

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

Summary overview

- Over 450 people attended the Conference. Most of the Conference participants made the effort to convey their observations, responses and suggestions through the “thought forms”. A total of 476 individual response forms and 34 group response forms were received. Most response forms included several comments.

- **The majority [around 4 to 1] of the respondents were in agreement** with the strategic directions put forward and discussed at the Conference. Most expressed the view that revisiting welfare philosophies was necessary and that strategic shifts were urgently needed. For instance, 215 responses were in support of the concepts and strategic directions put forward in the first session with 41 dissenting responses.

- This snapshot provided clear indications that the proposed policy directions and concepts such as social capital, social investment and sharing responsibilities through tripartite partnerships were gaining mainstream support (as reflected amongst the participants).

- Most of the questions raised were concerned with “**how**” to shift from the current position, e.g.:
 - a) How to transit from the current relatively passive welfare provision approach to an active social investment approach;
 - b) The need for more specific guidance and concrete actions for the Welfare sector on **how** to effect the transition from the current welfare provision mode to a social investment mode;
 - c) How to extend the conference discussion within the sector, particularly involving front-line staff and in greater depth within each organization or districts, to bring about mindset changes
 - d) The need to develop further **dialogue** and shared **platforms** to engage the business and NGOs sectors to achieve closer mutual understanding and foster joint actions;
 - e) Investigate what motivates the business sector’s interest in social investment and commitment to developing tripartite partnerships; and
 - f) How to **demonstrate returns** from social investment.

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- Some respondents expressed doubts and/or reservations about the need to revisit welfare philosophies and strategies. These participants were of the view that the welfare sector had always taken a social investment approach, and therefore there was no need for any major changes in mindsets, programme designs or resource reprioritization. Another 10 agreed with the change directions but preferred a slower pace and narrower scale of change.
- There were divergent views expressed by both the contributors and participants about the roles of the “first” / Government sector in developing future tripartite partnerships and on whether the Government should take a more proactive role or step back. There were strong disagreements over one of the speaker’s views that the Government should only play a minimal and non-interventionist role. The majority advocated for the Government to take a stronger facilitating role to lead the changes.
- A few issues or actions previously advocated by some of sector opinion leaders did not seem to feature prominently in the participant responses. For instance, the need for a welfare “blueprint”/ plan was mentioned in 6 response forms.
- The response forms provided a rich source of information of stakeholder views at this juncture. The Bureau and the Department planned to take into account the response patterns and implications to take forward the next phases of the exercise.

Responses to the first session on shifting welfare philosophies

- *Total number of forms received was 252.*
- *The numbers in bracket indicated the number of responses for each category/item.*
- *A small number of participants had signed the response forms.*

1. The points that participants most agreed with (*total no of responses: 215*)

1.1. Overall Development [211 responses in support]

- Social welfare should take on the social investment approach. (59)
- The change direction of welfare should shift from social welfare to social development. Social policy must move with the time. The shift towards a social investment approach is the expected trend (27)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- Multi-sector collaboration should be implemented (26)
- Social and economy policies should be integrated and complementary (20)
- Social capital is not new for HK and can be implemented (30)
- Social investment requires social infra-structure (20)
- Social capital can become effective. (3)

1.2. Values that were most endorsed:

- Community Capacity / Social Capital Building (9)
- A caring and healthy community. (6)
- Empowerment (7)
- Equity (2)
- Equal in opportunity (2)

1.3. Comments on Role of Government [4 responses in support]

- Increase employment and encourage more retired people to do voluntary work (3)
- Promote a wider perspective of social policy & welfare policy (1)

Total responses in support: 215

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

2. The points that participants most disagreed with (*total no. of responses: 41*)

2.1. Overall Development [33 responses expressed concerns over one of the contributor's comments on the long-term sustainability of the welfare system in respect of issues such as retirement, employment, economic participations and independence]

- Overlooking the unreasonably low paid employment. (6)
- People should not necessarily retire (5)
- A capital budget may lead to further exclusion of some marginalized groups (5)
- Social investment enhances people's ability to work (5)
- Policy to exempt retired employees from paying tax (4)
- Promote inter-dependence, rather than independence. (3)
- Elderly people should continue to work (3)
- Volunteer work (1)
- Social welfare not totally linked with economic participation. (1)

2.2. Other comments [8 responses in disagreement]

1. Social welfare (provision in HK) is not the same as redistributive welfare (4)
2. Traditional welfare NGOs should play a leading role in building social infrastructure (3)
3. Shouldn't just focused on those who "failed"; instead, attention should be directed at improving education and nurturing our young people (1)

Total responses: 41

3. The questions that participants would like to ask (*total no. of response: 85*)

3.1. Overall Development

- **What** made some of the projects successful? Are there definitive proposals to develop "social investment"? (6)
- **How** to make the public understand and accept the concepts? (6)
- **What** would be the **effects** of providing employment to the elders on youth employment? (5)
- **What** is the current priority in community capital building? (4)
- **What** is the aim of social investment and its direction? (4)
- **What** are the expected social returns that we are looking for? (3)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- **How** to define economic growth? (3)
- **What** is the path from social investment to achieving social capital (2)
- **How** to support the social welfare staff to achieve new goals? (1)

Answers and comments:

- This Conference was designed to include both conceptual and experience contributions. Academics explored topics such as what is social capital, sustainable social development, differences between passive welfare provision to active social investment approaches, shared responsibilities and implications of tripartite partnerships. Other contributors shared their valuable practical experiences, illustrating common critical success factors (CSF) and pathways to social capital development through the local projects they presented. Such CSF include the Project team's commitment to taking a social investment approach; trust in the participants' ability to contribute by actively involving them; active participant involvement in the projects; focus on linking social capital across social groups, emphasis on building capacity and networks for self-help and mutual help; high level of participant self-management of the projects; cross sector collaboration, and use of various empowerment strategies with developmental outcomes.

3.2. Role of Government

- What is the government's role in building up the tri-sectors collaborations (23)
- Any plans to promote and build up social capital? (26)

Answers and comments:

- The Government will continue to be one of the key partners in promoting the partnership concepts, clarifying expectations, facilitating formation of tripartite collaboration, sharing responsibilities and contributing resources in support of collaborative initiatives with social capital outcomes.

3.3. Other comments

- Reasons of rejection of some CIIF applications? (1)
- If social infrastructure is important to social capital development, then how could some of the community services be sustained without a community base (infra-structure), because the CIIF's approved project funding did not seem to include rental? (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

Answers and comments

- 46 Projects with funding totaling \$36.8M had been approved by the CIIF Committee over the last 16 months. For a new fund promoting a new social capital concept, the level of approval can be considered quite substantial. Some of the approved projects have been implemented with early results, and their experience was being shared during the Conference.
- The proportion of CIIF proposals being accepted by the CIIF Committee for had been steadily increasing each of the previous three batches. The increasing success rate was due partly to the prospective applicants gaining from the practical examples of the approved projects.
- The main reasons for some of the earlier proposals were not been supported: the applicants were not eligible, the proposals duplicated significantly with existing subvented services and that the social capital potential was not clearly illustrated.
- It should be noted that, instead of outright rejection, the CIIF Committee would provide advice and feedback to applicants who had submitted proposals with potentials on areas that might benefit from revisions to encourage their resubmissions.
- Many of the approved Project Budgets did include rental costs where justified.

4. Comments on the contents of the 1st session (*total no of response: 160*)

4.1. Overall Positive Comments (130 responses)

- Informative / interesting/ clear in concept/ agreed with the dual emphasis on theory and practical example (59)
- Stimulating and fruitful discussions (30)
- Good / good to refresh the mind (28)
- Very good framework (6)
- The presentation by Dr Joe Leung is very enlightening (5)
- Very useful overview and real life examples (2)

4.2. Neutral Responses (5 responses)

- Fair, would be better if more concentrated (5)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

4.3. Negative Comments and Suggestions (25 responses)

- Insufficient time (10)
- Too macro (5)
- Similar cases of self-employment (3)
- Would like more dialogue with the speakers (3)
- Unclear / too theoretical, not practical at all (2)
- Should be more focusing and elaborating on social investment (1)
- Provide more in-depth analysis of the welfare situation in HK (1)

Answer and comments:

- The rationale for the programme design that combined both theories and applications of the social investment approaches was explained in the earlier answers.
- In view of the large numbers involved (with around 450 participants) and the timeframe concerned, most of the participants had found the small group discussions and exchanges around the table to be more fruitful than an open forum approach.
- The suggestion for further in-depth analysis of the welfare situation in Hong Kong was noted for future deliberations.

5. Suggestions on the way forward (*total no of response: 84*)

5.1. Role of Government

- Some focus to continue the discussion & formulation / Need more discussions across different sectors (28)
- Government's role in promoting the tripartite collaboration (22)
- More potential guides & information on social investment & capital. More promotion of the successful cases to enhance public credibility. Increase education / marketing to the community (10)
- Build on our existing strengths (5)
- Welfare plan review / develop a 10 years social development strategy (6)
- Consolidating the views of sectors (4)
- Build up and develop a better retirement system (3)
- Increase tax rate and encourage donation and help (3)
- Submit proposals to CIIF (1)
- Would like the CIIF to reconsider whether the project effectiveness is in reasonable proportion to the level of CIIF funding (1).

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- *Report the conclusion of the table discussion by email(1)*

Answer and comments

- The roles of the Bureau in taking forward the deliberation and development exercises could be those of a leader, facilitator, partner or participant, depending on the circumstances. The Bureau will take note of the many specific and helpful suggestions made to take forward the deliberation exercise. While it might be appropriate for the Bureau to continue its leading roles in some areas, it would welcome joint efforts with other sectors and would encourage the NGOs to initiate in-depth discussion within its own organizations or within the sector.

Thoughtform #2 Individual Responses to the 2nd session on Future Partnerships (*Total number of forms received- 181, names in bracket are those respondents who have identified themselves*)

1. The points that participants most agreed with (*total no of response: 171*)

1.1. The importance of social investment and tripartite partnerships

- Tripartite partnership is important for social capital (24)
- Cross sectoral collaboration must be based on cohesion, consensus and shared values before progressing further to joint community projects with win-win outcomes. (11)
- Building a tripartite partnership is very important, a viable way to build SC but we need to establish a common language (7)
- The 3 parties have diverse practices in resource allocation and use and we need to establish consensus before we can work together. (6)
- We should put our efforts into sharing our perspectives (each other's needs and wants, as well as expectation) with one another in the tripartite relationships. (5)
- Social intra-structure is important (1)
- The concept of social investment helps bring about harmony, social stability and economic prosperity, as the saying goes to a cohesive family will prosper; and wealth is generated through harmony (2)
- Echoed with concepts like “together we build” through community networking; each and every one of us has the potential to contribute; social investment needs to go hand in hand with social infrastructure

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

development. (1)

- We need communication, understanding, and recognition (1)

1.2. Role of the Government

- Government should play a more active role: provide a conducive environment - remove unnecessary barriers and restrictions for the 2nd and 3rd sectors to work together (6) and when required, the Government should provide some seed money (3) [total 9]
- Government should only take the role of facilitator with less intervention (10)
- Government should facilitate dialogue between 3 sectors (4)
- How to bridge 3 sectors (3)
- Some seems to agree the government should be non-interventionist:
 - Total non-intervention (3)
 - Agree to some extent with Mr Bernard Chan's viewpoints of minimalist government intervention to allow the business and the 3rd sector to interact amongst them. Yet government should still has a role to play - focusing on providing social infrastructure and other basic logistic support, facilitating and promoting a collaborative culture, giving recognition to those contributing parties. (1)

1.3. Role of the business sector

- Let business sectors understand social services with less jargons and more involve business sectors in development of social capital (not only money, but also effort) (26)
- The fact that "Business sector only talks about "interest"" is too hard to ignore. NGOs need to educate the sector and at the same time speak their language. (5)
- Happy to know that the business sector is "ready". (3)
- Not only large companies, but small and medium companies can also play an important role in social investment but HOW (3)
- More caring companies to bridge between 2nd & 3rd sectors (2)
- Apart from monetary contribution, business sector can help in non-monetary contribution such as human resources, expertise and facilities (2)
- The business sector having little understanding in social investment and having forum as such will enhance each other's understanding. Business sector appears to be very practical and they only seems to be interested in the word "INCREASE", yet it becomes a very good "tip" for NGO to speak their language.

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

(2)

- Not all businessmen are “cunning and corrupt”, but they are probably the exception (1)
- Not easy to define the corporate social responsibility of business sector. (1)
- Must change the business sector’s perception on the 3rd sector: i.e. we simply take whatever they give. (1)

1.4. Role of the 3rd sector

- 3rd sectors have to know business sectors' needs and expectations (9)
- Civil society organizations, like the glue, can help accumulate social capital (7)
- Develop common values and change of existing mode of handling method for sustaining the social development (5)
- Sustainable development can’t rest on hanging onto outdated ways, and that social workers will need to have more reflection in getting their mindsets more aligned. (3)
- We need to sit in the chairs of the business corporations, and see their points of view and challenges if we want to interact successfully. Otherwise our effort will have little chance of success. (1)
- Engaging business sector is kind of long-term investment (1)
- While applying for support, need to attend to the interests of the funders (1)
- Social workers have to change their views (1)

1.5. Agree with speakers view

- Agree with cross disciplinary standards (4)
- Develop professional guideline (2)
- Not enough understanding among business and 3rd sectors (2)
- Cross-profession and cross-sector training should start from education (1)
- Appreciate the concept and method of “caring estate project” and its establishment of “caring index” (1)

2. The points that participants most disagreed with (*total no of response: 44*)

2.1. Role of the Government [i.e. most of the responses in this section indicate that they considered it necessary for the Government to take some sort of roles]

- Government need not to involve in business and 3rd sector partnership (6)
- Government should do nothing (2) / the Government is only a facilitator. (3)
- The role of the state. In the tripartite relationship, I think the state should

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

assume a larger role in organizing and facilitating the partnerships between different sectors concerning issues such as wider social / economic policies. (2)

- Not agree with the point that government should not “intervene”. Government should have a role to play in providing a level-playing platform so that interested parties, regardless big or small can have a fair game to play. Otherwise, small-sized firms may be forced out of the market; also interest of the society may sometimes be sacrificed for the interest of making business. (2)
- Dr Kwok mentioned the 3 sectors in his speech but only saying the 2nd and the 3rd should actively involve, whereas the government will only need set the policy direction and provide seed money, does it mean that the government would like to shift its responsibility to the 2 sectors? (1)
- Government should take the lead (1)
- Government is caring of whole people (1)
- Hong Kong’s problem is agency-based, and cooperation with less systematic trust (1)

2.2. Role of the business sector

- Doubt if the business sector is “ready”, even if it is, not the entire business sector is willing to participate in welfare service (especially in times of economic downturn) , would that be one-sided wish only? (10)
- Business sector is ready (2)
- Business sector is a giver. (1)
- The success of the “caring company” initiative (1)
- The collaboration of private rest homes and medical outreach teams is not a cross-sectoral collaboration. (1)
- The criteria used by PCCW in sponsorship to welfare programme need to be revisited. (1)
- Recognition of commercial firm spending little in charity (1)

2.3. Role of the 3rd sector

- 3rd sector should take up the responsibility of services continuous development (1)
- Social workers training with 100 hours field work placement in social welfare services (1)

2.4. Speakers’ views

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- Not agree with the point that “part of the fieldwork placement of social work students be put after the graduation. (2)
- The concept of “pendulum” by Nelson Chow’s may not be applicable to current situation. (1)
- Cross-profession and cross-sector training should start from pre-education (1)
- Not only tripartite partnership, should involve individual (1)
- Develop professional guideline (1)

3. The questions that participants would like to ask (*total no of response: 88*)

3.1. Expectations on the government

- What is the main role of the Government in the tripartite partnership (6) / to what extent should government participate? (1)
- How to balance the benefits between different sectors (4)? How to balance the diverse interests of the tripartite parties; the role of Government in building trust? How to get mindset changed? (3)
- Who should start liaison for tripartite partnership (2)
- How to link up 3 sectors (2)
- What are the platforms for cross-sectors cooperation (2)
- Any model setting for reference (2)
- Which party should shoulder the responsibility in bridging up the business sector and social welfare sector? (1)
- Should it be the role of government or the HKCSS to build the collaborative platform to pull together the 3rd sector and the business sector? Is there any standardized implementation system? (1)
- Those “ready” are largely big corporations. What is the role of the Government in getting those small to medium enterprises in the community “ready”? (1)
- Large NGOs may have greater advantage over small to medium firms to partner with business sector, so how to raise the competitive advantage of SMEs? (1)
- How to avoid tripartite partnership being treated as political tools (1)
- Will the Government take care of the areas that no business sectors would be interested to invest (1)
- How much of Government’s subvented resources is involved in supporting CIIF projects (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

3.2. Shall we talk and how?

- How (more concrete plans needed) to increase the dialogue between business and the 3rd sectors and establish a common language amongst the 3 parties (10)
- How to promote volunteerism and the concept of social investment within the business sector? (3)
- Further detail re the factors that make social investment **attractive** to the business sector (1)

3.3. Expectations on the business sector

- How to involve business sectors (including SMEs) (11)
- How to cultivate amongst the business sector the culture of corporate social responsibility? Only by doing that the sector is willing to shoulder greater commitment and responsibility. (4)
- To what extent is the business sector ready (4)
- How to recognize business sectors' participation and contribution (3)
- Would it be possible for the business sector to host similar sharing forum with other sectors to participate? (2)
- How to approach the business sector? Are there any contact or reference materials? (2)
- How to inspire functional staff with social capital concept (2)
- What is the “return” for business sector to participate in social welfare? (1)
- How to extend the caring company initiative at grassroot level? (1)
- Provide more names of business organization sponsorship (1)
- When to talk with business sector (1)
- More analysis on welfare behaviours by business sectors (1)
- Hearing the experience from existing organizations on matching NGOs' sponsorship in HK (1)

3.4. Questions relating to the 3rd sector

- How should NGOs develop social capital (1)
- What is the 3rd sector (1)

3.5. Questions for speakers

- How to avoid social investment becoming (a life of toil without reprieve)? (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- How to establish “caring index”? (1)
- What is good corporate citizenship? How to implement it territory-wide? (1)
- Would like to know contents of rules(泛專業守則)as raised by Dr Joseph Kwok and its subsequent implementation? (1)
- Would like to know more about the practical ways to changing mindset and building collaboration as mentioned in “keynote speech”. (1)
- What is tripartite partnership? (1)
- Queries on speaker's speech (1)
- What is the purpose and expected achievement of the forum (1)
- Why only 5 participants from business sectors (1)

Answers and comments

- Most of the questions and issues arising from the second session were mainly concerned with the need for communication or collaboration platforms from which shared understanding of what tripartite partnerships are all about could be established, the gaps of expectations bridged; and roles clarified. The questions raised will no doubt form the basis of further dialogues and initiatives to establish collaborative platforms.
- Many of the participants had multiple affiliations, and the number from the business sectors was far more than 5. The design of this particular conference was focused on the third sector as it was felt that the first priority should be placed on revising welfare philosophies and directions and clarifying expectations for future partnerships first with the third sector so that future dialogues on tripartite partnerships with the business sector could be more productive.
- There were no additional Government allocations for implementing the CIIF, and was being managed within the Bureau's existing resources.

4. Comments on 2nd session (*total no of response: 94*)

4.1. Good to see business sector participation

- The participation of business sector for sure had widened NGO's perspective, getting more confidence in getting their involvement. (13)
- Discussions very stimulating, lively, clear and practical and fruitful. (12)
- Good & Rich content (9)
- Good speakers presentation (7)
- To the point & informative (5)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- Fruitful presentation by NGOs on networking with business sectors (1)
- Widened perspectives towards 3rd sector requirement (1)
- Thought-provoking even though difficult to put into practice. Should talk more about HOW (5)
- The speakers were very practical in reference to the difficulties corporations face. That practicality and honesty was very helpful. (3)
- Look forward to hearing more sharing from big corp. (1)
- The business sector has expressed their willingness to fund NGOs and what the NGOs need to do is to come up with proposal that can whet their appetite (i.e. think on the feet, the clients' feet) Likewise, business sector should also listen to issues of NGOs' concern. (1)
- Happy to see that the business sector is willing to contribute in social welfare development and it is hoped that their contribution can extend to education sector. (1)
- Comprehensive by having different sectors including academic, frontline NGOs as well as SWD to give their views. (1)

4.2. Needed more time and dialogue

- A few negative comments about the presentations:
 - Not good speakers presentation (2)
 - Not useful and boring (2)
 - The content is weak (1)
 - Distracting PowerPoint (1)
 - The presentations of large corporation is like advertisement, giving them a chance to promote and sell their products (2)
 - Too broad content with repeated information (1)
- Comments about the programme format
 - Too rushed, too long presentation and too tight schedule (8)
 - Not enough dialogue, problem with the design of the entire programme rundown. The organizer should design in such a way that participants and the speakers can have greater chance to interact, to talk to each other. What's the point for project sharing – seemed to be quite irrelevant to the theme? The contents are too "factual" and "mechanical". Very disappointed with some of the speakers' talks. (2)
 - Should leave more time to fill in the response form and group discussion. (1)
 - Not sufficient time for enquiring effective ways to involve business sectors

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

(1)

- Seemed that the 1st sector, the state, was excluded in the discussion. (1)
- No mention on shortage of resource for NGOs to develop networks (1)
- No new idea as business partnership or sponsorship already exist (1)

Comments and responses

- The designs of future sessions will certainly take account of the time management issues raised as well as retaining the positive elements (such as the balance of theories and practice and the roundtable discussion approach).

4.3. Other comments on developing future partnerships

- We don't need the government to teach us how to do things; all we need is their support, recognition and networking. (11)
- Government should play an important role to: (8)
 - enhance tripartite partnership (2)
 - present concrete samples for reference (as done at the conference) (2)
 - provide more practical examples relating to business involvement (1)
 - create common criteria in focus group for how the tripartite partnerships work and be evaluated for effectiveness for all partners and HK society (1)
 - look at what attracts the sponsorship from business sectors (1)
 - develop evaluation standards for business sector to assess the return of their contribution to 3rd sectors (1)
- Social workers have to change their views on understand more business sectors and rethink of their professional (1)
- Useful to have first-hand views from business sectors (1)

5. Suggestions on way forward (*total no of responses: 83*)

5.1. Role of the Government

- **Government should take a stronger lead:** (sub-total: 47)
 - More thought on how to **invite business sectors** (15)
 - Follow-up actions to engage the business sector, motivate them and gain their commitment. (7)
 - Liaise with other public enterprise such as Town Gas, and the 2 railway companies, etc to let them understand the work being done by social welfare sector. (5)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- SWD/ The Bureau can organize more forums / programmes for all the 3 sectors to talk directly. (4)
- SWD should take the lead to liaise organizations within districts to strengthen community network. (1)
- develop common value (2)
- actively promote the tripartite partnership, making all parties feel enthusiastic and interested in each other's work, and government could take the lead and facilitate both the process as well as the outcome. (4)
- set up an organization to coordinate tripartite partnership (4)
- review what is the appropriate role for Government to play (2)
- encourage each district and functional group to discuss SC development in their own sectors, and come up with viable strategy. (1)
- establish rewarding system / provide recognition to business sector. (1)
- worth implementing the "caring city" [Island South Caring Estate project] concept territory-wide. (1)
- **Government** should not cut subvention immediately (1)
- HAB's participation is more important than HWFB in developing social investment (2)

5.2. Further dialogue and action to strengthen the tripartite relationship

- **Government to facilitate more dialogues:**
 - Encourage open discussion & communication among 3 sectors (7)
 - Regular platform for dialogue (7)
 - Keep the dialogue going (3)
 - Hold focus groups with business sectors to find out how they are thinking and what they advise for positioning for social capital move (3)
 - Forum to be organized for business sectors (2)
 - Need to interact in face-to-face encounters and identify problems in the way of closer co-operation. Then we can target them effectively. (1)
 - Apart from training, programme or activities that enable people to influence each other is also considered effective. (1)
 - Not a criticism but would like to see greater business sector involvement (especially personnel from SMEs and multi-national firms) in future discussions. (1)
 - Motivate SMEs' participation (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- HKCSS to consider facilitating co-operation between NGOs and private firms by helping approach the firms and supply the list of those “willing” firms to the NGOs to follow up themselves for further partnering. (1)
- Provide more names of business organization sponsorship (1)

5.3. Role of the 3rd sector

- The social welfare sector need to better equip themselves before they can gain recognition of others in promoting social development. (1)
- How can the 3rd sector pull their experience together to work with the business sector and how the 3 parties should work together to create a shared vision? (1)
- We may apply the concepts generated by the business sector in the community. (1)
- Re-think strategic approach to penetrate network power to 3rd sector (1)
- Extension of Caring Company by HKCSS (1)
- To balance the interest of private enterprise and society as a whole, we need to appeal to the social responsibility interest of the business sector so as not to turn the Caring Company initiative into an activity of advertisement for sponsorship only. (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

Thoughtform #3 Responses to the 3rd session – total received 43

1. The points that participants most agreed with (*total no. Of responses: 28*)

1.1. Overall Development

- Tripartite partnership is important for building up social capital in the community (9)
- Tripartite partnership help to create the synergy in the community (1)

1.2. Role of Government

- Government should take the lead to enhance the tripartite partnership, such as building up the dialogue platform for different sectors' communications (7)
- Social investment not equivalent/replace the present welfare policy (1)

1.3. Role of Business

- Change mindset of business and social welfare sector (3)
- Demonstrate the business operating spirit in the social welfare sector (1)

1.4. Others

- Those who can afford to pay should pay (1)
- Endorsed Mr Wilfred Wong's conclusion: "Heart first, and then money will come", 5S, and government should take the leading role (5)

2. The points that participant most disagreed with (*total no. Of responses: 5*)

2.1. Overall Development

- Social investment is the future direction of the social welfare development (1)

2.1. Role of Government

- The government should not intervene and just let business and 3rd sector to interact (1)

2.3. Others

- CSSA may enhance dependence. (Actually, CSSA might not enhance dependence, but make the society more stable. The main point is to how to help those don't want to apply CSSA and keep independence by themselves) (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- Those who can afford to pay should pay (1)
- Just “heart” is enough (1)

3. The questions that participants would like to ask (total no. of responses: 13)

3.1. Overall Development

- Clarify the concept of social investment and how does it relate to social welfare? (1)
- How to strike a balance between social investment and social welfare provision? (1)

3.2. Role of Government

- What is the government’s role in building up collaboration amongst the 3 sectors? (1)
- Any plan to help those vulnerable groups? (1)
- How can the Government address the negative conflicting interests in resource allocation and utilization between the 2nd and 3rd sector (1)
- Any plan to update the future social welfare policy? (2)
- Any plan to promote and build up social capital? (1)

3.3. Role of Business

- Social enterprise = social entrepreneur? (1)
- NGOs running enterprises = Private sector running social enterprise? (1)
- In what sense is that the Business sector is “ready”? (1)
- How to enhance tripartite partnership with only 5 participants coming from the business sectors? (1)
- How to build up the consistent mindsets between the three sectors? (1)

4. Comments on the contents of the 3rd session (total no. of responses: 18)

4.1. Suggestion

- Provide the direction of the development of social capital but it needs a practical implementation and collaboration platform between partners. (1)
- To form a task force with representatives from various government bureaus, the welfare and business sectors to formulate concrete plans on promoting tripartite cooperation at the policy and executive levels. (1)
- Promote and involve those rich people not in the business sector. (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

- To advocate this idea (of what each individual can contribute to society) in the community (1)
- Priority must be placed on mobilizing productive energy. A society needs productive energy and capability before it can effectively generate wealth and resources; and a society with wealth would be able to provide care for the frail and young. If we place emphasis on care provision (without development of productive capability), then society's resources will soon be exhausted. Productive energy refers to more than money and income. A society's resources include people's experience, time and energy. The focus of society should be placed on developing productive capability. (1)

4.2. Overall Comments

- Good but short, suggests having more discussion in future. (6)
- Interesting but running out of time. (2)
- Good conclusion (by Wilfred Wong) (1)
- Short and sharp presentation. (1)
- Stimulating and fruitful discussion (3)

5. Suggestions on the way forward (*total no of responses: 21*)

5.1. Role of Government

- To build up platform for NGO and private sector to explore the opportunity for collaboration effort (7)
- To organize more forum/discussion to encourage community-wide participation (4)
- SWD should set up the task groups and time frame to promote the concept of social capital in the community (1)
- To improve the Government's efficiency through internal reflection (1)
- Encourage academics and experts' participation in planning the future social welfare policy (1)
- To promote volunteering service within the Government (1)
- Use the (recently announced) \$2 billion fund wisely (2)
- Implement appropriate reward schemes to attract business participation (1)
- Upload the participants' comments in government web site (1)

5.2. Role of Business

- Business should match the need of the community (1)

3 April Conference on Social Investment and Future Partnerships – Participants Responses/Questions and Suggestions

5.3. Overall Comment

- There needs to be in-depth discussion within each sector, to increase proper understanding of the social capital concept. In the first instance, each sector should clearly define its own function before promoting its contributions to social capital development. This is a more feasible approach to establish consensus on social capital. Government should include the development of social capital a key requirement for welfare subvention. (1)