

My response to the supplementary questions is:

1. There are always concerns with the viability of any scheme. There is the current health and safety practices and monitoring practices in industry, adequacy of premium contributions, return on investment, changes to underwriting assumption, projected capitation levels, benefits suite including new diagnosis and treatment, changes to investment performance, administration costs that all come into effect when the scheme's viability is being assessed. What the union was pointing to was that the industry partners closest to the issue were effectively removed from the day to day monitoring of operations of the scheme in 2025.
2. From when I was on the Board, as per the above question, the focus was redirected from the content above to that of the medical research grants and also support groups. Despite several union board members asking about these aspects, these were not forthcoming in future meetings. Therefore, the same level of information as was publicly available became the standard during my tenure. I would not be able to answer this question regarding the aspects of the level of capitalization within the realms of my affirmation to my Parliament today seriously, from my time of being on the board, due to the lack of information provided at the time. I have not the relevant information available to me today to provide a comment on the status today.

Truthfully

Shay Deguara