

Superannuation objective review

The following are my views on the draft superannuation objective issued by Govt in 2023.

1. *"Governments will do to us whatever we allow them to do so and this is yet another wrong move my Government"*
2. Refer marked up comments (tracked changes) to the issued document as attached.
3. I do not support this objective. Reasons are numerous and outlined in the attached review of the issued document and further points as outlined below.
4. Govt of all persuasions have made a complete shambles of superannuation over decades and this latest politically motivated objective just continues that tradition.
5. **I would note that the Prime Minister advised as part of Labor election mandate that there would be no changes to superannuation.** This objective is a change and as such the Prime Minister is breaking that promise.
6. **A key question is what this objective does in regard to acting in best interests of Australians, rather than the superannuation industries best interests?** I challenge Treasurer and the Dept to look objectively and respond to this point as it is the crux of the issue with superannuation – too many vested interests and not enough looking after the real people.
7. This objective of legislating the objective of super is overkill, a dumbing down of reality. Super outcomes are likely complicated highly varied and few will be same – after all they are / should meet the needs of individuals or couples.
8. What is more important when a couple are starting out? Housing? Starting a family? Saving for retirement ? Contributing to retirement? There are a range of expectations and outcomes. My view is housing is first priority and I think this same expectation is very strong and robust across Australia. This objective ignores that.
9. The objective put forward is so simplified it cannot embody the needs of Australians who must contribute to Superannuation. It does not take into consideration many factors such as age, sex, family, housing, child care etc.
10. The consultation paper fails to realize a lot of the history of superannuation. Superannuation was pushed hard early in my working life and came with the message; you as a person need to cater for your retirement as there will not be enough money in Govt at that time for an aged pension other than for disadvantaged groups. Go back and check.
11. Your paper seeks feedback from stakeholders. The stakeholders are those with superannuation or who will have superannuation. Stakeholders are: " those who have a directly impacted by the work or are end users of the work ". Service provider definition: " are those who provide services to the stakeholders to support the stakeholders outcomes". **Stakeholders are therefore not** super funds, accountants, tax advisors, investment advisors, unions or employer groups or real estate industry. These people are are service providers. **So you need to make that really clear you do not want to see anything from these groups.** Or perhaps Labor wants to further support industry super funds objectives rather than the objectives of the people who have superannuation.
12. Is the problem the aged pension cost if so state that as a fundamental matter. Its unclear exactly what the objective is needed for. By inspection superannuation is for

post-retirement use. Its not a hard concept to understand. So why is an objective like this needed?

13. Your consultation paper has aged pension as one of the core elements of post work income. That is clearly at odds with the messages that we were sent long ago. I point this out for a couple of reasons. Successive governments have changed what they expect and to us as superannuation contributors the messages have been mixed, unclear and inconsistent. This consultation paper follows that great tradition. We do not want or need ideological solutions that any political party wishes to push.
14. You are assuming that best outcome is one size fits all. Why? There is a continuum of people and incomes and expected post work plans they may have. Have you modeled these and if so where are the results? What is the continuum, what is the median, the mean standard deviation etc
15. The current system favors the large superannuation funds and in particular the industry funds. That's clearly a Labor mandate and hence what drives this objective rather than best interests of Australians. I think industry funds are a great idea pity they started too late for me. However, they have become so dominant and boards stacked with ex politicians and union officials. These super funds have way too much influence of Govt decisions due to size and political connections and should not have any say in how superannuation is planned managed or this objective as they are a vested interest.
16. The LNP have it right (at least what Stuart Roberts said is right). There should be a purpose for superannuation, and it should be about how the individual (or couple) uses their money not how the Treasurer wants to use their money.
17. Only individual responses should be considered. Why? Simple – its our superannuation, its our longer-term planning, its our way of life that we want not something Govt or a super fund manager determines as best for as it might be in their best interest not ours.
18. Key issues with current superannuation will not be addressed by this objective.
 - a. Fees are excessive.
 - b. Bureaucracy and reporting of superannuation is ridiculous and adds costs that eat into the super fund returns..
 - c. Women – they are not at all looked after if they have family. Absolutely unacceptable.
19. Given the repeated shambles successive Governments including the current one make of superannuation we cannot trust politicians to have any say what-so ever in what superannuation looks like or how it functions. A stand alone Bureau should be established which reports but does not take any direction from the Federal Treasurer nor is it funded by Govt rather all superannuation funds should contribute. The objectives of superannuation should be drafted by this Bureau and then issued to citizens of Australia for them to vote on. Its our superannuation and our retirement so we should have the say not politicians who get a cozy superannuation. We cannot trust politicians or the political bureaucracy - example is the robot debt debacle. This shows that politicians and bureaucrats are not doing the right thing for Australians.