|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Participant: | Student number： |
|

**POLI8026 Workshop in Managerial Skills (2014-15)**

**Joint HKU POP-MPA Workshop on Civil Engagement & Deliberative Polling**

**Experimental Deliberative Poll on Old Age Income Protection**

**Pre-Deliberation Survey**

Please complete the survey by indicating one choice at each question with a “✓”, and return it on January 17 at the workshop.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please rate on a scale of 0-10 how much do you agree or disagree with the below principles** | Very much disagree |  |  |  |  | Half-half |  |  |  |  | Very much agree | Hard to say |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 88 |
| 1. Introducing a new mandatory and contributory scheme that provides all, or almost all, elderly of age 65+ a fixed monthly income.   (Note: the government, employers and employees will contribute.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Change the current welfare system for the elderly so that all, or almost all, elderly of age 65+ will receive some monthly income.   (Note: such a change is likely to bring about new taxes or tax increases.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Revamping the MPF system into a wholly or partly annuity scheme.   (Note: both employers and employees will have to increase their contributions to the MPF; and the government will also need to partly fund the new scheme.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Selling public housing units to tenants at no or very low cost as a means to improve old-age income protection.   (Note: tenants who bought or are given the public housing units will have to pick up the management and maintenance costs of the properties.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***From Rikkie***
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**For internal reference: Draft questionnaire and key features of proposals**

**Draft questionnaire**

[Please Winnie, please advise on the answer options in Q 1, 3-6.]

1. To what extent do you agree to the following description of old-age income protection in Hong Kong?

1. All or almost all people in Hong Kong are guaranteed basic livelihood at old age.
2. All or almost all people in Hong Kong have stable and adequate income protection at old age.
3. The current systems of old-age income systems, namely the social welfare systems and MPF, are financially sustainable in an aging Hong Kong.

2. Do you think that the Hong Kong SAR Government should introduce new policy or reform in the area of old-age income protection?

* No.
* Yes, it should introduce new policy or reform within the next 1-2 years.
* Yes, it should introduce new policy or reform within the next 3-4 years.
* Yes, it should introduce new policy or reform within the next 5 years.
* Yes, but there is no urgency.

3. Do you agree in principle to introducing a new mandatory and contributory scheme that provides all, or almost all, elderly (e.g. above the age of 65) a fixed monthly income? Please note that the government, employers and employees will contribute.

4. Do you agree in principle to significant change to the current welfare system for the elderly so that all, or almost all, elderly (e.g. above the age of 65) will receive some monthly income? Please note that such a change is likely to bring about new taxes or tax increases.

5. Do you agree in principle to revamping the MPF system into a wholly or partly annuity scheme? Please note that both employers and employees will have to increase their contributions to the MPF; and the government will also need to partly fund the new scheme.

6. Do you agree in principle to selling public housing units to tenants at no or very low cost as a means to improve old-age income protection? Please note that tenants who bought or are given the public housing units will have to pick up the management and maintenance costs of the properties.

**Key features of proposals**

**Nelson Chow:**

[Chow’s proposal is similar to **Pro-Commons**, except for fine details such as contribution rates. Both proposals do not suggest any transfer from MPF to the new scheme.]

**Type: Pillar 1, mandatory and contributory scheme (similar to pay-as-you-go), universal uniform non-means tested**

* Target beneficiaries: Universal benefit for all aged 65 or above
* Level of benefits: “Demo-grant” of $3000 per month ($3000-$4000 as a range)
* Funding: Tripartite contribution:
  + Government to inject a one-off fund of $50 billion
  + A new payroll old age tax to be paid by employers and employees (1%-2.5% of salary with a maximum limit at $120,000.
  + No increase in profit tax or new tax is required
* MPF contribution rate is **not** changed. MPF is not transferred to fund the demo-grant
* Financial sustainability: Net balance of cash inflow from 2013 (presumed starting year) until 2041

**Alliance for Universal Pension / Federation of Trade Union**

[Their proposals are quite similar, except for the size of government’s initial fund, contribution rates and the ratio of transfer from MPF, etc.]

**Type: Pillar 1, mandatory and contributory scheme (similar to pay-as-you-go) , universal uniform non-means tested**

* Target beneficiaries: Universal benefit for all aged 65 or above
* Level of benefits: AUP $3000 per month / FTU $3250
* Funding: Tripartite contribution:
  + Government’s initial funding: AUP $50 billion / FTU $270 billion, 5% of government’s financial surplus
  + Transfer from MPF contribution for both employers and employees: AUP 2.5% / FTU 1%
  + Extra contribution from both employers and employees: AUP 0% / FTU 0.5%
  + Extra funding from profit tax increase is proposed: AUP 1.9% / FTU 1%
* Maintain MPF schemes and reduce contribution rate to: AUP 2.5% / FTU 4%
* Financial sustainability: Net balance of cash flow in 2041: AUP $127 billion / FTU ($248.5 billion)

**DAB / New People’s Party**

[Their proposals are very similar, except for details of levels of benefits]

**Type: Pillar 0, non-contributory. This is to significantly improve the current social security / welfare system.**

* Target beneficiaries: All elderly. Means-tested with tiers
* Level of benefits: different levels for different tiers up to DAB $3405 / NPP $3600
* Funding: From government general revenues. DAB did not discuss tax reform. NPP suggested tax review to widen tax base.
* MPF is not changed.
* Financial sustainability:
  + Average annual expenditure: DAB $48.2 billion / NPP $41 billion
  + Total expenditure in 2041: DAB $68.9 billion / $60.4 billion

**C K Law**

**Type: This is to revamp Pillar 2, the mandatory and contributory the MPF into a partly voluntary annuity system.**

* Target beneficiaries: working population
* To set up a ‘public retirement fund’ to provide a monthly pension to retirees who voluntarily deposit their accrued MPF benefits at retirement to this new fund.
* There will be means-tested supplement for those getting a monthly pension of less than $3600.

**Richard Wong / BPF**

Both opposed to pay-as-you-go systems

**Opposed to Pillar 1**

Richard Wong: Sell public housing units at very low price

No financials are provided

BPF: No specific proposal. Suggest to reform and improve MPF in order to lower its costs and improve returns