

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)598/14-15(01)

Ref : CB2/PL/HS

Panel on Health Services

**Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
for the special meeting on 13 January 2015**

Voluntary Health Insurance Scheme

Purpose

This paper summarizes the views and concerns of the members of the Subcommittee on Health Protection Scheme ("the Subcommittee") set up under the Panel on Health Services on the Health Protection Scheme ("HPS")¹.

Background

2. Further to the public consultation in 2005 on the future service delivery model of the healthcare system², the Government initiated a two-stage public consultation to take forward the reform. On 13 March 2008, it put forth a package of healthcare service reforms and six possible supplementary healthcare financing options in the First Stage Healthcare Reform Consultation Document entitled "Your Health Your Life". Based on the outcome of the first stage consultation which revealed strong resistance to any supplementary healthcare financing options of a mandatory nature, the Government proceeded to develop possible policy options along the principle of voluntary participation.

3. On 6 October 2010, the Government published the Healthcare Reform Second Stage Public Consultation Document entitled "My Health My Choice" ("the Second Stage Public Consultation") in which a voluntary and government-regulated private health insurance ("PHI") scheme, HPS, was proposed for

¹ As HPS is intended as a supplementary financing arrangement, the Administration renames the scheme as Voluntary Health Insurance Scheme in the consultation document published on 15 December 2014 to better reflect its objectives and nature.

² The Health and Medical Development Advisory Committee ("HMDAC") released a Discussion Paper entitled "Building a Health Tomorrow" on 19 July 2005 proposing the future service delivery model of the healthcare system.

public consultation. It was proposed that insurers would be required to offer standardized indemnity insurance plans that would enable the insured to access general ward class of private healthcare services when needed. Key features of the proposed HPS products involved a range of requirements on operational rules, benefit structure and other consumer protection measures.

4. According to the Healthcare Reform Second Stage Public Consultation Report released on 11 July 2011, members of the public have expressed support for the introduction of HPS to enhance transparency, competition and efficiency of PHI for the provision of an alternative to those who are willing and may afford to pay for private healthcare services. To take forward HPS, a Working Group and a Consultative Group on HPS were set up under HMDAC to make recommendations on matters concerning the implementation of HPS. To provide professional and technical support to the Working Group and the Consultative Group, the Administration commissioned a Consultant to study and advise on key issues relating to HPS, inter alia, the formulation of a viable and sustainable product design for HPS and areas where public funding could be considered to ensure the viability and sustainability of HPS.

Deliberations of the Subcommittee

5. The Subcommittee commenced work in December 2012 and has since then held 10 meetings to study issues relating to HPS. The deliberations and concerns of members are summarized below.

The Minimum Requirements approach

6. There was a concern that the latest proposal of requiring all individual indemnity³ hospital insurance products to meet or exceed a proposed set of 12 Minimum Requirements⁴ upon the implementation of HPS would interfere with the free market, limit the diversity of PHI in the market and limit consumer choice over products that did not meet the Minimum Requirements. In addition, the proposal would lead to an increase in average annual standard premium due to enhanced benefits. There was a suggestion that the Administration should allow co-existence of a regulated market segment under the aegis of HPS and an unregulated market segment where products were not bound by Minimum Requirements, so that consumers could choose among different grades of

³ According to the Administration, an indemnity insurance generally refers to an insurance where the insured will be reimbursed or indemnified by the insurer for his/her actual loss.

⁴ The proposed Minimum Requirements included: (a) guaranteed renewal; (b) no "lifetime benefit limit"; (c) coverage of pre-existing conditions; (d) guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap; (e) portable insurance policy; (f) coverage of hospitalization and prescribed ambulatory procedures; (g) coverage of prescribed advanced diagnostic imaging tests and non-surgical cancer treatments; (h) minimum benefit limits; (i) cost-sharing restrictions; (j) budgetary certainty; (k) standardized policy terms and conditions; and (l) premium transparency.

products with diverse benefit limits and correspondingly different premium levels to suit their needs and affordability.

7. The Administration advised that according to the 2011 Thematic Household Survey ("THS"), among those who were covered by PHI, about 54% of their local hospital admissions still pertained to the public sector. One possible reason was that patients might feel uncertain about the out-of-pocket payment when the insurance protection was insufficient to cover all expenses, or were concerned over the possibility of an increase in premium or even termination of policy after claims. The Minimum Requirements were designed to provide simplicity, clarity and certainty to consumers and help those who did not possess insurance professional knowledge to understand easily and clearly the minimum protection they would receive when taking out a hospital indemnity insurance policy. The Minimum Requirements proposal was also in line with international experience. In the Administration's view, a two-market situation would be untenable as adverse selection would undermine the sustainability of HPS: insurers could cherry pick customers from the healthy population by offering relatively lower premium for the unregulated products, leaving HPS a choice mainly for the unhealthy population.

8. There were views that the above findings revealed by the 2011 THS could not serve as inferences of shortcomings of existing PHI products and hence a justification for the introduction of Minimum Requirements, as the relevant percentages were referring to the number of admissions, instead of the number of respondents. There might be cases that the respondents concerned used both public and private hospital services. Some insured who had already exhausted the benefit limits of their insurance might also resort to the public healthcare sector for follow-up treatment.

Product design requirements for the Standard Plan⁵

Coverage of pre-existing conditions

9. On the proposal that insurers had to cover pre-existing conditions subject to a standard waiting period and partial reimbursement arrangement (viz. no coverage in the first year and a respective coverage of 25%, 50% and 100% in the second year, the third year, and fourth year onwards), some members cast doubt about the Consultant's estimations that the price impact of coverage of pre-existing conditions on the premiums to be paid by insured persons with standard-risk under HPS⁶ would be 5%, whereas that on the average claims cost

⁵ An individual indemnity hospital insurance product that met all (but not exceeding) the 12 Minimum Requirements was considered a Standard Plan.

⁶ Taking into account all the enhanced features and benefits proposed under the Minimum Requirements, the average annual standard premium of Standard Plan was estimated by the Consultant to be around \$3,600 (in 2012 constant prices).

of members of the high risk pool ("HRP")⁷ would be six times (or 600%) than that of an average standard-risk policyholder. The Administration explained that the former referred to the price impact arising from the enrollment of those migrants with pre-existing conditions excluded in their existing insurance policies who opted to remove these case-based exclusions and the required increase in overall standard premium if all such migrants went for this option and the insurers chose to finance the extra claims cost through standard premium increase. The cost impact of covering pre-existing conditions on members of HRP referred to that arose from enrollment of high-risk people who would be transferred to HRP, a separate risk pool from the generic one of which the standard premium was estimated. Such impact would have no bearing on the standard premium and was not accounted for as part of the calculation. Hon CHAN Kin-por, however, expressed the view that the insurance sector remained unconvinced of the Consultant's estimation that the price impact to be brought about by the requirement of covering pre-existing conditions on the premiums to be paid by insured persons with standard-risk would only be 5%.

Guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap

10. Members expressed concern that insurers offering Standard Plan would only be required to guarantee acceptance with premium loading capped at 200% of standard premium of all ages within the first year of implementation of HPS; and those aged 40 or below starting from the second year of implementation of HPS. Noting that the total cost to the Government for funding the operation of HRP over the period of 2016 to 2040 would only be increased from \$4.3 billion⁸ (if the age limit was set at the proposed level of 40) to \$5.3 billion (if the age limit was raised to the age of 50) or \$6.4 billion (if the age limit was raised to the age of 55), they considered that the entry age limit of guaranteed acceptance should be set at an older age, say, 50 or 55, to enable more time for older age people to consider to subscribe to the Standard Plan or at times when they had greater affordability to do so. They surmised that the proposed guaranteed acceptance age limit of 40 was meant to limit the size of HRP membership and the public funding support required to ensure the sustainability of HRP.

11. The Administration advised that the proposed guaranteed acceptance age limit of 40 was aimed to encourage people to enroll HPS when they were young and healthy. A lower age limit for guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap would lead to a lower membership of HRP over the projection horizon, as

⁷ An HRP, which was the key enabler of guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap, was proposed to be set up to accept policies of Standard Plan of which the premium loading was assessed to be 200% or more of the standard premium offered by the insurer. Under the proposal, the claims cost arising from the acceptance of high-risk subscribers would be met by their own premiums and Government funding for HRP.

⁸ According to the Administration, the total cost to operate HRP for a period of 25 years would be \$17.8 billion, of which \$15.8 billion was the claims cost and the remaining \$2 billion was the administration cost. Under the assumption that the estimated total premiums collected under HRP would be \$13.5 billion, the required Government funding to finance HRP over the period was estimated to be \$4.3 billion.

well as early participation of healthy people which was conducive to the risk pooling function of PHI. Without such a limit, there would be incentive for more people to join HPS until an older age when their health condition already deteriorated. The Administration, however, kept an open mind on the setting of the age limit subject to the outcome of the public consultation.

12. There was a suggestion that insurers should be allowed to offer individual indemnity hospital insurance policies with exclusion of specific pre-existing conditions to provide accessible and affordable PHI coverage to those high-risk individuals aged above 40 who chose to subscribe health insurance after the first year of launch of HPS.

13. The Administration advised that relaxing the requirement would impair the effectiveness of HPS in achieving its policy objective to facilitate more people to be willing to make use of private healthcare services. The requirement was in keeping with international experience and practice, and received broad support during the Second Stage Public Consultation. High-risk individuals aged above 40 would be able to benefit from guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap if they subscribe HPS in its first year of implementation. In addition, the public healthcare system would continue to act as the safety net for the whole population.

Coverage of hospitalization and prescribed ambulatory procedures

14. Question was raised about the Consultant's estimation that covering endoscopy/colonoscopy through packaged pricing in ambulatory settings would decrease the average standard premium of the Standard Plan by approximately 12%. The Administration advised that the Consultant had adopted the individual PHI market's average expense loading ratio in 2011 (i.e. 43%, and hence a claim ratio of 57%) in the calculation. It was estimated that the claims cost per insured person⁹ at all ages for coverage of endoscopy/colonoscopy would be about \$560 for the Standard Plan, which was lower than that of \$790 for comparable individual indemnity hospital insurance product in the market. This was mainly due to a higher use of more cost-effective¹⁰ ambulatory procedures with packaged pricing to substitute for unnecessary hospital admissions¹¹. Such cost savings was expected to outweigh the cost increases due to a higher claims frequency (i.e. an estimated 35% increase) as greater demand would be generated by coverage of ambulatory procedures under HPS, and the cost increases due to a higher claims-to-bill ratio (i.e. from the current 89% to 100%

⁹ According to the Administration, claims cost per insured person was a function of claims frequency, average billed size and claims-to-bill ratio.

¹⁰ According to the estimate of the Consultant, in 2010, the average cost of the procedure "colonoscopy with removal of tumor, polyp or lesion" performed under an ambulatory setting was around \$8,600. The average cost was around \$19,100 for those who stayed overnight in a hospital (general ward level).

¹¹ It was assumed that the percentage of endoscopy/colonoscopy performed under an inpatient setting would decrease from the current 70% to 15% under HPS.

as it was assumed that the full cost of ambulatory procedures would be covered under HPS).

15. There was a view that the Administration should use up-to-date claim ratio, which stood at 69% in 2013 according to the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers statistics (and hence an expense loading ratio of 31%) for the whole PHI market, for calculating the relevant price impact.

Coverage of prescribed advanced diagnostic imaging tests and non-surgical cancer treatments

16. Question was raised as to the reason why the Administration would consider that advanced diagnostic imaging tests would be more easily subject to mis-use or abuse and, hence, should be subject to a fixed 30% co-insurance arrangement. The Administration advised that in the course of discussing with the insurance and healthcare sectors on the requirement, there were concerns that covering advanced diagnostic imaging tests under HPS might lead to moral hazard and a rapid increase in utilization of these tests. The imposition of a fixed 30% co-insurance for claims on these tests would be conducive to managing the risk of utilization growth arising from moral hazard, which would in turn help keep premium levels in better check in the longer term. Noting the Consultant's finding that the average out-of-pocket payment by policyholders of existing individual indemnity hospital insurance products (ward level) was about one-third of the total costs, the Administration considered the 30% co-insurance ratio (subject to an annual ceiling) proposed by the Consultant reasonable, as it balanced between the need to combat moral hazard and premium affordability of the Standard Plan.

17. There was a view that the proposal would be a step backward in consumer protection, as advanced imaging tests for surgical purpose were covered under some existing individual indemnity hospital insurance policies in the market and were likely to be fully claimable under the benefit item of miscellaneous hospital expenses. It was suggested that the co-insurance arrangement should only be imposed on those tests conducted for diagnostic purpose. The Administration advised that the existing arrangements would entail unnecessary hospitalization and the reimbursement might not be sufficient for covering the full cost of these tests.

Budget certainty

18. In the Second Stage Public Consultation, it was proposed that HPS plans should offer coverage for common procedures using diagnosis-related groups¹² ("DRG")-based packaged pricing. On the Administration's latest stance that it would take a relatively longer time for Hong Kong to develop an operable

¹² Diagnosis-related groups was a sophisticated coding system for classifying medical conditions requiring treatments or procedures by diagnosis and complexity.

system of DRG suitable for local use in the private sector that a "no-gap/known-gap" arrangement and an "informed financial consent" would instead be introduced under HPS to promote budget certainty, some members expressed concern that there would be a lack of mechanism to govern the healthcare costs. Concern was also raised as to whether private healthcare providers would be interested in contracting with the insurers and providing the estimated service charges required to map out the lists of "no-gap" or "known-gap" procedures to be covered in the insurance policies regulated under HPS, given the present overwhelming demand for private hospital services.

19. The Administration explained that the proposal to develop DRG-based charging system was only a means to meeting the end of enhancing payment certainty. Patients would enjoy greater payment transparency and certainty under the "no-gap/known-gap" and "informed financial consent" arrangements. The Administration advised that the major technical challenges for formulating packaged pricing was the complexity of diseases and the fact that a majority of private hospitals' admissions were handled by visiting doctors. Nevertheless, the Administration would continue to discuss with the existing private hospitals the introduction of packaged charging for common treatments or procedures. In addition, new private hospital developments were required to offer at least 30% of in-patient bed days each year for packaged priced services.

20. Some members expressed concern that private hospitals might form a price cartel to maintain the packaged charges for common procedures at a high level. They asked the Administration whether private hospital services would be subject to the regulatory regime of the Competition Ordinance (Cap. 619). The Administration advised that most private hospitals fell within the definition of "undertakings" and would therefore be subject to the regulation of the Ordinance. The Steering Committee on Review of the Regulation of Private Healthcare Facilities was reviewing the regulatory regime for private healthcare facilities, which included, among others, private hospitals, with a view to strengthening the regulatory standards. Measures to enhance price transparency and upfront payment certainty would be covered in the review¹³.

Impact of HPS on existing PHI subscribers

Average annual standard premium of Standard Plan

21. The Consultant's estimation was that the average annual standard premium of the Standard Plan would be around \$3,600 in 2012 constant prices (viz. 9% or \$300 higher as compared to the average premium of existing individual indemnity hospital insurance products (ward level) of \$3,300 in 2012),

¹³ The Government has published the Consultation Document on Regulation of Private Healthcare Facilities on 15 December 2014, in which price transparency is put forward as one of the proposed regulatory aspects, for a three-month public consultation.

subject to a potential range of variation between -8% and +45%. Hon CHAN Kin-por remarked that as the actual premiums offered by different insurers would vary by factors such as pricing strategy and risk profile of individual insurers, it would be difficult for the insurance industry to come up with their figures concerning the average annual standard premium of Standard Plan. Members were concerned that those existing PHI subscribers who were at the lower end of the range of premium and/or in the older age group might be priced out as they would be unable to afford a 30% to 40% higher premium under the Standard Plan.

22. The Administration explained that since some premium impacts might vary considerably depending on market reaction, the estimated figure of \$3,600 was subject to a range of variation from -8% to +45%. Among the 12 proposed Minimum Requirements, the Consultant considered that the coverage of pre-existing conditions, coverage of hospitalization and ambulatory procedures, coverage of advance diagnostic imaging tests and non-surgical cancer treatments, and minimum benefit limits would carry significant and quantifiable impacts on the standard premium of the Standard Plan, while the impacts of the remaining requirements were considered non-quantifiable and/or insignificant¹⁴. A key driver for the variation was how well HPS was able to contain moral hazards on the use of advanced diagnostic imaging tests. In the scenario with a premium variation of +45%, it was assumed that per-person usage of these tests would be on the high side, as in the United States, which illustrated a scenario with ineffective control over abuse in usage. The Administration further advised that the increase in the estimated average annual standard premium under HPS could be partly offset if tax incentives were to be introduced.

23. Some members expressed concern that the Minimum Requirements could not help containing medical inflation arising from, among others, advances in medical technology and medications. With higher medical cost as a result, the reimbursement levels would get less unless there was corresponding upward adjustment in the level of premium. The Administration advised that insurers would remain free to adjust the age-banded premium schedules for the Standard Plan they offered according to changes, if any, in medical cost.

Premium of high-risk individuals

24. While it was proposed that only those applicants whose premium loading was assessed to equal or exceed 200% of standard premium would be admissible to HRP, there was a concern that insurers might mark up the premium loading rate in order to pass on all higher-risk subscribers to HRP.

¹⁴ In particular, the Consultant considered that guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap would not carry significant impact on the standard premium as the price impact primarily translated into premium loading. As regards guaranteed renewal, the Consultant considered it acceptable not to include this requirement in the scope of quantification since the price impact would occur only gradually and incrementally in the long term and offset through improved market dynamics.

25. The Administration advised that by transferring the policies of those applicants whose premium loading was assessed to equal or exceed 200% of standard premium to HRP, the insurer would surrender the premium collected for these policies after deducting a nominal handling fee to be prescribed by the HPS agency. While the insurer would continue to be responsible for the administration of the policies, the premium income (net of expense), claim liabilities and profit/loss of these policies would be accrued to HRP instead of the insurer concerned. Hence, as long as the insurers could charge a premium loading on higher-risk applicants commensurate with the extra risks that they took on, they could still expect to have an underwriting profit by keeping the higher-risk subscribers under their own portfolio. In addition, given that all insurers would be required to provide the Standard Plan as an option to the consumer, it would not be in the interest of an insurer to mark up the premium loading rate due to price competition, given that the consumer could compare offers from other insurers for coverage of the Standard Plan.

26. Question was raised about the premium of a high-risk individual who was in the older age group. According to the Administration, the annual standard premium for an individual aged 50 was estimated by the Consultant to be about \$5,000 a year. Given that those insured persons assessed by the insurers to have sub-standard risk might be charged a premium loading up to a maximum of 200% of standard premium, the premium of a high-risk individual in the age of 50 would be around \$15,000 a year. Some members held the view that the above premium would be unaffordable to many high-risk individuals in the older age groups.

27. Members sought clarification as to whether insurers could introduce premium loading at next policy renewal, so as to pass on unfavourable risks to HRP, in case the low-risk policyholders had made a claim. The Administration advised that insurers would only be allowed to underwrite a prospective insured person, taking into account the latter's health status, pre-existing medical conditions and other relevant risk factors, before effecting a health insurance policy. No re-underwriting would be allowed for policy renewal.

Employees covered by existing group hospital insurance policies

28. Pointing out that most of the existing employer-provided hospital indemnity insurance policies were of limited protection in terms of benefit coverage and limits, members called on the Administration to carefully assess, whether and to what extent, the introduction of the Minimum Requirements would discourage employers from providing group indemnity hospital insurance for their employees. Concern was raised as to whether employees could enjoy continuity of health insurance after retirement and whether those covered by group indemnity hospital insurance products taken up by their employers would be given the choice to take up products with lower premium but fewer benefits, such as those with case-based exclusions of pre-existing conditions.

29. The Administration advised that insurers would be required to offer employers a conversion option in the group indemnity hospital insurance products so that employees covered by the group policy could, upon leaving their employment, chose to switch to an individual Standard Plan at standard premium without re-underwriting, provided that the employees concerned had been employed for a full year before transferring to the individual Standard Plan. It was also proposed that insurers might, on a group policy basis, offer voluntary supplement to individual members covered by a group policy who wished to procure at their own costs additional protection on top of their group policy at a level tantamount to that of the Standard Plan.

Public funding for HPS

Financing of HRP

30. Some members expressed strong reservations about the use of public funds to subsidize the uptake of PHI. Some members considered it not cost effective to use public funds to subsidize people for taking out HPS plans as the insured might continue to utilize the public system, in particular for the more expensive healthcare services. Hence, whether HPS could achieve, among others, its objective of relieving pressure on the public healthcare system was in doubt. There was also a view that given the high administrative fees charged by the private insurers, any such subsidies might benefit the insurers more than the insured themselves. Some members considered that it would be more cost effective to use the \$50 billion fiscal reserve earmarked to support healthcare reform to improve public healthcare services. Another suggestion was that in face of an ageing population, the \$50 billion fiscal reserve should be used to provide direct subsidy to elderly persons aged 65 or above in using private healthcare services, as they might not be able to afford continuous health insurance protection after retirement when they needed it most.

31. According to the Administration, Hong Kong was unique in that both the public and private hospital systems were well developed to provide a comprehensive range of quality services. However, there was a significant public-private imbalance that the highly subsidized public system provided over 90% of all in-patient services (in terms of bed-days), resulting in longer waiting lists and waiting time for services. To provide better choice of individualized healthcare for the public, an objective of HPS was to enable more people who could afford and were willing to purchase PHI to use the readily available private services on a sustained basis. In so doing, the public system could focus on serving its target areas and population groups. The Administration stressed the need to use public funds to support HRP, which was the key enabler of guaranteed acceptance with premium loading cap and without which insurers might have to assimilate the excessive risks among their policyholders by charging higher premium across the board causing those high-risk individuals

who could not afford to pay the premium to fall back on the public system. Given that only about \$4.3 billion from the \$50 billion fiscal reserve earmarked to support healthcare reform would be required to support HRP for a period of 25 years (i.e. 2016 to 2040), it was considering the option of using part of the \$50 billion to enhance the overall healthcare system.

Tax deduction vs other forms of financial incentives

32. Hon CHAN Kin-por considered that the proposal of introducing tax reduction for health insurance plans would not be as attractive as the previously proposed options of premium discount and premium rebate for long stay under the savings options put forward in the Second Stage Public Consultation as an incentive for new joiners to the Standard Plan and the insured to stay on. He was concerned about how the current proposal could appeal to young and healthy individuals to make HPS financially viable. There was a suggestion that to encourage HPS policyholders to stay insured continuously, consideration could be given to offering a fixed amount of monthly premium subsidy to the insured at their old age.

33. The Administration explained that the provision of direct premium subsidy or discount might provide an incentive for some insurers to mark up the premiums of the HPS plans, thus effectively pocketing a significant portion of the premium subsidy or discount. Some form of premium control would therefore be necessary. There were considerable reservations within the community over the inclusion of compulsory savings component as an essential part of HPS, as it would result in a higher premium at the younger age and discourage people from enrolling in HPS plans. It was considered more appropriate for the savings component to be an optional feature under HPS. The Administration further advised that under HPS, the young and healthy would have greater incentive to join the scheme early given that the premium would be age-banded and that the amount of premium loading would be calculated on the basis of the health conditions of the insured at the time he/she joined the health insurance. The requirement of guaranteed renewal for life would also enable the early entrants to enjoy life-long protection without having to undergo re-underwriting even if they suffered from catastrophic illnesses after purchasing their HPS plans. According to the market survey conducted by the Consultant to gauge the willingness of consumers to purchase or migrate to the Standard Plan focusing on the main scenario of \$3,600, about 70% of the respondents, with or without cover of indemnity hospital insurance, indicated that they were willing to consider to do so.

Institutional framework for the governance and operation of HPS

34. There was a view that the proposed regulatory agency for HPS should serve its function of ensuring a smooth implementation and operation of HPS and not end up becoming a "white elephant". Given that the existing Insurance

Claims Complaints Bureau which provided adjudication services for free had all along been effective in dealing with claims disputes arising from individual insurance policies, the proposed claims dispute resolution mechanism for HPS would be suitable for resolving disputes involving a larger amount of money.

35. According to the Administration, the setting up of the proposed regulatory agency was to ensure that individual indemnity hospital insurance plans being offered in the market would comply with the prescribed Minimum Requirements, and handle complaints about insurance claims arising from the HPS plans. Claims disputes between insurers and healthcare service providers under direct billing arrangement would not be covered under the proposed claims dispute resolution mechanism during the initial phase of implementation of HPS.

Supporting infrastructure

36. Some members held the view that the healthcare manpower demand assessment being conducted by the Steering Committee on Strategic Review on Healthcare Manpower Planning and Professional Development should take into account the potential decrease in demand for public healthcare services after the implementation of HPS and impact of enhanced inpatient beds in private hospitals. The distribution of medical manpower in public and private healthcare sectors and the imbalance of public-private healthcare services should also be taken into account in the generic manpower forecasting model developed by The University of Hong Kong¹⁵ for the respective healthcare profession.

37. The Administration advised that at present, public and private healthcare sectors each accounted for about 50% of the medical manpower. While over 90% of the inpatient services (in terms of number of bed days) were provided by public hospitals (viz. a total of 25 000 beds), the majority of outpatient consultations were provided by medical practitioners practising in the private sector. The generic model and manpower projection for doctors would be adopted to adjust for the impact of externalities such as the distribution of medical manpower resources between the private and public sector, the elasticity of medical manpower supply of the private sector separated by clinical settings (i.e. inpatient and outpatient services). It was expected that the introduction of HPS, which aimed to provide a value-for-money alternative to those who were willing and could afford to use private healthcare services, could indirectly provide relief to the public healthcare system. It should also be noted that the number of private hospital beds would be increased from around 4 000 to more than 6 000 in the next five to six years upon completion of various hospital expansion and development projects.

¹⁵ To assist the Steering Committee on Strategic Review on Healthcare Manpower Planning and Professional Development in making informed recommendations to the Government on the means and measures to ensure an adequate supply of healthcare professionals of the 13 healthcare professions under study, the Administration has commissioned The University of Hong Kong to provide professional input and technical support to the review.

38. Given the lead time required for completing the review on healthcare manpower planning and that medical manpower could not be trained and made available overnight, members were concerned about the short to medium-term measures to ensure an adequate supply of healthcare manpower to meet the service demand. The Administration advised that the number of first-year first-degree places in medicine had been increased by 100 to 420 for the triennial cycle starting from 2012-2013 to address the current shortfall of doctors. Apart from addition of new medical graduates to the total doctor pool, there would also be a constant inflow of qualified, overseas-trained doctors each year. To facilitate overseas-trained doctors to practise in Hong Kong, the Medical Council of Hong Kong had increased the number of the Licensing Examination to twice a year.

Latest development

39. On 15 December 2014, the Government published the Consultation Document on Voluntary Health Insurance Scheme. The consultation exercise will last for three months until 16 March 2015.

Relevant papers

40. A list of the relevant papers on the Legislative Council website is in the **Appendix**.

Relevant papers on the Health Protection Scheme

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Subcommittee on Health Protection Scheme	14.1.2013	Agenda Minutes CB(2)698/12-13(01) CB(2)698/12-13(02)
	4.3.2013	Agenda Minutes CB(2)1634/12-13(01)
	4.6.2013	Agenda Minutes CB(2)1507/12-13(01)
	8.7.2013	Agenda Minutes CB(2)151/13-14(01)
	11.11.2013	Agenda Minutes
	9.12.2013	Agenda Minutes CB(2)855/13-14(01)
	18.2.2014	Agenda Minutes CB(2)1264/13-14(01)
	15.4.2014	Agenda Minutes CB(2)2260/13-14(01)
	12.9.2014	Agenda Minutes CB(2)388/14-15(01)