

The Treasury

Budget 2017 Information Release

Release Document July 2017

www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/informationreleases/budget/2017

Key to sections of the Official Information Act 1982 under which information has been withheld.

Certain information in this document has been withheld under one or more of the following sections of the Official Information Act, as applicable:

[1]	to prevent prejudice to the security or defence of New Zealand or the international relations of the government	6(a)
[4]	to prevent prejudice to the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation, and detection of offences, and the right to a fair trial	6(c)
[11]	to damage seriously the economy of New Zealand by disclosing prematurely decisions to change or continue government economic or financial policies relating to the entering into of overseas trade agreements.	6(e)(vi)
[23]	to protect the privacy of natural persons, including deceased people	9(2)(a)
[25]	to protect the commercial position of the person who supplied the information or who is the subject of the information	9(2)(b)(ii)
[26]	to prevent prejudice to the supply of similar information, or information from the same source, and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied	9(2)(ba)(i)
[27]	to protect information which is subject to an obligation of confidence or which any person has been or could be compelled to provide under the authority of any enactment, where the making available of the information - would be likely otherwise to damage the public interest	9(2)(ba)(ii)
[29]	to avoid prejudice to the substantial economic interests of New Zealand	9(2)(d)
[31]	to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting collective and individual ministerial responsibility	9(2)(f)(ii)
[33]	to maintain the current constitutional conventions protecting the confidentiality of advice tendered by ministers and officials	9(2)(f)(iv)
[34]	to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions	9(2)(g)(i)
[36]	to maintain legal professional privilege	9(2)(h)
[37]	to enable the Crown to carry out commercial activities without disadvantages or prejudice	9(2)(i)
[38]	to enable the Crown to negotiate without disadvantage or prejudice	9(2)(j)
[39]	to prevent the disclosure of official information for improper gain or improper advantage	9(2)(k)
[40]	Not in scope	

In preparing this Information Release, the Treasury has considered the public interest considerations in section 9(1) and section 18 of the Official Information Act.

Memorandum: Response to Treasury Aide Memoire 4 August 2016

To: John Marney, Treasury

Copy to: Ben McBride, Cath Atkins (Treasury), Lewis Holden, Jane Douglas (SSC), Tania Warburton (DPMC), Paul Stocks, Samuel Thornton (Joanne Hughes (MBIE), Stephen Barclay, Hamiora Bowkett (Health), Yvonne Bruorton (Health)

Purpose

On 4 August 2016 Treasury and SSC provided an Aide Memoire to Finance Ministers. The Aide Memoire raised five issues which health has been asked to address. This memorandum provides those responses.

1. Treasury suggested the negotiators use wage rates that are the same as those for Mental Health Assistants (MHAs).

The Ministry has revised the costing model and used the MHAs rates.

2. Treasury sought clear and realistic assumptions about annual wage increases for MHAs over the next five years, and details of how these will affect the cost of a settlement.

The Ministry has included an annual adjuster to the wage scale to take into account wage increases. [38]

3. Treasury had suggested a more realistic assumption about workforce attrition rates was needed.

The Ministry accepts that a 5 percent turnover rate is conservative and so has increased the turnover assumption to 15 percent.

While some segments of residential care have turnover rates significantly higher than 15%, at this stage it is not known what the impact of improved wages and conditions will be on turnover.

4. Treasury sought information about estimated savings (if any) that could be made by sharing costs with providers.

We accept your comments regarding operationalising any settlement as negotiations with funders and providers are pivotal to ensure sector stability. To this end, it is quite possible that negotiations

Contacts:	Stephen Barclay Chief People & Transformation Officer	[39]
	Yvonne Bruorton Chief Advisor Employment Relations People and Transformation	[39]

with funders and providers take different paths – e.g. different negotiation outcomes with DHBs, Home & Community Support Services, Disability Support Services (residential and community based) and Aged Care Residential.

The Ministry is committed to sharing advice on settlement proposals with key agencies as the bargaining process unfolds, whilst ensuring the principles of ‘good faith’ bargaining are preserved.

5. Treasury sought a revised assumption for the impact on the aged residential care subsidy as a result of higher prices.

The Ministry has reviewed the assumptions around the proportion of increased costs to be borne by Aged Care Residents paying the maximum contribution rate.

Using current policy settings, average rest home bed day prices would need to increase by 27 percent to cover the cost of the proposed expanded negotiation parameter. As such, 27 percent of the projected cost increase for Aged Residential Care would be funded by residents with assets over the \$220,000 threshold – i.e. they will pay a higher daily rate for their care. This adds approximately [38] to the total resident’s contribution over 5 years.

The increase in the maximum contribution will mean that people deplete their assets faster and become eligible for the Residential Care Subsidy earlier. By way of example, the first year increase of [38] is equal to approximately [38] days of care at current prices. The fifth year increase of [38] above current levels equates to [38] days of care at the current prices. The median length of stay in aged residential care facilities is currently 18 months.

The Ministry is currently undertaking further analysis of different asset thresholds, eligibility and the financial impact on the residents.

Revised Costing Model

The revised costing, including the changes noted above, delivers a 5-year cost of [38] to the crown and [38] to residents paying the maximum contribution (under current policy settings).