「工作指引」臚列合適的例子。 ● 由社署定期收集有關《協議》相關活動的例子，並更新「工作指引」。
處理 《協議》 相關活動的 財政管理	(5) 在「工作指引」訂明：機構須將提供《協議》相關活動所帶來的收入及支出，全數計入整筆撥款帳目
	(6) 在「工作指引」訂明：如機構在提供非《協議》規定服務時，使用了整筆撥款的資源，須作成本分攤 ● 須以獨立帳目處理提供非《協議》規定服務所帶來的收入及支出。 ● 在提供非《協議》規定服務時，如使用了整筆撥款的資源，須按額外收入／資助的對應成本項目 [如人手、活動經費或場地經費資助] 作成本分攤。
	(7) 製作運用整筆撥款津助的「成本分攤指引」以提供成本分攤安排、基準及例子 ● 審計署要求社署採取措施，以協助機構採用合適的基準，把經常開支分攤予《協議》規定服務及非《協議》規定服務。因此，社署會製作一套運用整筆撥款津助的「成本分攤指引」。 ● 社署會在「成本分攤指引」中涵蓋就《協議》規定服務與非《協議》規定服務的成本分攤安排及基準，並會列舉機構在問卷所提供適用的例子，以供機構參考。

檢討內容	初步建議方案

評估《協議》相關活動的成本效益	(8) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：不需要將《協議》相關活動納入統計資料系統的季度報告</u>
	• 鑑於《協議》相關活動的性質各有不同，故此不適宜將《協議》相關活動納入統計資料系統的季度報告。
	• 建議機構須就舉辦的《協議》相關活動向社署呈交年度報表，以報告《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例。社署會制訂年度報表的範本，內容包括：
	   ➤ 《協議》相關活動是否符合建議(1)的考慮準則；
	   ➤ 《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例；
	   ➤ 機構是否建議將《協議》相關活動納入《協議》規定服務；及
	   ➤ 擬建議納入《協議》規定服務的《協議》相關活動，機構須提供活動的服務內容、服務量、服務成效等，供社署考慮。

員工及服務使用者的參與	(9) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：機構須就推行《協議》相關活動，考慮諮詢／知會員工的準則，以提升透明度</u>
	• 機構應考慮下列因素以決定是否需要諮詢／知會員工：
	   ➤ 處理**員工的可能關注及疑慮**；
	   ➤ 對員工**原有工作的實質影響**；
	   ➤ 增加《協議》相關活動的**透明度**等。

	(10) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：機構須就推行《協議》相關活動，考慮諮詢／知會服務使用者的準則，以提升透明度</u>
	• 機構應考慮下列因素以決定是否需要諮詢／知會服務使用者：
	   ➤ 確認相關活動設計**切合服務使用者的需要**；
	   ➤ 對服務使用者**可能帶來的影響**；及
	   ➤ 增加《協議》相關活動的**透明度**等。

檢討範疇 (f) －檢討《協議》的機制及機構服務表現評估的機制

檢討內容	初步建議方案
檢討《協議》的常規機制	(11) <u>將檢討有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標的周期定為每五年一次</u> ● 現時，有時限的住宿服務《協議》的有效期均設定為五年，而有時限的日間服務《協議》均設定為三年。 ● 建議統一有時限《協議》的有效期為每五年一個周期，並按周期每五年一次檢討服務量及服務成效指標，以騰出時間及人手進行服務檢討。
	(12) <u>在有新資源的情況下檢討沒有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標</u> ● 現時，雖然沒有時限的《協議》並沒有設定有效期，然而社署及業界會不時檢討有關《協議》，以回應服務發展的需求。 ● 建議在有新資源的情況下，檢討沒有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標，以適時回應服務發展的需求。
	(13) <u>訂定服務檢討的內容</u> ● 服務檢討應包括以下內容： 　➢ 服務對象； 　➢ 服務性質； 　➢ 服務表現標準(包括：基本服務規定、服務量標準及服務成效標準)； 　➢ 估計人手編制； 　➢ 行政及其他支援；及 　➢ 其他考慮。
	(14) <u>就服務檢討而言，機構應該提供以下數據及資料供社署及業界全面檢視：</u> 　➢ 有關**服務需要改變**的資料； 　➢ 有關**人手需求改變**的資料； 　➢ 有關**服務性質改變**的資料；及 　➢ 有關**行政及其他支援改變**的資料。 ● 社署亦會提供地區資訊，包括人口概況及地區福利需要社會指標以作參考。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(15) <u>訂立服務檢討的優次準則</u> • 建議訂立服務檢討的優次準則,例如:優先處理長年未有進行檢討的服務、涉及單位數目較多的服務、有較大發展需要或涉及較大範圍的服務等。 • 社署服務科會諮詢持分者在未來五年內進行服務檢討的項目及其優次,並在「福利議題及優次會議」中收集相關意見,以供服務科考慮。 • 訂定檢討的項目及其優次後,按機構的承受能力及社署的人力資源,個別服務範疇在同一時段內最多就兩個服務項目/服務項目群組進行檢討;而每個服務項目/服務項目群組的檢討期望於一年內完成。若在一年內未能完成檢討,則不能在同一服務範疇內開展另一個服務項目/服務項目群組的檢討。 註: 1. 除了上述「《協議》檢討」及「服務檢討」機制外,政府亦會繼續按需要就着不同服務進行大型服務規劃(例如:安老服務計劃方案、香港康復計劃方案等)。 2. 政府會持續檢視個別服務的需要,按需要爭取資源以提升人手及服務,而不會等待上述「服務檢討」機制的安排(例如:精神健康綜合社區中心及綜合家庭服務中心近年不斷增加人手及資源,以應付上升的服務需要)。
	(16) <u>就服務檢討而言,訂定機制,每年透過「福利議題及優次會議」檢視優先檢討的服務名單</u>
	(17) <u>進行服務檢討時,除了社署及服務營辦機構管理層外,應該邀請前線員工及服務使用者參與</u>

檢討內容	初步建議方案
改善服務表現 自我評估機制 的可行措施	(18)　在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應最少每年進行一次<u>內部服務審查</u> ● 由於機構進行內部服務審查的次數會因應機構規模大小而有所不同，建議所有機構應最少每年進行一次內部服務審查，以提升服務表現的自我評估機制。 (19)　在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應至少由服務督導或<u>內部服務審查單位／小組執行內部服務審查</u> ● 建議所有機構應按實際情況至少由服務督導或內部服務審查單位／小組執行內部服務審查，以提升服務表現自我評估機制。 ● 機構可按實際情況，考慮在訂定內部服務審查機制時加入員工及服務使用者的參與。 (20)　在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應透過實地評估、書<u>面報告、抽樣檢查等方式執行內部服務審查</u> ● 建議機構應透過實地評估(包括突擊、預約)、書面報告、抽樣檢查等執行內部服務審查，以提升服務表現自我評估機制。
識別和分享 機構在 自我評估方面 的優良措施	(21)　<u>透過定期舉辦業界分享會，讓機構分享內部服務審查機制的優良措施及訂立業界的基準</u> ● 建議透過定期舉辦業界分享會，讓機構分享內部服務審查機制的優良措施及訂立業界的基準。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
提高董事會、高級管理層及財政資料的透明度	(22) 機構須提高董事會及高級管理層的透明度 • 為回應社會人士對受資助機構須就管治架構提高透明度及向公眾問責的期望，並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示接近所有機構已向**公眾**發放董事會成員名單、董事會架構及管理層／行政人員名單，**建議**機構須提供適當渠道（如年報、機構網頁等）讓**公眾**（包括員工及服務使用者）閱覽上述資料，並適時更新有關資料。
	(23) 機構須披露周年財務報告 • **建議**機構須按照現時《整筆撥款手冊》要求的途徑披露機構的周年財務報告；及須按社署要求把周年財務報告或相關網址連結呈交社署，由社署上載資料於社署網頁，讓公眾人士閱覽。
	(24) 機構須披露機構最高三層管理人員薪酬 • **建議**機構須按行政署於 2018 年 8 月 27 日發出的新指引（即如機構(i)每年獲社署資助 1,000 萬元或以上及(ii)來自社署的運作收入佔其在福利範疇的整體運作收入超過 50%），須公開最高級三層管理人員的數目、職級和薪酬條件；及 • 為提升機構向公眾的問責及讓公眾更了解機構的財務狀況，鼓勵現時獲豁免遞交及披露「最高級三層人員薪酬條件檢討報告」的機構考慮公開有關最高級三層管理人員的薪酬資料。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(25) 機構須向公眾發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊 • 為回應社會對受資助機構須就運用公帑提高透明度及向公眾問責的期望,並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示接近所有回覆的機構已向公眾發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊(包括金額及運用計劃),**建議**機構須向**公眾**發放上述資料以增加透明度;並透過不同**渠道**(例如:在單位報告板張貼資料)向**公眾**(包括員工及服務使用者)發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊。
	(26) 機構須提高在機構或服務單位發生特別事故及重要事故的透明度 • <u>特別事故</u>:**建議**機構須設立**機制**,就發生在機構或服務單位的特別事故在三個工作天內向社署發放有關資料,並在保障個人私隱的前提下向相關的服務使用者及╱家屬╱員工或其他相關人士發放有關資料(例如:按特別事故的類別訂立發放資料的對象及渠道);及 • <u>重要事故</u>:**建議**機構須設立**機制**,向社署通報涉及廣大公眾利益或知情權的重要事故,並適時透過適當的渠道向公眾發放相關資料。重要事故的例子:機構出現管治危機、因財務而影響服務及人手安排等。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(27) <u>機構須提高員工薪酬政策的透明度,包括須披露在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的薪酬架構及／或起薪點</u> • 勞福局／社署的政策目標是建議所有機構公開在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕的薪酬架構及／或起薪點,以提升機構薪酬政策的透明度,而要求公開這些資料一直是員工、立法會、審計署、傳媒以至公眾人士的關注及期望。但為顧及機構需時準備相關擬公開的資料或須就其薪酬架構進行討論及調整,建議給予機構 5 年過渡時間進行相應的準備工作,以全面實施「機構須披露其在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的薪酬架構及／或起薪點」的建議。勞福局／社署同時鼓勵機構在過渡期間亦應盡量披露有關資料。
	(28) <u>機構須提高在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕編制的透明度</u> • 為回應社會人士對受資助機構須提高在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的透明度及向公眾問責的期望,並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示目前大部分機構的服務單位已按服務質素標準(SQS)4 公開張貼組織架構圖於報告板,建議機構須於報告板及／或網頁公開服務單位在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕的組織架構及相關人手編制,以提升透明度。
加強對員工及服務使用者負責	(29) <u>機構須就重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的員工的意見,以加強對員工負責</u> • 建議機構須就一些影響員工的重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的員工的意見。重要事宜的例子:更改現有的職員編制、人手比例有顯著改變、薪酬待遇或工作條件、服務檢討／重整服務或改變提供服務的模式、服務發展／推行《協議》相關活動,及改變服務表現標準。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(30) 機構須就重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的服務使用者的意見，以加強對服務使用者負責 ● 建議機構須就一些直接影響服務使用者的重要事宜徵詢服務使用者及／或其家屬的意見。重要事宜的例子：更改現有的職員編制，人手比例有顯著改變、服務檢討／重整服務或改變提供服務的模式、服務發展／推行《協議》相關活動、更改服務表現標準，及調整服務收費。

檢討範疇 (h) －溝通及持分者的參與

檢討內容	初步建議方案
有意見指應邀請員工和服務使用者參與重大管理決定及 服務發展計劃的決策，並加強他們與董事會溝通	(31) <u>建議機構須設立董事會及管理層與員工及服務使用者的常設溝通渠道〔例如會員大會、服務使用者加入管委會、問卷等〕，以收集及回應員工及服務使用者就整筆撥款津助有關事宜的意見</u> (32) <u>建議機構須設立渠道就重要事宜讓可能受影響的員工參與機構決策的過程，以提高持分者的參與</u> • 建議機構須設立參與渠道，例如出席／列席董事會、服務管理委員會、中心／單位管理委員會或召開員工大會等，就一些重要事宜讓可能受影響的員工參與機構決策的過程。 (33) <u>建議機構須設立渠道就重要事宜讓可能受影響的服務使用者參與機構決策的過程，以提高持分者的參與</u> • 建議機構須設立參與渠道，例如出席／列席董事會、服務管理委員會、服務質素監察委員會、中心／單位管理委員會或舉行諮詢會議等，就一些重要事宜讓可能受影響的服務使用者及／或其家屬參與機構決策的過程。

<u>檢討範疇 (e)、(f)、(g) 及 (h) 的初步建議</u>
(Chinese Version Only)

檢討範疇(e)－《津貼及服務協議》(《協議》)相關活動和非政府機構的靈活性

檢討內容	初步建議方案
釐定《協議》相關活動的考慮準則及《協議》相關活動的資源運用比例	(1) <u>釐定《協議》相關活動的考慮準則及運用整筆撥款的比例上限</u> (a) 若《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款 **10%或以下**，機構須確保這些活動符合(i)－(iv)四項準則： 　(i)　與《協議》有相同**目的及目標**； 　(ii)　與《協議》有相同**服務性質**； 　(iii)　與《協議》有相關**服務內容**；及 　(iv)　與《協議》有相關**服務對象**。 (b) 如擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例介乎 **10%－20%**，機構除了須確保這些活動符合上述(i)－(iv)四項準則外，亦須採用以下較為審慎的原則： 　(v)　須經董事會／管理委員會先行討論及評估對機構服務、員工及服務使用者的影響並獲得支持； 　(vi)　須透過既定機制諮詢前線員工及服務使用者；及 　(vii)　機構擬進行上述《協議》相關活動前，須取得社會福利署(社署)的同意。 (c) 不管擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例是多少，如該相關活動<u>不符合</u>《協議》列明的條款，機構須在進行**該《協議》相關活動前取得社署相關服務科的同意**： 　➢ 如《協議》有<u>指明服務對象的規限</u>，而擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動涉及超出既定的服務對象（例如：改變服務對象年齡的上、下限）；及 　➢ 如《協議》有指明服務地域，而擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動超越／改變既定服務地域。
	(2) <u>制定推行《協議》相關活動的工作指引(「工作指引」)</u> ● 建議制定推行《協議》相關活動的工作指引，列明釐定《協議》相關活動的準則，讓機構有所依從，以減少因推行《協議》相關活動而可能出現的不明確性或不必要爭議。「工作指引」應定時更新，以適時優化準則。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(3) <u>在進行服務檢討時，評估是否將《協議》相關活動納入為《協議》規定服務</u> ● 建議社署及業界在進行服務檢討時，亦同時檢視《協議》相關活動的資料及成效，並評估是否將它們納入為《協議》常規化的規定服務。
曾/擬舉辦的《協議》相關活動	(4) <u>在「工作指引」臚列《協議》規定服務、《協議》相關活動及非《協議》規定服務的例子</u> ● 建議在「工作指引」臚列合適的例子。 ● 由社署定期收集有關《協議》相關活動的例子，並更新「工作指引」。
處理《協議》相關活動的財政管理	(5) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：機構須將提供《協議》相關活動所帶來的收入及支出，全數計入整筆撥款帳目</u>
	(6) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：如機構在提供非《協議》規定服務時，使用了整筆撥款的資源，須作成本分攤</u> ● 須以獨立帳目處理提供非《協議》規定服務所帶來的收入及支出。 ● 在提供非《協議》規定服務時，如使用了整筆撥款的資源，須按額外收入／資助的對應成本項目[如人手、活動經費或場地經費資助]作成本分攤。
	(7) <u>製作運用整筆撥款津助的「成本分攤指引」以提供成本分攤安排、基準及例子</u> ● 審計署要求社署採取措施，以協助機構採用合適的基準，把經常開支分攤予《協議》規定服務及非《協議》規定服務。因此，社署會製作一套運用整筆撥款津助的「成本分攤指引」。 ● 社署會在「成本分攤指引」中涵蓋就《協議》規定服務與非《協議》規定服務的成本分攤安排及基準，並會列舉機構在問卷所提供適用的例子，以供機構參考。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
評估《協議》相關活動的成本效益	(8) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：不需要將《協議》相關活動納入統計資料系統的季度報告</u> • 鑑於《協議》相關活動的性質各有不同，故此不適宜將《協議》相關活動納入統計資料系統的季度報告。 • 建議機構須就舉辦的《協議》相關活動向社署呈交年度報表，以報告《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例。社署會制訂年度報表的範本，內容包括： ➢ 《協議》相關活動是否符合建議(1)的考慮準則； ➢ 《協議》相關活動的開支佔整筆撥款的比例； ➢ 機構是否建議將《協議》相關活動納入《協議》規定服務；及 ➢ 擬建議納入《協議》規定服務的《協議》相關活動，機構須提供活動的服務內容、服務量、服務成效等，供社署考慮。
員工及服務使用者的參與	(9) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：機構須就推行《協議》相關活動，考慮諮詢／知會員工的準則，以提升透明度</u> • 機構應考慮下列因素以決定是否需要諮詢／知會員工： ➢ 處理**員工的可能關注及疑慮**； ➢ 對員工原有工作的**實質影響**； ➢ 增加《協議》相關活動的**透明度**等。
	(10) <u>在「工作指引」訂明：機構須就推行《協議》相關活動，考慮諮詢／知會服務使用者的準則，以提升透明度</u> • 機構應考慮下列因素以決定是否需要諮詢／知會服務使用者： ➢ 確認相關活動設計**切合服務使用者的需要**； ➢ 對服務使用者**可能帶來的影響**；及 ➢ 增加《協議》相關活動的**透明度**等。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
檢討 《協議》的 常規機制	(11) 將檢討有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標的周期定為每五年一次 ● 現時，有時限的住宿服務《協議》的有效期均設定為五年，而有時限的日間服務《協議》均設定為三年。 ● 建議統一有時限《協議》的有效期為每五年一個周期，並按周期每五年一次檢討服務量及服務成效指標，以騰出時間及人手進行服務檢討。
	(12) 在有新資源的情況下檢討沒有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標 ● 現時，雖然沒有時限的《協議》並沒有設定有效期，然而社署及業界會不時檢討有關《協議》，以回應服務發展的需求。 ● 建議在有新資源的情況下，檢討沒有時限的《協議》的服務量及服務成效指標，以適時回應服務發展的需求。

	(13) 訂定服務檢討的內容
	● 服務檢討應包括以下內容：
	  ➢ 服務對象；
	  ➢ 服務性質；
	  ➢ 服務表現標準(包括：基本服務規定、服務量標準及服務成效標準)；
	  ➢ 估計人手編制；
	  ➢ 行政及其他支援；及
	  ➢ 其他考慮。

	(14) 就服務檢討而言，機構應該提供以下數據及資料供社署及業界全面檢視：
	  ➢ 有關**服務需要改變**的資料；
	  ➢ 有關**人手需求改變**的資料；
	  ➢ 有關**服務性質改變**的資料；及
	  ➢ 有關**行政及其他支援改變**的資料。
	● 社署亦會提供地區資訊，包括人口概況及地區福利需要社會指標以作參考。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(15) <u>訂立服務檢討的優次準則</u> • 建議訂立服務檢討的優次準則,例如:優先處理長年未有進行檢討的服務、涉及單位數目較多的服務、有較大發展需要或涉及較大範圍的服務等。 • 社署服務科會諮詢持分者在未來五年內進行服務檢討的項目及其優次,並在「福利議題及優次會議」中收集相關意見,以供服務科考慮。 • 訂定檢討的項目及其優次後,按機構的承受能力及社署的人力資源,個別服務範疇在同一時段內最多就兩個服務項目/服務項目群組進行檢討;而每個服務項目/服務項目群組的檢討期望於一年內完成。若在一年內未能完成檢討,則不能在同一服務範疇內開展另一個服務項目/服務項目群組的檢討。 註: 1. 除了上述「《協議》檢討」及「服務檢討」機制外,政府亦會繼續按需要就着不同服務進行大型服務規劃(例如:安老服務計劃方案、香港康復計劃方案等)。 2. 政府會持續檢視個別服務的需要,按需要爭取資源以提升人手及服務,而不會等待上述「服務檢討」機制的安排(例如:精神健康綜合社區中心及綜合家庭服務中心近年不斷增加人手及資源,以應付上升的服務需要)。
	(16) <u>就服務檢討而言,訂定機制,每年透過「福利議題及優次會議」檢視優先檢討的服務名單</u>
	(17) <u>進行服務檢討時,除了社署及服務營辦機構管理層外,應該邀請前線員工及服務使用者參與</u>

檢討內容	初步建議方案
改善服務表現自我評估機制的可行措施	(18) <u>在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應最少每年進行一次內部服務審查</u> ● 由於機構進行內部服務審查的次數會因應機構規模大小而有所不同，建議所有機構應最少每年進行一次內部服務審查，以提升服務表現的自我評估機制。
	(19) <u>在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應至少由服務督導或內部服務審查單位／小組執行內部服務審查</u> ● 建議所有機構應按實際情況至少由服務督導或內部服務審查單位／小組執行內部服務審查，以提升服務表現自我評估機制。 ● 機構可按實際情況，考慮在訂定內部服務審查機制時加入員工及服務使用者的參與。
	(20) <u>在《整筆撥款手冊》訂明：機構應透過實地評估、書面報告、抽樣檢查等方式執行內部服務審查</u> ● 建議機構應透過實地評估(包括突擊、預約)、書面報告、抽樣檢查等執行內部服務審查，以提升服務表現自我評估機制。
識別和分享機構在自我評估方面的優良措施	(21) <u>透過定期舉辦業界分享會，讓機構分享內部服務審查機制的優良措施及訂立業界的基準</u> ● 建議透過定期舉辦業界分享會，讓機構分享內部服務審查機制的優良措施及訂立業界的基準。

檢討範疇 (g) 透明度和對公眾負責

檢討內容	初步建議方案
提高董事會、高級管理層及財政資料的透明度	(22) 機構須提高董事會及高級管理層的透明度 • 為回應社會人士對受資助機構須就管治架構提高透明度及向公眾問責的期望，並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示接近所有機構已向**公眾**發放董事會成員名單、董事會架構及管理層／行政人員名單，**建議**機構須提供適當渠道（如年報、機構網頁等）讓**公眾**（包括員工及服務使用者）閱覽上述資料，並適時更新有關資料。
	(23) 機構須披露周年財務報告 • **建議**機構須按照現時《整筆撥款手冊》要求的途徑披露機構的周年財務報告；及須按社署要求把周年財務報告或相關網址連結呈交社署，由社署上載資料於社署網頁，讓公眾人士閱覽。
	(24) 機構須披露機構最高三層管理人員薪酬 • **建議**機構須按行政署於 2018 年 8 月 27 日發出的新指引（即如機構(i)每年獲社署資助 1,000 萬元或以上及(ii)來自社署的運作收入佔其在福利範疇的整體運作收入超過 50%），須公開最高級三層管理人員的數目、職級和薪酬條件；及 • 為提升機構向公眾的問責及讓公眾更了解機構的財務狀況，鼓勵現時獲豁免遞交及披露「最高級三層人員薪酬條件檢討報告」的機構考慮公開有關最高級三層管理人員的薪酬資料。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(25) 機構須向公眾發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊 • 為回應社會對受資助機構須就運用公帑提高透明度及向公眾問責的期望,並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示接近所有回覆的機構已向公眾發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊(包括金額及運用計劃),**建議**機構須向**公眾**發放上述資料以增加透明度;並透過不同**渠道**(例如:在單位報告板張貼資料)向**公眾**(包括員工及服務使用者)發放其整筆撥款儲備運用及公積金儲備運用的資訊。
	(26) 機構須提高在機構或服務單位發生特別事故及重要事故的透明度 • <u>**特別事故**</u>:**建議**機構須設立**機制**,就發生在機構或服務單位的特別事故在三個工作天內向社署發放有關資料,並在保障個人私隱的前提下向相關的服務使用者及/家屬/員工或其他相關人士發放有關資料(例如:按特別事故的類別訂立發放資料的對象及渠道);及 • <u>**重要事故**</u>:**建議**機構須設立**機制**,向社署通報涉及廣大公眾利益或知情權的重要事故,並適時透過適當的渠道向公眾發放相關資料。重要事故的例子:機構出現管治危機、因財務而影響服務及人手安排等。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(27) 機構須提高員工薪酬政策的透明度，包括須披露在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的薪酬架構及／或起薪點 • 勞福局／社署的政策目標是建議所有機構公開在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕的薪酬架構及／或起薪點，以提升機構薪酬政策的透明度，而要求公開這些資料一直是員工、立法會、審計署、傳媒以至公眾人士的關注及期望。但為顧及機構需時準備相關擬公開的資料或須就其薪酬架構進行討論及調整，建議給予機構 5 年過渡時間進行相應的準備工作，以全面實施「機構須披露其在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的薪酬架構及／或起薪點」的建議。勞福局／社署同時鼓勵機構在過渡期間亦應盡量披露有關資料。
	(28) 機構須提高在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕編制的透明度 • 為回應社會人士對受資助機構須提高在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位的透明度及向公眾問責的期望，並考慮到問卷的調查結果顯示目前大部分機構的服務單位已按服務質素標準(SQS)4 公開張貼組織架構圖於報告板，建議機構須於報告板及／或網頁公開服務單位在整筆撥款資助下各常設職位〔即非臨時或短期的職位〕的組織架構及相關人手編制，以提升透明度。
加強對員工及服務使用者負責	(29) 機構須就重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的員工的意見，以加強對員工負責 • 建議機構須就一些影響員工的重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的員工的意見。重要事宜的例子：更改現有的職員編制、人手比例有顯著改變、薪酬待遇或工作條件、服務檢討／重整服務或改變提供服務的模式、服務發展／推行《協議》相關活動，及改變服務表現標準。

檢討內容	初步建議方案
	(30) 機構須就重要事宜徵詢可能受影響的服務使用者的意見，以加強對服務使用者負責 ● 建議機構須就一些直接影響服務使用者的重要事宜徵詢服務使用者及／或其家屬的意見。重要事宜的例子：更改現有的職員編制，人手比例有顯著改變、服務檢討／重整服務或改變提供服務的模式、服務發展／推行《協議》相關活動、更改服務表現標準，及調整服務收費。

檢討範疇 (h) －溝通及持分者的參與

檢討內容	初步建議方案
有意見指應邀請員工和服務使用者參與重大管理決定及服務發展計劃的決策，並加強他們與董事會溝通	(31) <u>建議機構須設立董事會及管理層與員工及服務使用者的常設溝通渠道〔例如會員大會、服務使用者參與管委會、員工組織、問卷等〕，以收集及回應員工及服務使用者就整筆撥款津助有關事宜的意見</u>
	(32) <u>建議機構須設立渠道就重要事宜讓可能受影響的員工參與機構決策的過程，以提高持分者的參與</u> • 建議機構須設立參與渠道，例如出席／列席董事會、服務管理委員會、中心／單位管理委員會或召開員工大會等，就一些重要事宜讓可能受影響的員工參與機構決策的過程。
	(33) <u>建議機構須設立渠道就重要事宜讓可能受影響的服務使用者參與機構決策的過程，以提高持分者的參與</u> • 建議機構須設立參與渠道，例如出席／列席董事會、服務管理委員會、服務質素監察委員會、中心／單位管理委員會或舉行諮詢會議等，就一些重要事宜讓可能受影響的服務使用者及／或其家屬參與機構決策的過程。