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## PREFACE

The Government has strengthened our social safety nets over the last decade by investing heavily in education, healthcare, housing, employment and retirement adequacy for Singaporeans. The social safety nets comprise broad-based schemes and subsidies that benefit many, complemented by targeted support schemes, and a network of government and community agencies that provides assistance for low-income and vulnerable groups that need additional help. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Government introduced additional support schemes to further strengthen these social safety nets. Within these multiple layers of assistance, ComCare continues to play a critical role in supporting low-income households with their living expenses, as it has since its inception in 2005.

This report provides an overview of the profile of households assisted by ComCare over the last five financial years. ComCare assistance is provided through the Social Service Offices (SSOs) run by the Ministry of Social and Family Development. Besides cash assistance, ComCare beneficiaries also receive assistance with household bills and medical bills, employment assistance (e.g. job searches and training), and referrals to other government agencies and community partners for case work and counselling, as needed. This support helps to provide individuals with the means to stabilise their circumstances, and then work towards self-reliance if they are able to.

## DEFINITIONS

## Applicants

- "Individual assisted" refers to any household member assisted by ComCare.
- "Main applicant" refers to the household member who applied for and was assisted by ComCare.
- Each household assisted by ComCare has one main applicant. In total, each household may have one or more individuals assisted.


## Highest Educational Qualification Attained

- "No formal/primary qualification" refers to those who have no formal educational qualification or received primary-level education, including those who did and did not pass the Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE).
- "Secondary qualification" refers to those who received secondary-level education, including those who did and did not pass the GCE "O" or "N" Level.
- "Post-secondary qualification (non-tertiary)" refers to those who have ITE/vocational education or professional qualifications.
- "Post-secondary qualification (tertiary)" refers to those who have polytechnic, university, or post-graduate qualifications.
- "Not reported" refers to instances where no information was available on the individuals' educational qualifications.


## Employment Status

- "Working" refers to those who were holding full-time or part-time jobs.
- "Seeking employment" refers to those who were not working but were looking for jobs.
- "Not working - Medically unfit" refers to those who were certified to be unfit for work by a healthcare professional.
- "Not working - Others" refers to those without regular employment or were not working for reasons (e.g. caregiving) other than medical conditions or retirement.
- "Not reported" refers to instances where no information was available on the individuals' employment status.


## Marital Status

- "Not reported" refers to instances where no information was available on the individuals' marital status.


## Dwelling Type

- "Institutions" refer to homes and centres which provide specialised care, e.g. nursing homes and elderly aged homes.
- "Not reported" refers to instances where no information was available on the individuals' dwelling type.


## LIST OF FIGURES

Snapshot of ComCare Households in FY2021
Salient Trends
Figure 1 Number of Households Assisted (by ComCare Schemes), FY2017-FY2021
Figure 2a SMTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 2b Individuals Assisted with SMTA by Age Group, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 3a LTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 3b Individuals Assisted with LTA by Age Group, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 4a SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 4b SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 5a LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 5b LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 6a SMTA Households by Employment Status of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 6b Individuals Assisted with SMTA by Employment Status, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 6c SMTA Households by Number of Employed Household Members, FY2017FY2021
Figure 7 SMTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant, FY2017FY2021
Figure 8 LTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 9 SMTA Households by Dwelling Type, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 10 SMTA Households by Household Size, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 11 LTA Households by Dwelling Type, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 12 LTA Households by Household Size, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 13 SMTA Households by Household Composition, FY2017-FY2021
Figure 14 LTA Households by Household Composition, FY2017-FY2021

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SMTA : ComCare Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance scheme

LTA : ComCare Long-Term Assistance scheme (also known as Public Assistance)
SCFA : Student Care Fee Assistance scheme

For more information on ComCare schemes, please refer to https://msf.gov.sg/ComCare.

## SNAPSHOT OF COMCARE HOUSEHOLDS IN FY2021
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## SALIENT TRENDS

The overall number of unique households assisted yearly with SMTA, LTA and SCFA was stable at around 37,000 to 39,000 per year from FY2017 to FY2019, and increased significantly to 46,000 in FY2020, before decreasing slightly to 45,000 in FY2021. The trend was due to the larger number of households assisted with SMTA in FY2020 and FY2021, as the total number of households assisted yearly with LTA (at around 4,000 to 4,400) and SCFA (at around 7,300 to 8,800 ) remained relatively stable over FY2017 to FY2021. Arising from the economic impact of COVID-19 as well as flexibilities exercised in the last two years to allow more households to receive SMTA, the number of households assisted with SMTA in FY2020 and FY2021 was higher than in pre-COVID years.


From FY2020 to FY2021, the proportion of SMTA main applicants who were seeking employment decreased ( $22.3 \%$ to $18.9 \%$ ), while the proportion of SMTA main applicants who were working increased ( $25.0 \%$ to $26.7 \%$ ), suggesting that some SMTA clients may have managed to secure employment as the job market improves. The proportion of those not working increased ( $51.6 \%$ to $54.2 \%$ ), reversing the dip in FY2020 due to COVID-19. This is partly due to the increase in the proportion of SMTA clients who were retirees (15.2\% to 16.3\%).


Main Applicant Employment Status FY2017 - FY2021

## KEY TRENDS

## KEY TRENDS

## I) ComCare Households Assisted

1 The total number of households assisted yearly with LTA (at around 4,000 to 4,400 ) and SCFA (at around 7,300 to 8,800) remained relatively stable over FY2017 to FY2021, although a slight decline in the number of households assisted with LTA was observed over the five financial years. However, with the economic impact of COVID-19 and flexibilities exercised to allow more households to receive SMTA, the number of households assisted with SMTA in FY2020 increased significantly compared to previous years. The number of SMTA households decreased slightly in FY2021 although not to pre-COVID-19 levels.

Figure 1: Number of Unique Households Assisted, by ComCare Scheme


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year. Hence, the same household might be counted more than once across schemes in a given financial year, if it received assistance from more than one scheme in that year.

2 On the whole, the profiles of households on SMTA and LTA remained similar over the past five financial years. This was observed across the demographic characteristics, i.e. age group, highest educational qualification attained, employment status, marital status, sex, dwelling type, household size and household composition.

## II) ComCare Households - Age Group Distribution

## About half of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance main applicants were aged 45-64

3 Households with main applicants aged 45-64 made up approximately half of the households assisted with SMTA. This trend was consistent from FY2017 to FY2021.

4 The proportion of SMTA main applicants aged 55-64 increased from 23.8\% in FY2017 to $26.2 \%$ in FY2021, while the proportion aged 45-54 decreased across the five financial years, from 25.5\% in FY2017 to 21.9\% in FY2021.

Figure 2a: SMTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. Age was taken as at end of each financial year (i.e. 31 March). There could be main applicants aged below 15 because (i) the adults in the household were incarcerated or (ii) the children were orphans.

5 Within households, the proportion of individuals assisted with SMTA across all age groups remained consistent from FY2017 to FY2021. Individuals aged 19 and below made up slightly over one-third of all individuals assisted with SMTA.

Figure 2b: Individuals Assisted with SMTA by Age Group, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):

1. Each individual was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. Age was taken as at end of each financial year (i.e. 31 March).

## The majority of Long-Term Assistance main applicants were aged 65 and above

6 Households with main applicants aged 65 and above remained the largest proportion of households assisted with LTA, a consistent trend observed across FY2017 to FY2021. This proportion also increased, from 79.4\% in FY2017 to 81.7\% in FY2021.

Figure 3a: LTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. Age was taken as at end of each financial year (i.e. 31 March). There could be main applicants aged below 15 because (i) the adults in the household were incarcerated or (ii) the children were orphans.

7 Within households, the proportion of individuals assisted with LTA across all age groups remained consistent from FY2017 to FY2021. Individuals aged 65 and above continued to make up the majority of all individuals assisted with LTA, at about $80 \%$ each year.

Figure 3b: Individuals Assisted with LTA by Age Group, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):

1. Each individual was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. Age was taken as at end of each financial year (i.e. 31 March).

## III) ComCare Households - Highest Educational Qualification Attained

## The majority of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance main applicants had secondary-level education or below

8 Households with main applicants with secondary-level education or below remained the largest proportion of households assisted with SMTA. This has been consistent across FY2017 to FY2021, fluctuating slightly across the years between $72.8 \%$ to $77.3 \%$.

Figure 4a: SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant, FY2017FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

9 The majority of individuals in households assisted with SMTA had a highest education qualification of secondary-level and below. This was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021. However, the proportion of such individuals in SMTA households decreased from 72.7\% in FY2017 to $68.7 \%$ in FY2021, while the proportion with post-secondary education increased from 17.1\% in FY2017 to 21.3\% in FY2021.

Figure 4b: SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household, FY2017FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

The majority of Long-Term Assistance main applicants had primary-level education or below

10 Households with main applicants with highest education qualification at primary-level education or below remained the largest proportion of households assisted with LTA, a consistent trend across FY2017 to FY2021. However, this proportion decreased consistently from FY2017 (70.9\%) to FY2021 (67.9\%).

Figure 5a: LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

11 The majority of individuals in households assisted with LTA also had a highest education qualification of primary-level and below. This was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021. However, the proportion of such individuals decreased in the last five years, from 69.8\% in FY2017 to 67.7\% in FY2021.

Figure 5b: LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each individual was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

## IV) ComCare Households - Employment Status

## Almost half of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance main applicants were employed or seeking employment

12 Households with main applicants who were either employed or seeking employment made up slightly below half of the households assisted with SMTA. This was consistent from FY2017 to FY2021.

13 The proportion of SMTA main applicants who were either employed or seeking employment was around $45 \%$ across FY2017 to FY2021, except for an increase to $47.3 \%$ in FY2020.

14 Across the same period, there was an increase in the proportion of SMTA main applicants who were retirees, from 12.9\% in FY2017 to 16.3\% in FY2021.

Figure 6a: SMTA Households by Employment Status of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under respective scheme in each financial year.

15 Those who were either employed or seeking employment made up around $30 \%$ of the individuals assisted with SMTA. This was consistent from FY2017 to FY2021. The largest proportion of non-working individuals comprised students, averaging 29\% across FY2017 to FY2021.

Figure 6b: Individuals Assisted with SMTA by Employment Status, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each individual was counted once under respective scheme in each financial year.

16 Households with no employed individuals remained the largest proportion of households assisted with SMTA. The proportion of households which had no employed individuals increased from $64.5 \%$ in FY2017 to $66.3 \%$ in FY2019, and decreased to $64.2 \%$ in FY2020 and $62.1 \%$ in FY2021. The proportion of households with one employed individual decreased from $30.0 \%$ in FY2017 to 28.5\% in FY2019, and increased to $30.1 \%$ in FY2020 and 31.9\% in FY2021.

Figure 6c: SMTA Households by Number of Employed Household Members, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under respective scheme in each financial year.

## V) ComCare Households - Marital Status and Sex

## Most Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance main applicants were married or males

17 Households with main applicants who were married remained the largest proportion of households assisted with SMTA, followed by those with main applicants who were widowed/separated/divorced. This was consistent between FY2017 and FY2021.

18 The proportion of SMTA main applicants who were married was largely similar across the five financial years at around $37 \%$. The proportion of divorced SMTA main applicants increased from 22.9\% in FY2017 to 24.0\% in FY2021.

19 The proportion of male SMTA main applicants made up approximately 54\% of the households assisted with SMTA. This was consistent between FY2017 and FY2021.

20 Among main applicants who were single, the proportion of males remained about twice that of females across FY2017 to FY2021.

21 The top three marital and sex groups of SMTA main applicants remained consistent across FY2017 to FY2021: single males (19.2\%), married males (18.9\%) and married females (17.9\%) in FY2021.

Figure 7: SMTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

## Most Long-Term Assistance main applicants were singles or males

22 Households with main applicants who were single remained the largest proportion of households assisted with LTA. This was consistent between FY2017 and FY2021.

23 The LTA main applicants who were single decreased in proportion across the five financial years, from 69.5\% in FY2017 to 67.9\% in FY2021.

24 The proportion of male LTA main applicants made up approximately $66 \%$ of the households assisted with LTA. This was consistent between FY2017 and FY2021.

25 The top three groups of LTA main applicants were single males, single females and divorced males. This was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021. The proportion of single males was relatively similar across FY2017 to FY2021, although FY2021 recorded the lowest proportion at $46.6 \%$. The proportion of single females remained consistent at about $22 \%$ across FY2017 to FY2021.

26 Divorced LTA main applicants increased in proportion, from 9.3\% in FY2017 to $11.9 \%$ in FY2021 for males, and from 3.4\% in FY2017 to 4.2\% in FY2021 for females. Widowed females decreased in proportion, from 7.3\% in FY2017 to 6.6\% in FY2021.

Figure 8: LTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

## VI) ComCare Households - Dwelling Type and Household Size

## About half of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance households stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats

27 Households that stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats made up about half of those assisted with SMTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 (49.3\%) to FY2021 (50.7\%), with slight fluctuations across these years.

28 The proportion of households that stayed in HDB 3- to 4-room flats decreased from 40.0\% in FY2017 to $37.7 \%$ in FY2019. This increased to $39.6 \%$ in FY2020 and decreased slightly to 39.5\% in FY2021.

Figure 9: SMTA Households by Dwelling Type, FY2017-FY2021


## Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. There were instances of ComCare applicants staying in landed properties. They were not home owners but were staying with family members or friends.

## More than half of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance households were one- to two-person households

29 One- to two-person households made up more than half of those assisted with SMTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021.

30 Although the proportion of one- to two-person SMTA households was consistently above $50 \%$, it varied across the five financial years, with the highest proportion recorded in FY2019 (64.5\%), and the lowest recorded in FY2021 (58.5\%). The proportion of SMTA households with three or more persons decreased from 37.7\% in FY2017 to 35.5\% in FY2019, but increased over the last two financial years, to $41.5 \%$ in FY2021.

Figure 10: SMTA Households by Household Size, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

## More than two-thirds of Long-Term Assistance households stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats

31 Households that stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats remained the largest proportion of those assisted with LTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021.

32 The proportion staying in HDB 1- to 2-room flats increased each year, from $69.0 \%$ in FY2017 to 73.3\% in FY2021. The proportion staying in HDB 3- to 4-room flats decreased from 20.1\% in FY2017 to 19.4\% in FY2020, and increased slightly to 19.6\% in FY2021.

Figure 11: LTA Households by Dwelling Type, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. The number of LTA households included those staying in non-government funded institutions. Individuals staying in government-funded institutions was excluded as their long-term needs were supported using non-ComCare funds.

## The majority of Long-Term Assistance households remained one-person households

33 One-person households remained the largest proportion of those assisted with LTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021.

34 The proportion of one-person LTA households increased between FY2017 (83.2\%) and FY2020 (87.4\%), but decreased to 85.9\% in FY2021.

35 The proportion of two-person LTA households decreased between FY2017 (11.6\%) and FY2020 (9.0\%), but increased to 10.3\% in FY2021.

Figure 12: LTA Households by Household Size, FY2017-FY2021


Note(s):
Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.

## VII) ComCare Households - Household Composition

## Over half of Short-to-Medium-Term Assistance households had elderly and/or children

36 Households with members who were elderly and/or children remained the largest proportion of those assisted with SMTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021.

37 However, the proportion decreased slightly to $53.9 \%$ in the last two financial years, from 55.0\% in FY2017.

38 Correspondingly, the proportion of SMTA households with only adults increased from 45.0\% in FY2017 to $46.1 \%$ in FY2020 and $46.0 \%$ in FY2021.

Figure 13: SMTA Households by Household Composition, FY2017-FY2021


## Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. "Elderly" refers to those aged 65 and above; "adult" refers to those aged 21 to 64 ; and "children" refers to those aged below 21.

## The majority of Long-Term Assistance households were one-person elderly households

39 One-person elderly households remained the largest proportion of those assisted with LTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 to FY2021.

40 The proportion of LTA households with only one elderly person aged 65 and above increased over the last five financial years, from 68.7\% in FY2017 to 72.1\% in FY2021. The proportion was largest in FY2020 at 73.0\%. The proportion of LTA households with only one person aged below 65 was the lowest in FY2021 (13.9\%), out of the last five financial years. Households with two or more persons decreased in proportion in the first four financial years, from 16.8\% in FY2017 to 12.6\% in FY2020, but increased slightly to 14.1\% in FY2021.

Figure 14: LTA Households by Household Composition, FY2017-FY2021


## Note(s):

1. Each household was counted once under the respective scheme in each financial year.
2. Elderly households were defined as those with main applicants aged 65 and above.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

## ComCare Households Assisted

- The overall number of unique households assisted yearly with SMTA was stable from FY2017 to FY2019 and increased significantly in FY2020, in light of COVID-19. While it has decreased slightly in FY2021, the number is not back to pre-COVID levels. COVID-19 had a clear impact on earned income and job stability, although the economy has improved over the last year or so. The total number of unique households assisted yearly with LTA and SCFA has remained relatively stable over the period FY2017 to FY2021.
- In FY2021, 33,911 households, which represented the majority of households receiving ComCare assistance, were assisted with SMTA. 3,926 households were assisted with LTA and 8,800 households received SCFA in the same year.


## Age Group Distribution of ComCare Households

- The proportion of SMTA main applicants aged 55-64 increased from 23.8\% in FY2017 to 26.2\% in FY2021, while the proportion of SMTA main applicants aged 45-54 decreased from 25.5\% in FY2017 to $21.9 \%$ in FY2021. This could be reflective of changes in the broader population due to ageing.
- Within households, the proportion of individuals assisted with SMTA across all age groups remained consistent from FY2017 to FY2021. Individuals aged 19 and below made up slightly over one-third of all individuals assisted with SMTA.
- The proportion of LTA main applicants aged 65 and above has increased consistently from $79.4 \%$ in FY2017 to $81.7 \%$ in FY2021. This could be reflective of changes in the broader population due to ageing.
- Within households, the proportion of individuals assisted with LTA across all age groups remained consistent from FY2017 to FY2021. Since most LTA households are one-person households, akin to the trend observed for ages of main applicants, individuals aged 65 and above continued to make up the majority of all individuals assisted with LTA, at about $80 \%$ each year.

Highest Educational Qualification Attained of ComCare Households

- The proportion of SMTA main applicants with secondary-level education or below decreased from 76.8\% in FY2017 to $74.1 \%$ in FY2021.
- The proportion of individuals in SMTA households with a highest education qualification of secondary-level education or below decreased from 72.7\% in FY2017 to 68.7\% in FY2021.
- The proportion of LTA main applicants with primary-level education or below has been decreasing consistently across FY2017 (70.9\%) to FY2021 (67.9\%).
- The proportion of individuals in LTA households with a highest education qualification of primary-level education or below decreased from 69.8\% in FY2017 to 67.7\% in FY2021.
- These trends could be reflective of the broader population attaining higher educational qualifications in general.


## Employment Status of ComCare Households

- The proportion of SMTA main applicants who were either employed or seeking employment was around 45\% across FY2017 to FY2021, except for a slight increase to 47.3\% in FY2020.
- The proportion of SMTA main applicants who were retirees increased from 12.9\% in FY2017 to $16.3 \%$ in FY2021.
- From FY2017 to FY2021, the proportion of individuals assisted with SMTA who were either employed or seeking employment was around $30 \%$. The largest proportion of non-working individuals were students, averaging 29\%.
- The proportion of SMTA households which had no employed individuals decreased from 64.5\% in FY2017 to 62.1\% in FY2021.


## Marital Status and Sex of ComCare Households

- The top three marital and sex groups of SMTA main applicants remained consistent across FY2017 to FY2021: single male (19.2\%), married male (18.9\%) and married female (17.9\%) in FY2021.
- The proportion of SMTA main applicants who were married was largely similar across FY2017 to FY2021, at around 37\%.
- The top three marital and sex groups of LTA main applicants remained consistent across FY2017 to FY2021: single male (46.6\%), single female (21.3\%) and divorced males (11.9\%) in FY2021.
- The proportion of LTA main applicants who were single decreased from $69.5 \%$ in FY2017 to 67.9\% in FY2021.


## Dwelling Type and Household Size of ComCare Households

- Households that stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats made up about half of those assisted with SMTA. This trend was consistent across FY2017 (49.3\%) to FY2021 (50.7\%), with slight fluctuations in the years in between.
- The proportion of households that stayed in HDB 3- to 4-room flats decreased from $40.0 \%$ in FY2017 to 37.7\% in FY2019. This increased to 39.6\% in FY2020, likely due to the economic impact of COVID-19 on such households, but the proportion decreased slightly to $39.5 \%$ in FY2021.
- Although the proportion of one- to two-person SMTA households was consistently above $50 \%$, it varied across the five financial years, with the highest proportion recorded in FY2019 (64.5\%), and the lowest recorded in FY2021 (58.5\%).
- The proportion of SMTA households with three or more persons decreased from $37.7 \%$ in FY2017 to $35.5 \%$ in FY2019, but increased over the last two financial years, to $41.5 \%$ in FY2021.
- The proportion of LTA households that stayed in HDB 1- to 2-room flats increased from 69.0\% in FY2017 to 73.3\% in FY2021.
- The proportion of LTA households staying in HDB 3- to 4-room flats decreased from $20.1 \%$ in FY2017 to 19.4\% in FY2020, and increased slightly to $19.6 \%$ in FY2021.
- The proportion of one-person LTA households increased between FY2017 (83.2\%) and FY2020 (87.4\%), but decreased to 85.9\% in FY2021.
- The proportion of two-person LTA households decreased between FY2017 (11.6\%) and FY2020 (9.0\%), but increased to $10.3 \%$ in FY2021.


## Household Composition of ComCare Households

- The proportion of SMTA households with elderly (those aged 65 and above) and/or children (those aged below 21) decreased from 55.0\% in FY2017 to 53.9\% in FY2020 and FY2021. This is in line with the observed increase in the proportion of SMTA households with one to two members, and a decrease in the proportion with three of more members, across the five financial years.
- The proportion of LTA households with only one elderly person aged 65 and above increased over the last five financial years, from $68.7 \%$ in FY2017 to $72.1 \%$ in FY2021. The proportion of LTA households with only one person aged below 65 was the lowest in FY2021 (13.9\%), out of the last five financial years.


## APPENDIX

## APPENDIX

## ComCare Households - Age Group Distribution

Table A1: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Age } \\ \text { Group }\end{array} & \text { FY2017 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2018 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2018 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2019 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2019 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2020 } & \text { FY2020 } & \text { FY2021 }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array}\right)$

Table A2: Number and Proportion of Individual Assisted with SMTA by Age Group
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Age } \\ \text { Group }\end{array} & \text { FY2017 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2018 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2018 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2019 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2019 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array} & \text { FY2020 } & \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array}\right)$

Table A3: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Age Group of Main Applicant
$\left.\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Age } \\ \text { Group }\end{array} & \text { FY2017 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2017 } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \text { FY2018 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2018 } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \text { FY2019 } & \begin{array}{c}\text { FY2019 } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \text { FY2020 } & \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) }\end{array}\right)$

Table A4: Number and Proportion of Individuals Assisted with LTA by Age Group

| Age Group | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY2020 } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| <15 | 5 | 0.1\% | 3 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| 15-19 | 7 | 0.1\% | 8 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.1\% |
| 20-24 | 8 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.1\% | 5 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.1\% |
| 25-29 | 15 | 0.3\% | 13 | 0.3\% | 13 | 0.3\% | 10 | 0.2\% | 10 | 0.2\% |
| 30-34 | 27 | 0.6\% | 26 | 0.6\% | 26 | 0.6\% | 22 | 0.5\% | 21 | 0.5\% |
| 35-39 | 41 | 0.9\% | 34 | 0.8\% | 38 | 0.9\% | 40 | 0.9\% | 39 | 0.9\% |
| 40-44 | 66 | 1.4\% | 68 | 1.5\% | 66 | 1.5\% | 51 | 1.2\% | 51 | 1.2\% |
| 45-49 | 88 | 1.9\% | 78 | 1.7\% | 80 | 1.8\% | 71 | 1.7\% | 62 | 1.5\% |
| 50-54 | 153 | 3.3\% | 134 | 3.0\% | 128 | 2.9\% | 126 | 3.0\% | 116 | 2.8\% |
| 55-59 | 188 | 4.0\% | 179 | 4.0\% | 180 | 4.1\% | 191 | 4.5\% | 184 | 4.5\% |
| 60-64 | 297 | 6.4\% | 307 | 6.8\% | 331 | 7.6\% | 290 | 6.8\% | 283 | 6.9\% |
| 65-69 | 710 | 15.2\% | 628 | 14.0\% | 666 | 15.2\% | 675 | 15.8\% | 622 | 15.1\% |
| >=70 | 3,070 | 65.7\% | 3,011 | 67.0\% | 2,830 | 64.7\% | 2,773 | 65.0\% | 2,716 | 66.0\% |
| Total | 4,675 | 100.0\% | 4,495 | 100.0\% | 4,373 | 100.0\% | 4,263 | 100.0\% | 4,116 | 100.0\% |

## ComCare Households - Highest Educational Qualification Attained

Table A5: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant

| Highest Education Attained | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> (\%) | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Formal/Primary Qualification | 10,803 | 38.6\% | 10,347 | 38.1\% | 11,048 | 38.4\% | 12,455 | 34.8\% | 11,804 | 34.8\% |
| Secondary Qualification | 10,684 | 38.2\% | 10,472 | 38.6\% | 11,201 | 38.9\% | 13,568 | 38.0\% | 13,315 | 39.3\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Non-Tertiary) | 2,360 | 8.4\% | 2,395 | 8.8\% | 2,693 | 9.3\% | 3,351 | 9.4\% | 3,481 | 10.3\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Tertiary) | 1,250 | 4.5\% | 1,195 | 4.4\% | 1,329 | 4.6\% | 1,882 | 5.3\% | 1,748 | 5.2\% |
| Special Education/ Other Courses | 304 | 1.1\% | 304 | 1.1\% | 340 | 1.2\% | 381 | 1.1\% | 368 | 1.1\% |
| Not Reported | 2,585 | 9.2\% | 2,409 | 8.9\% | 2,196 | 7.6\% | 4,112 | 11.5\% | 3,195 | 9.4\% |
| Total | 27,986 | 100.0\% | 27,122 | 100.0\% | 28,807 | 100.0\% | 35,749 | 100.0\% | 33,911 | 100.0\% |

Table A6: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household

| Highest Education Attained | FY2017 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY2017 } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | FY2018 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2018 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2019 | FY2019 (\%) | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Formal/Primary Qualification | 8,935 | 31.9\% | 8,741 | 32.2\% | 9,202 | 31.9\% | 10,504 | 29.4\% | 9,731 | 28.7\% |
| Secondary Qualification | 11,409 | 40.8\% | 11,170 | 41.2\% | 11,739 | 40.8\% | 13,991 | 39.1\% | 13,570 | 40.0\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Non-Tertiary) | 3,136 | 11.2\% | 3,197 | 11.8\% | 3,575 | 12.4\% | 4,533 | 12.7\% | 4,673 | 13.8\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Tertiary) | 1,645 | 5.9\% | 1,553 | 5.7\% | 1,755 | 6.1\% | 2,730 | 7.6\% | 2,532 | 7.5\% |
| Special Education/ Other Courses | 1,029 | 3.7\% | 899 | 3.3\% | 1,105 | 3.8\% | 1,345 | 3.8\% | 1,314 | 3.9\% |
| Not Reported | 1,832 | 6.5\% | 1,562 | 5.8\% | 1,431 | 5.0\% | 2,646 | 7.4\% | 2,091 | 6.2\% |
| Total | 27,986 | 100.0\% | 27,122 | 100.0\% | 28,807 | 100.0\% | 35,749 | 100.0\% | 33,911 | 100.0\% |

Table A7: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification Attained of Main Applicant

| Highest Education Attained | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY2020( } \\ & \%) \end{aligned}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Formal/Primary Qualification | 3,124 | 70.9\% | 2,973 | 69.8\% | 2,879 | 69.3\% | 2,816 | 69.1\% | 2,667 | 67.9\% |
| Secondary Qualification | 654 | 14.8\% | 631 | 14.8\% | 638 | 15.4\% | 648 | 15.9\% | 662 | 16.9\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Non-Tertiary) | 75 | 1.7\% | 75 | 1.8\% | 70 | 1.7\% | 69 | 1.7\% | 67 | 1.7\% |
| Post-Secondary Qualification (Tertiary) | 26 | 0.6\% | 23 | 0.5\% | 20 | 0.5\% | 21 | 0.5\% | 27 | 0.7\% |
| Special Education/ Other Courses | 72 | 1.6\% | 73 | 1.7\% | 71 | 1.7\% | 67 | 1.6\% | 69 | 1.8\% |
| Not Reported | 458 | 10.4\% | 486 | 11.4\% | 478 | 11.5\% | 457 | 11.2\% | 434 | 11.1\% |
| Total | 4,409 | 100.0\% | 4,261 | 100.0\% | 4,156 | 100.0\% | 4,078 | 100.0\% | 3,926 | 100.0\% |

Table A8: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Highest Educational Qualification of Members in Household

| Highest Education <br> Attained | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> (\%) | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | FY2020 <br> (\%) | FY2021 | FY2021 <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Formal/Primary <br> Qualification | 3,076 | $69.8 \%$ | 2,941 | $69.0 \%$ | 2,871 | $69.1 \%$ | 2,811 | $68.9 \%$ | 2,657 | $67.7 \%$ |
| Secondary <br> Qualification | 664 | $15.1 \%$ | 647 | $15.2 \%$ | 641 | $15.4 \%$ | 655 | $16.1 \%$ | 672 | $17.1 \%$ |
| Post-Secondary <br> Qualification <br> (Non-Tertiary) | 32 | $1.7 \%$ | 77 | $1.8 \%$ | 77 | $1.9 \%$ | 75 | $1.8 \%$ | 72 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Post-Secondary <br> Qualification <br> (Tertiary) | 67 | $0.5 \%$ | 20 | $0.5 \%$ | 19 | $0.5 \%$ | 21 | $0.5 \%$ | 27 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Special Education / <br> Other Courses | 85 | $1.9 \%$ | 81 | $1.9 \%$ | 79 | $1.9 \%$ | 70 | $1.7 \%$ | 74 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Not Reported | 485 | $11.0 \%$ | 495 | $11.6 \%$ | 469 | $11.3 \%$ | 446 | $10.9 \%$ | 424 | $10.8 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 , 4 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 2 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 9 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

## ComCare Households - Employment Status

Table A9: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Employment Status of Main Applicant

| Employment Status | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2018 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working | 6,595 | 23.6\% | 6,347 | 23.4\% | 6,414 | 22.3\% | 8,946 | 25.0\% | 9,058 | 26.7\% |
| Seeking Employment | 6,038 | 21.6\% | 5,421 | 20.0\% | 5,998 | 20.8\% | 7,957 | 22.3\% | 6,398 | 18.9\% |
| Not Working Medically Unfit | 6,302 | 22.5\% | 6,083 | 22.4\% | 6,155 | 21.4\% | 6,056 | 16.9\% | 6,249 | 18.4\% |
| Not Working Retirees | 3,620 | 12.9\% | 3,616 | 13.3\% | 4,349 | 15.1\% | 5,416 | 15.2\% | 5,537 | 16.3\% |
| Not Working Students | 600 | 2.1\% | 665 | 2.5\% | 642 | 2.2\% | 710 | 2.0\% | 706 | 2.1\% |
| Not Working Others | 4,745 | 17.0\% | 4,651 | 17.1\% | 5,105 | 17.7\% | 6,268 | 17.5\% | 5,879 | 17.3\% |
| Not Reported | 86 | 0.3\% | 339 | 1.2\% | 144 | 0.5\% | 396 | 1.1\% | 84 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 27,986 | 100.0\% | 27,122 | 100.0\% | 28,807 | 100.0\% | 35,749 | 100.0\% | 33,911 | 100.0\% |

Table A10: Number and Proportion of Individuals Assisted with SMTA by Employment Status

$\left.$| Employment <br> Status | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> (\%) | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2020 | FY2020(\%) | FY2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | FY2021 |
| :---: |
| (\%) | \right\rvert\,

Table A11: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Number of Employed Household Members

| Number of Employed Household Members | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 18,053 | 64.5\% | 17,506 | 64.5\% | 19,094 | 66.3\% | 22,948 | 64.2\% | 21,055 | 62.1\% |
| 1 | 8,398 | 30.0\% | 8,049 | 29.7\% | 8,207 | 28.5\% | 10,761 | 30.1\% | 10,831 | 31.9\% |
| 2 | 1,408 | 5.0\% | 1,443 | 5.3\% | 1,365 | 4.7\% | 1,833 | 5.1\% | 1,819 | 5.4\% |
| 3 or more | 127 | 0.5\% | 124 | 0.5\% | 141 | 0.5\% | 207 | 0.6\% | 206 | 0.6\% |
| Total | 27,986 | 100.0\% | 27,122 | 100.0\% | 28,807 | 100.0\% | 35,749 | 100.0\% | 33,911 | 100.0\% |

## ComCare Households - Marital Status and Sex

Table A12: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant

| Marital Status | Sex | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2018 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single | Female | 2,581 | 9.2\% | 2,598 | 9.6\% | 2,740 | 9.5\% | 3,485 | 9.7\% | 3,371 | 9.9\% |
|  | Male | 5,375 | 19.2\% | 5,368 | 19.8\% | 5,617 | 19.5\% | 6,671 | 18.7\% | 6,510 | 19.2\% |
| Married | Female | 5,317 | 19.0\% | 5,052 | 18.6\% | 5,296 | 18.4\% | 6,173 | 17.3\% | 6,054 | 17.9\% |
|  | Male | 5,298 | 18.9\% | 5,023 | 18.5\% | 5,257 | 18.2\% | 7,125 | 19.9\% | 6,394 | 18.9\% |
| Widowed | Female | 1,196 | 4.3\% | 1,078 | 4.0\% | 1,185 | 4.1\% | 1,421 | 4.0\% | 1,355 | 4.0\% |
|  | Male | 454 | 1.6\% | 413 | 1.5\% | 433 | 1.5\% | 515 | 1.4\% | 491 | 1.4\% |
| Separated | Female | 704 | 2.5\% | 676 | 2.5\% | 680 | 2.4\% | 789 | 2.2\% | 768 | 2.3\% |
|  | Male | 540 | 1.9\% | 548 | 2.0\% | 602 | 2.1\% | 699 | 2.0\% | 699 | 2.1\% |
| Divorced | Female | 3,253 | 11.6\% | 3,152 | 11.6\% | 3,409 | 11.8\% | 4,167 | 11.7\% | 4,077 | 12.0\% |
|  | Male | 3,153 | 11.3\% | 3,136 | 11.6\% | 3,437 | 11.9\% | 4,211 | 11.8\% | 4,065 | 12.0\% |
| Not reported | Female | 48 | 0.2\% | 25 | 0.1\% | 78 | 0.3\% | 214 | 0.6\% | 51 | 0.2\% |
|  | Male | 67 | 0.2\% | 53 | 0.2\% | 73 | 0.3\% | 279 | 0.8\% | 76 | 0.2\% |
| Total | Female | 13,099 | 46.8\% | 12,581 | 46.4\% | 13,388 | 46.5\% | 16,249 | 45.5\% | 15,676 | 46.2\% |
|  | Male | 14,887 | 53.2\% | 14,541 | 53.6\% | 15,419 | 53.5\% | 19,500 | 54.5\% | 18,235 | 53.8\% |

Table A13: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Marital Status and Sex of Main Applicant

| Marital Status | Sex | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2018 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single | Female | 970 | 22.0\% | 924 | 21.7\% | 898 | 21.6\% | 892 | 21.9\% | 838 | 21.3\% |
|  | Male | 2,094 | 47.5\% | 2,036 | 47.8\% | 1,980 | 47.6\% | 1,925 | 47.2\% | 1,830 | 46.6\% |
| Married | Female | 69 | 1.6\% | 63 | 1.5\% | 60 | 1.4\% | 58 | 1.4\% | 54 | 1.4\% |
|  | Male | 174 | 3.9\% | 144 | 3.4\% | 131 | 3.2\% | 124 | 3.0\% | 127 | 3.2\% |
| Widowed | Female | 322 | 7.3\% | 310 | 7.3\% | 299 | 7.2\% | 280 | 6.9\% | 258 | 6.6\% |
|  | Male | 138 | 3.1\% | 134 | 3.1\% | 130 | 3.1\% | 117 | 2.9\% | 114 | 2.9\% |
| Separated | Female | 18 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.5\% | 18 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.5\% |
|  | Male | 45 | 1.0\% | 45 | 1.1\% | 42 | 1.0\% | 42 | 1.0\% | 41 | 1.0\% |
| Divorced | Female | 150 | 3.4\% | 144 | 3.4\% | 144 | 3.5\% | 156 | 3.8\% | 164 | 4.2\% |
|  | Male | 411 | 9.3\% | 422 | 9.9\% | 437 | 10.5\% | 451 | 11.1\% | 468 | 11.9\% |
| Not reported | Female | 9 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.1\% | 7 | 0.2\% | 5 | 0.1\% |
|  | Male | 9 | 0.2\% | 12 | 0.3\% | 10 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% |
| Total | Female | 1,538 | 34.9\% | 1,468 | 34.5\% | 1,426 | 34.3\% | 1,411 | 34.6\% | 1,338 | 34.1\% |
|  | Male | 2,871 | 65.1\% | 2,793 | 65.5\% | 2,730 | 65.7\% | 2,667 | 65.4\% | 2,588 | 65.9\% |

## ComCare Households - Dwelling Type and Household Size

Table A14: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Dwelling Type

| Dwelling Type | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | FY2020 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Table A15: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Dwelling Type

| Dwelling Type | FY2017 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2017 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2018 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2018 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ \text { (\%) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY2020 } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HDB 1- to 2-Room | 3,041 | 69.0\% | 3,031 | 71.1\% | 2,994 | 72.0\% | 2,970 | 72.8\% | 2,878 | 73.3\% |
| HDB 3-Room | 482 | 10.9\% | 444 | 10.4\% | 436 | 10.5\% | 430 | 10.5\% | 415 | 10.6\% |
| HDB 4-Room | 406 | 9.2\% | 399 | 9.4\% | 383 | 9.2\% | 364 | 8.9\% | 354 | 9.0\% |
| HDB 5-Room and Executive | 123 | 2.8\% | 109 | 2.6\% | 110 | 2.6\% | 103 | 2.5\% | 95 | 2.4\% |
| Institutions ${ }^{1}$ | 224 | 5.1\% | 175 | 4.1\% | 153 | 3.7\% | 133 | 3.3\% | 117 | 3.0\% |
| Condominiums and Other Apartments | 7 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% | 7 | 0.2\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Landed Properties | 10 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.2\% | 9 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.2\% |
| Others - Interim Rental Housing / Shop houses etc. | 79 | 1.8\% | 37 | 0.9\% | 46 | 1.1\% | 15 | 0.4\% | 47 | 1.2\% |
| Not Reported | 37 | 0.8\% | 50 | 1.2\% | 17 | 0.4\% | 47 | 1.2\% | 6 | 0.2\% |
| Total | 4,409 | 100.0\% | 4,261 | 100.0\% | 4,156 | 100.0\% | 4,078 | 100.0\% | 3,926 | 100.0\% |

[^0]Table A16: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Household Size

| Household Size | FY2017 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY2017 } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2019 } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | FY2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2020 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ | FY2021 | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY2021 } \\ \text { (\%) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12,518 | 44.7\% | 12,647 | 46.6\% | 13,531 | 47.0\% | 15,572 | 43.6\% | 13,337 | 39.3\% |
| 2 | 4,959 | 17.7\% | 4,694 | 17.3\% | 5,044 | 17.5\% | 6,601 | 18.5\% | 6,517 | 19.2\% |
| 3 | 3,768 | 13.5\% | 3,564 | 13.1\% | 3,737 | 13.0\% | 4,885 | 13.7\% | 4,835 | 14.3\% |
| 4 | 3,010 | 10.8\% | 2,699 | 10.0\% | 2,745 | 9.5\% | 3,749 | 10.5\% | 3,853 | 11.4\% |
| 5 | 1,865 | 6.7\% | 1,737 | 6.4\% | 1,837 | 6.4\% | 2,442 | 6.8\% | 2,549 | 7.5\% |
| 6 or more | 1,866 | 6.7\% | 1,781 | 6.6\% | 1,913 | 6.6\% | 2,500 | 7.0\% | 2,820 | 8.3\% |
| Total | 27,986 | 100.0\% | 27,122 | 100.0\% | 28,807 | 100.0\% | 35,749 | 100.0\% | 33,911 | 100.0\% |

Table A17: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Household Size

| Household <br> Size | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> $(\%)$ | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | FY2020 <br> (\%) | FY2021 | FY2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(\%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ComCare Households - Household Composition

Table A18: Number and Proportion of SMTA Households by Household Composition

| Household <br> Profile | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> (\%) | FY2018 | FY2018 <br> (\%) | FY2019 | FY2019 <br> (\%) | FY2020 | FY2020(\%) | FY2021 | FY2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A19: Number and Proportion of LTA Households by Household Composition

$\left.$| Household <br> Profile | FY2017 | FY2017 <br> (\%) | FY2018 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2019 | FY2020 | FY2020 <br> (\%) | FY2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | FY2021 |
| :---: |
| (\%) | \right\rvert\,


[^0]:     needs were supported using non-ComCare funds.

