# Submission template

#### A New Zealand Income Insurance Scheme

This is the submission template for the discussion document, A New Zealand Income Insurance Scheme.

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE), on behalf of the Government, Business New Zealand and the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions, seeks your written submission on the matters raised in the discussion document by **5pm on 26 April 2022**.

## Your submission could be made public

The information provided in submissions will be used to inform policy development on the proposed income insurance scheme, including how it could be improved and how it could affect different groups. We may contact submitters directly if we require clarification of any matters in submissions.

The *Privacy Act 2020* applies to submissions and responses. Any personal information you supply to MBIE in making a submission will only be used for the purpose of assisting in the development of policy advice as part of this review. When businesses or organisations make a submission, we will consider that you have consented to the content being included in any summary of submissions unless you clearly state otherwise. If your submission contains any information that is confidential or that you do not want published, you can say this in your submission. Please clearly indicate in your cover letter or email with your submission if you do not wish your name, or any other personal information, to be included in any summary of submissions that may be published.

Submissions and responses may be subject to requests for information under the *Official Information Act* 1982. Please clearly indicate in your cover letter or email with your submission if you have any objection to the release of any information in your submission, and which parts you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information. Your views will be taken into account when responding to requests under the *Official Information Act* 1982. Any decision to withhold information requested under the *Official Information Act* 1982 can be reviewed by the Ombudsman.

#### How to make a submission

Please send your written submission on the options and questions in this consultation document by **5pm on 26 April 2022.** You can make your submission (preferably using this submission template) as follows:

- 1. Include your name, the name of your organisation (if applicable), and contact details. We may contact submitters directly if we require clarification of any matters in submissions.
- 2. Your submission may respond to any or all of the questions in the consultation paper. Where possible, please include information or evidence to support your views. We also encourage your input on any other relevant aspects of the income insurance scheme in the "Other comments" section.
- 3. Sending your submission:
  - a. Attach as a Microsoft Word document or searchable PDF and email to:

### incomeinsurance@mbie.govt.nz (preferred), or

b. Mail your submission to:

Social Unemployment Insurance Tripartite Working Group Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment PO Box 1473 Wellington 6145

If you have any questions on the submissions process, please contact <a href="mailto:incomeinsurance@mbie.govt.nz">incomeinsurance@mbie.govt.nz</a>.

# Submission on A New Zealand Income Insurance Scheme

# Your name and organisation

Name	Michelle Cotton
Organisation (if applicable)	
Contact details	Privacy of natural persons

# R

insurance scheme's governance and operations?

income insurance scheme?

4

5

Resp	esponses to consultation document questions	
Chap	ter 4 – How a new income insurance scheme could achieve our objectives (Pg 30-48)	
	Forum considers the benefits of income insurance for job loss due to displacement or health itions would outweigh its costs.	
1	Do you agree New Zealand should introduce an income insurance scheme for displacement and loss of work due to health conditions or disabilities?	
	Yes	
Chap	ter 5 – Honouring Te Triti o Waitangi (Pg 49-51)	
Kawa	Kawanatanga – Good governance and partnership	
2	How can we ensure the proposed income insurance scheme honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi?	

What are the opportunities for partnership and Māori representation in the proposed income

How can we ensure equity of access, participation, and outcomes for Māori in the proposed

How can we reflect and embed te ao Māori in the proposed income insurance scheme's design?

	oter 6 – Coverage for displaced workers (Pg 53-72)  Colored and standard employment (full- and part-time permanent employees)
6	Do you agree with defining displacement as the involuntary loss of work due to the disestablishment of a job?
	yes
7	Do you agree with excluding poor performance and gross misconduct as reasons for claiming insurance?
	Yes ( with the assumption that poor behaviour was not related to a medical condition)
8	Do you agree with excluding resignation as a reason for claiming insurance?
	yes
Cove	erage provided for complete job loss only
9	Do you agree that income insurance should cover only the complete loss of a job, and cover situations where a person loses only one of several jobs that they hold?
	No, partial loss of a job, say 50% could be devastating
10	Do you agree that insurance would be payable only where income loss was greater than a minimum threshold, such as a 20 percent loss of total earnings, counting income from all of their jobs?
	yes
Disp	lacement and non-standard employment – a principle-based approach
11	Do you agree that it is important to provide income insurance coverage to non-standard workers, where practical?
	Yes, if you earn and pay paye you are in.
12	Do you agree that income insurance should cover the 'loss of reasonably anticipated income'?
	Yes,, especially need to include the self-employed, piece workers etc.
13	Do you agree that income insurance entitlements should be based on an 'established pattern of work'?

Yes, you have to have something to measure against. Needs to be simple

### Coverage provided for fixed-term and seasonal employees

Do you agree that income insurance should cover fixed-term and seasonal employees if they are displaced before the end of an employment agreement, with the duration of the payment running to the scheduled end of the employment agreement, or the maximum insurance entitlement duration, whichever is shorter?

yes

15

Do you agree that income insurance should cover fixed-term and seasonal employees, where their employment agreements are not renewed, and they can show a regular pattern of work and reasonable expectation of future income?

Yes, and should include those workers her on work permits, not just residents and citizens.

#### Coverage provided for casual employees

Do you agree that income insurance should cover casual employees who can show a regular pattern of work with an employer and a reasonable expectation of future income?

yes

17

How would these design choices work in practice? What risks can you see with the approach to establishing a regular pattern of work?

Needs to be for reasonable length of time, say 6 months

#### Coverage for self-employed workers

18 What risks do you see with covering, or not covering, people in self-employment?

They will need to be able to show their earnings and some of them don't earn very much. It will not be suitable to cover their businesses going broke.

19 Are there some groups of self-employed who should and should not be covered?

People that set themselves up as providing ministerial services for their own churches should be excluded.

Influencers on Facebook and tictoc not really suitable either

How can we practically distinguish between contractors who resemble employees, and those with 20 a high degree of independence? Courts have given some guidance on these boundaries in recent years. It could be a moot point if contractors can be covered as self-employed. Because a self-employed person cannot technically be made redundant, what types of events 21 would be appropriate 'triggers' for insurance payments? Contracts to provide services no renewed, catastrophic change in health circumstances, 22 How do you think the levy should be collected from self-employed workers? Tax like the PAYE A modest minimum contribution period Do you agree with the proposed minimum contribution period of six months over a period of 18 23 months preceding the claim? So no one would get anything for the first 18 months, if so you need to be very clear about that up front. Limits on subsequent claims 24 Do you agree limits should be placed on the number claims people can make? yes Do you agree with limiting claims to a total of six months within an 18-month period? 25 That could be too blunt a tool, someone could be made redundant take 5 months to get a new job and then get sick 9 months later. 26 Could the risks associated with a low contribution history be managed in other ways? It could all become a admin night mare but it is essentially a good idea, keep it simple and transparent, minimise the exemptions. Ned to be clear that reducing work for medical reasons need to be "medical reason" not I am just fed up with work.



Cove	erage for New Zealand citizens and residents		
27	Do you agree with limiting coverage of the proposed income insurance scheme to New Zealand citizens and residents?		
	No, work permit holders should be covered, it is an income protection scheme and they came here to work.		
28	To ensure New Zealand workers are not disadvantaged by lower cost international workers, do you agree that working holiday makers, international students and temporary work visa holders — and their employers — should contribute to the proposed income insurance scheme's costs?		
	Yes, and they should benefit from it as well. And why should international workers get paid less, don't let that happen		
Chap	oter 7 – Entitlements for displaced workers (Pg 73-95)		
Inco	me caps and income replacement rates that match the accident compensation scheme		
29	Do you agree with a replacement rate set at 80 percent?		
	yes		
30	Do you agree with a cap on insurable (and leviable) income set at the same rate as the accident compensation scheme (currently \$130,911)?		
	yes		
Only	personal exertion income would abate (reduce) insurance entitlements		
31	Do you agree that only the insurance claimant's personal exertion income should affect their insurance entitlements?		
	yes		
32	Do you agree that income insurance should have individualised entitlement, meaning a partner's income would not affect the rate payable?		
	yes		
Abat	Abatement rates would ensure a claimant is not financially better off as a result of their loss of work		
22	Do you agree that someone should be able to earn some income from paid employment before it		

 $affects\ their\ entitlements\ to\ income\ insurance?$ 

	yes
34	Do you agree that insurance should abate 'dollar for dollar' when earned income and insurance combined reach 100 percent of previous income?
	Yes It is insurance scheme, not a get better off scheme
Insu supp	rance would generally be treated as income, to determine eligibility for welfare and student port
35	Do you agree that insurance should be treated as income for assessing eligibility for income support such as main benefits and Working for Families tax credits and student support?
	Not sure
36	Given the purpose of the In-Work Tax Credit and Minimum Family Tax Credit in encouraging people into employment and helping with in-work costs, do you agree that income insurance claimants would not be eligible for these tax credits?
	Not sure, I have serious concerns that the family tax credit scheme has contributed to the very lower incomes for many NZ workers.
Insu	rance claimants could also receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's Pension
37	Do you agree that income insurance claimants could also receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's Pension?
	yes
38	Do you think a limit should be placed on the amount of time someone can receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's pension and income insurance?
	yes
	re eligible, insurance claimants could choose whether to access Paid Parental Leave or income rance and may receive both sequentially
39	Do you agree that income insurance and Paid Parental Leave could be accessed sequentially but not at the same time?
	yes

Do you agree that claimants should be able receive both ACC weekly compensation and income insurance at the same time for differing income loss subject to independently meeting the eligibility criteria for both?  Not sure  A sufficient base entitlement period  Do you agree with a base insurance entitlement length of six months, plus a four-week bridging payment paid by the employer?  yes  Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?  no  Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?  YES	Insu loss	Insurance claimants could also receive ACC weekly compensation where it covers a different income loss	
A sufficient base entitlement period  Do you agree with a base insurance entitlement length of six months, plus a four-week bridging payment paid by the employer?  yes  Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?  no  Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	40	insurance at the same time for differing income loss subject to independently meeting the	
Do you agree with a base insurance entitlement length of six months, plus a four-week bridging payment paid by the employer?  yes  Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?  no  Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?		Not sure	
yes  Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?  no  Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	A su	fficient base entitlement period	
Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?  no  Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	41		
Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?		yes	
Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances  Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	42	Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?	
Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?		no	
entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?  May be  Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	Exte	nding the maximum period in specified circumstances	
Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods  Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	43		
Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?		May be	
insurer, before redundancy takes effect?	Enha	ancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods	
YES	44		
		YES	

Avoi	ding unnecessary redundancies
45	Do you agree that employers should pay former workers for the initial period of unemployment for four weeks?
	yes
46	Should bridging payments be applied to all workers, including those not eligible for income insurance?
47	Should the income insurance scheme finance bridging payments in circumstances where the payments are not forthcoming from employers, and refund employers for bridging payments if workers find work within this period?
48	Do you consider that stronger integrity measures are necessary to manage the risk of spurious claims to the income insurance scheme?
Chap 112)	oter 8 – Coverage and entitlements for loss of work due to health conditions or disabilities (Pg 96-
No r	estrictions on the types of conditions covered by the income insurance scheme
49	Do you agree there should be no restrictions on the types of conditions covered by the scheme?
	May be not
No r	estrictions on the working arrangements covered by the scheme
50	Do you agree that all work arrangements should be covered (assuming other eligibility criteria are met)?
	yes

Cove	erage for loss of at least 50 percent of capacity to work, for at least four weeks
51	Should the scheme cover partial loss of earnings due to a health condition or disability reducing work capacity?
	yes
52	If partial loss is to be covered, do you agree claimants should have at least a 50 percent reduction of capacity to work caused by a health condition or disability and that reduction is expected to last for at least four working weeks?
	Not sure
	nants' medical practitioners would assess work capacity, with final eligibility assessed by the me administrator
53	Do you agree that the claimants' health practitioner should be main the assessor of work capacity?
	For initial processing yes, any issues would need a more independent assessment
54	Do you agree that, where appropriate, employers could provide supporting information to inform the claimant's work capacity assessment process?
Emp work	loyers would remain responsible for taking reasonable steps to support an employee to continue king
55	Are the current requirements on employers to make workplace changes sufficient to allow health condition and disability claimants to return to their regular employment (or alternative work)?
56	How could employers be supported to help workers with health conditions or disabilities to remain in or return to work?

	Employers would be expected to make reasonable efforts to keep a job open where a return to work within six months is likely	
with	in six months is likely	
57	Where an employee must stop work entirely because of a health condition or disability, do you think employers should be expected to keep a job open and help with vocational rehabilitation where a reasonable prognosis is made of return to work within six months?	
58	Should this be a statutory requirement placed on employers or an expectation?	
The	scheme would generally meet the full cost of income replacement once a claim is accepted	
59	Do you agree that employers should only pay a bridging payment to employees leaving work because of a health condition or disability when the employment is terminated by the employer?	
Chap	oter 9 – Insurance claimants' obligations (Pg 113-120)	
Reas	onable obligations for people receiving income insurance payments	
60	Do you agree claimants should be obligated to look for work or prepare to return to work while receiving insurance?	
61	Do you agree that claimants would not be expected or required to accept offers of employment that provide lower wages or conditions?	
62	Do you agree the insurer could waive obligations partially or fully where a claimant is unable to meet those obligations?	
63	Do you agree claimants should be obligated to remain in New Zealand to remain eligible for income insurance?	

64	Do you think a period of time, such as 28 days, should be allowed for travel overseas, for example, to support ill family?
Spec	ific obligations for claimants with a health condition or disability
65	Should claimants with health conditions or disabilities be subject to obligations to participate in rehabilitative programmes and other support, where appropriate?
66	Should claimants with health conditions and disabilities be subject to obligations to search for work or undertaking training where they are able to?
Cons	equences for non-compliance
67	Do you think financial penalties should be in place for people who do not meet their obligations while receiving insurance payments?
68	Do you agree that payments could be fully suspended in cases of serious, intentional non-compliance with obligations?
69	Do you think any other consequences should be in place for people repeatedly not meeting their obligations, such as permanent suspension of entitlements?

# Chapter 10 - Delivering income insurance (Pg 121-134) Independent and effective delivery Do you think it is best for ACC to deliver the income insurance scheme alongside the accident 70 compensation scheme? No, ACC has proven itself very susceptible to political manipulation by narrowing down focus of entitlements. Don't know how to get part this. But someone has to administer it. ACC by default then. It is very difficult for Maori, Pacific and new immigrant families to negotiate bureaucracies, this must be avoided. Would the income insurance scheme be better delivered by a government department or a new 71 entity? Reluctant to have another entity and another CEO on \$300k + so would have to be an existing one. Accountable and effective governance How could employer and worker perspectives best be incorporated to strengthen the income 72 insurance scheme's delivery for New Zealanders? How could Māori perspectives best be incorporated to ensure the income insurance scheme is 73 delivered equitably and with aspiration? Ask and listen to Māori Displaced workers: Getting back to good jobs 74 What practical support should be available to insurance claimants to return to work? 75 Who should provide that return-to-work support? 76 What type of claimants would need an employment case manager, and who could self-manage?

77	What do you think a 'return-to-work plan' should include?
Heal	th condition and disability claimants: Getting back to good jobs
78	What practical support should be available to income insurance claimants with a health condition or disability to return to work?
79	Who should provide that support to return to work?
80	What type of claimants would need a case manager, and who could self-manage?
Disp	ute resolution
81	Do you agree with the proposed four-step dispute resolution process for the scheme?
82	Are there specific aspects to the scheme's dispute resolution you think should be considered?
Sche	me integrity and enforcement
83	Do you agree with the proposal to establish an effective offences and penalties framework to protect the scheme's integrity?
Info	rmation collection and sharing
84	Do you agree with the proposal to develop information sharing agreements and sharing arrangements with employers, other agencies and service providers?

Do you agree the income insurance scheme should be funded from compulsory levies on the income that is insured, rather than from general taxation?  yes  Levy payments would be shared by employers and workers  Do you agree that levy contributions should be equally split between the employee and employer?  Not sure  Do you agree that levies for health conditions and disabilities and for redundancy should be set separately?  Do you agree that employee would be charged at a flat rate  Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes  Do you favour a Pay As You Go or Save As You Go funding approach?	Chapter 11 – Funding income insurance (Pg 135-144)	
income that is insured, rather than from general taxation?  yes  Levy payments would be shared by employers and workers  Do you agree that levy contributions should be equally split between the employee and employer?  Not sure  Do you agree that levies for health conditions and disabilities and for redundancy should be set separately?  Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate  Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	Mos	t funding would come from compulsory levy payments on income
Levy payments would be shared by employers and workers  86  Do you agree that levy contributions should be equally split between the employee and employer?  Not sure  87  Do you agree that levies for health conditions and disabilities and for redundancy should be set separately?  88  Do you agree that employee would be charged at a flat rate  88  Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  89  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  90  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  91  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	85	
Not sure  Do you agree that levies for health conditions and disabilities and for redundancy should be set separately?  Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate  Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		yes
Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate  Bo you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate  Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?	Levy	payments would be shared by employers and workers
Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate  Bo you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  Yes	86	Do you agree that levy contributions should be equally split between the employee and employer?
Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate  Bo you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		Not sure
Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  By Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	87	
Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?  Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  By Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		
Why not have those who earn more pay a bit more, for those on very low incomes, even 2% is a lot.  By Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	Both	the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate
Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?  Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	88	Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?
Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		
levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	89	Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?
levy?  Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management  Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		
Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	90	
Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?  yes		
finance the income insurance scheme?  yes	Levi	es would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management
	91	
Do you favour a Pay As You Go or Save As You Go funding approach?		yes
	92	Do you favour a Pay As You Go or Save As You Go funding approach?

ding in scheme adaptability, while protecting levy sustainability
Do you agree that the legislation for the income insurance scheme should provide the flexibility to vary entitlements and eligibility in times of crisis, over and above the proposed income insurance scheme?
yes
Does such flexibility create risks that require additional mitigations?

# **Other comments**

This form is ridiculously long