

There were a number of questions asked by delegates on the day of the webinar which were not answered by presenters due to a lack of time. The presenters have therefore answered these additional questions here:

**Can you say more about outcomes for children aside from poverty? And is there any evidence of it being paid to children from birth?**

Examples of outcomes

- Children have been observed to stay in education longer (post-compulsory education) in various schemes (Manitoba, N. Carolina) and better attendance at school (N. Carolina)
- Behavioural issues shown to have reduced by 40% in North Carolina
- Better relationships noted between children and parents in North Carolina
- 22% decrease in self-reported (to their parents) criminal activity amongst 16 and 17 year olds, particularly related to drug dealing and minor crimes
- Lower prevalence of psychiatric disorders and substance use disorders amongst children growing into adulthood observed in the North Carolina scheme's longitudinal study – those who were youngest at the start of the dividend payments were less likely to have developed mental health issues or substance use disorders

As for basic income payments for children:

- In North Carolina, children in the tribal community receive a full share but the money is invested until they graduate from high-school or reach age 21.
- Alaska's Permanent Fund payment can be claimed by a parent on behalf of a child, but there is no restriction on how the parent uses this.

**You have presented interesting findings that indicate benefits of UBI; at a population-level do you feel UBI would have a great enough impact to minimise health and social inequities - or are there other policy measures that would have a greater medium- and long-term impact e.g. education, better jobs.**

- I don't think anyone realistically considers basic income alone to be a panacea for all inequities, and indeed the long-term evidence we have from basic income implementation is mixed, with only a few schemes existing beyond three years. But basic income could certainly play a role alongside other policy actions as a 'suite' of action to reduce inequities – as our report stresses, however, effectiveness and outcomes will all depend on how the policy is designed (who for, what payment level).

**How can we ensure this will empower individuals? Really need to think through the approach and understand the problem as defined by the target population before we come up with a solution**

- Agree – a well-designed proposal will need extensive consultation. Plus, policy-makers have to be cognisant that individuals may decline the ‘offer’ should a basic income be proposed.

**UBI being delivered direct to people's bank accounts - not all individuals have bank accounts (e.g. homeless, elderly, etc); so immediately this discriminates?**

- There are other approaches - i.e. in Santa Clara trial, individuals receive payment through an app-based service (Venmo). However, basic income is also perhaps an opportunity to help individuals develop their financial well-being, starting a bank account for the first time and understanding personal finances – again, Santa Clara offers financial mentorship alongside their payment via a credit union. Basic Income could be as much about asset-building as it is about direct payment.

**Do the speakers have a sense of how much scope may exist to influence pilot outcome measures? Important to consider appropriate measures of individual and collective wellbeing.**

- As we state in the report, there are potentially a whole range of outcomes that could be measured, as basic income has the potential to influence all aspects of our daily lives e.g. housing choices, transport choices, food purchases. This is why qualitative research for basic income is just as important, if not more so, than a prescribed list of quantitative indicators, particularly for a short-term trial, to try and capture individual experiences as fully as possible.

**Is there a view on how this benefits those in society with it being given to high-earners also, apart from reducing stigma? Have there been pilots that give the well-off a chance to donate to a local group/charity/credit union etc?**

- I’m not aware of any pilots which have given payments to high-earners - of course the long-standing schemes (Alaska’s Permanent Fund, for instance) which give payment to all residents unconditionally will include higher earners, but I’m not sure of any research specifically regarding high-earners use of payments. I’m also not aware of pilots designed as the second part of this question outlines.
- I think with questions like this we come at it with an assumption that high-earners will always be high-earners. What happens if they lose their job? Basic Income would ensure that these people always have that safety net which they might not have today.

**Adam, has there been analysis of different social benefit systems other than UBI that are in use in other countries - to understand the health and social benefits, impact on educational**

**attainment, unintended consequences etc. For example, I am thinking of the Nordic countries e.g. Norway.**

- Sorry, this is outside of the remit of this work, so I'm unsure. I'm sure this would be very interesting to look into though. It's worth noting that part of the motivation behind the Finnish experiment was to test basic income as a model to replace or redesign existing welfare in that country for specific populations (long-term unemployed).

**Is there any evidence of effects of UBI on labour market?**

- Yes – impacts in either direction (more/less work) negligible. Some recipients reduce to part-time work, but in some instances this has increased opportunities for others to enter the labour market. Others have used the support to start their own businesses

**What would you suggest is the best way to support individuals who are working in full-time employment and not be able to claim UC? Evidence has shown that many healthcare workers are minimum wage and are struggling to provide for their family. Do you think that there should be more of a focus on not just those who are unemployed, but also those who are in full-time employment especially those who have been such an asset during the pandemic?**

- I think this is a point outside of the basic income presentation – of course, if basic income was introduced in line with the classical definition, then people in full-time employment would also receive the payment, as it would be unconditional as opposed to the way that UC is conditional. Whether the payment level would be sufficient to address the challenges you highlight would be down to the policy design and implementation.
- Many basic income trials to date have focused on the unemployed, so it's hard to answer this question in relation to existing basic income evidence.