BusinessCentral

EMPLOYER BULLETIN

4 June 2024
A Weekly News Digest for Employers

EMPLOYER NEWS

Budget delivers on promises to Kiwis

Prime Minister Christopher Luxon says Budget 2024 delivers on the Government's promises, with savings across the public sector being reinvested in frontline services and meaningful tax reductions to support hard-working Kiwis.

"This Budget is prudent and fiscally responsible. By identifying billions of dollars of lower-value spending across the public sector, we have both been able to deliver meaningful tax relief to support Kiwis with the cost of living and invest in key frontline services like healthcare, schools, and the Police," says Mr Luxon.

"The tax package in Budget 2024 is fully funded from savings and other revenue measures - meaning it will not add to debt and inflation. But it will allow hard-working New Zealanders to keep more of what they earn. Tax relief will give the average income household up to $102 per fortnight, plus FamilyBoost childcare payments of up to $150 for eligible families.

"Under my Government, Budgets will no longer be about how much money we spend, but about what is delivered for Kiwis. Budget 2024 stops low-value spending and re-deploys that money where it will be used best – whether that's in our hospitals, our schools or our Police. We are resolutely focused on frontline service delivery. Says Mr Luxon.

To read further, please click here.

To read Nicola Willis's Budget 2024 Speech, please click here.

The New Zealand Government [30 May 2024]

Government improves mass arrival management

The Government has strengthened settings for managing a mass arrival, with the passing of the Immigration (Mass Arrivals) Amendment Bill.

"While we haven't experienced a mass arrival event in New Zealand, it is an ongoing possibility which would have a significant impact on our immigration and court systems," Immigration Minister Erica Stanford says.

"This Bill ensures we are better equipped to manage a mass arrival event, uphold the human rights of asylum seekers and protect the resilience of our critical courts and immigration infrastructure.

"Previously judges had just 96 hours to decide on warrants of commitment, which enable the detention of migrants to process applications. This did not allow enough time for the migrant to gain legal representation. We have provided more time for this decision, upholding the right to natural justice while protecting New Zealanders' safety and security.

"The legislation makes it clear a member of a mass arrival group cannot be detained in a prison or police station prior to a warrant of commitment being issued. It also provides that, in seeking a group warrant of commitment, an Immigration Officer must explain why the proposed detention is needed, and how it is the least restrictive and for the shortest time necessary to achieve its aims.

The Bill closes the gaps identified in a 2019 review of the mass arrivals provisions of the Immigration Act 2009, ensuring we are prepared to respond to a potential mass arrival in a safe and secure way, and in a manner which preserves the human rights of vulnerable migrants."

To read further, please click here.

The New Zealand Government [29 May 2024]

Super Fund to get more investment opportunities

Finance Minister Nicola Willis has welcomed the passage of legislation giving the New Zealand Superannuation Fund a wider range of investment opportunities.

The New Zealand Superannuation and Retirement Income (Controlling Interests) Amendment Bill passed its third reading in Parliament on Tuesday.

"The bill removes a section in the original act that prohibited the fund from taking a controlling interest in an entity," Nicola Willis says.

"The change reflects the fund's growing maturity and will give the fund's manager the flexibility it needs to manage direct investments in line with global best practice."

Willis says that the original New Zealand Superannuation and Retirement Income Act reflected the newness of the fund and the relatively small exposure to direct investments that was considered best practice in 2001, but the prohibition was no longer required.

To read further, please click here.

The New Zealand Government [28 May 2024]

Major investment in teacher supply through Budget 24

Over the next four years, Budget 24 will support the training and recruitment of 1,500 teachers into the workforce, says Education Minister Erica Stanford.

"To raise achievement and develop a world leading education system we're investing nearly $53 million over four years to attract, train and retain our valued teacher workforce," Ms Stanford says.

"We are being proactive in addressing the forecast future need for teachers, with recent estimates showing up to 680 more secondary teachers could be needed within the next three years.

"Today's investment in training, recruitment and development will help us to meet that demand by growing the domestic and overseas pipeline of teachers.

"We have also listened to principals and teachers who have constantly stressed the importance of new trainees spending more time in the classroom with experienced mentors. A recent Education Review Office Report, 'Ready, Set, Teach', found that teachers who spent two days or more in the classroom per week as part of their training were more prepared to enter the workforce."

To read further, please click here.

New Zealand Government [26 May 2024]

Forklift brake failure incident could have been avoided

Keeping people safe by paying better attention to vehicle maintenance would have saved a worker from a serious forklift injury, WorkSafe New Zealand says.

Casey Broad, WorkSafe's National Manager Investigations, says the $240,000 fine handed down to Refrigafreighters Limited for an incident in September 2022 is a wake-up call to all businesses using forklifts.

"A worker had been collecting rubbish with the forklift. They parked it and put the handbrake on, but when they got out it started to roll down the slope it was parked on."

The 33-year-old tried to recover the forklift but it tipped onto him and caused serious injuries including a punctured lung and broken back.

"WorkSafe's investigation verified the forklift hadn't been maintained and serviced to the standard we'd expect. We asked specialists to take a look and what they found was shocking – there were serious safety issues with the handbrake, to the point it would never have been able to stop the forklift from moving even on a slight incline."

WorkSafe's Casey Broad says the sentence is a reminder for businesses to keep workers safe.

To read further, please click here.

WorkSafe [23 May 2024]

Employment indicators: April 2024

Changes in the seasonally adjusted filled jobs for the April 2024 month (compared with the March 2024 month) were:

- All industries – up 0.1 percent (1,534 jobs) to 2.4 million filled jobs.
- Primary industries – down 0.5 percent (539 jobs).
- Goods-producing industries – up 0.2 percent (1,005 jobs).
- Service industries – flat (up 846 jobs).

To read further, please click here.

Statistics New Zealand [28 May 2024]

Census release on Te Whata important milestone for iwi data

Te Kāhui Raraunga and Stats NZ have taken an historic step in Aotearoa New Zealand's data landscape with the release of 2023 Census Māori descent data on the iwi-designed and operated platform, Te Whata.

This is the first time census data has been released on a non-government-owned platform as part of a census release.

The milestone has been made possible under the Mana Ōrite Relationship agreement between the Data Iwi Leaders Group and Stats NZ.

"Sharing the release of 2023 Census data is an important step in the implementation of the Māori data governance model and highlights the positive outcomes that can be achieved through iwi-Crown partnerships. This marks a significant move forward in Māori data governance and management," Te Kāhui Raraunga Chair, Rahui Papa says.

"Stats NZ has prioritised making Māori descent data available on Te Whata a part of the first release. We have worked closely with Te Kāhui Raraunga on the 2023 Census, because our aim is to help iwi and Māori access and use data about themselves. We look forward to replicating this model for the big data releases coming later in the year," Government Statistician and Stats NZ Chief Executive, Mark Sowden says.

Te Whata, developed by Te Kāhui Raraunga (with support from Stats NZ in 2020), is a by iwi, for iwi data platform hosting relevant information and insights that can be harnessed by iwi Māori to identify areas for celebration, development, or intervention.

To read further, please click here.

New Zealand Immigration [29 May 2024]

Growth in export markets for New Zealand milk powder

Milk powder exports were valued at $9.7 billion in the year ended April 2024, according to figures released by Stats NZ last week.

Milk powder made up 14 percent of the total value of exports for the same period, making it our largest export commodity.

Since the year ended April 2008, annual milk powder export values have increased 109 percent, and quantities have increased 112 percent.

In the year ended April 2024, China was the main destination for our milk powder exports. Over this period, 30 percent of our milk powder exports were sent to China.

"China has been our top milk powder destination for a long time, but we have also seen strong growth in exports to other markets," international trade manager Alasdair Allen said.

The signing of the free trade agreement with China in 2008 accelerated exports to China.

Milk powder exports to China increased 987 percent in value, and 1004 percent in quantity in the year ended April 2024, compared with the year ended April 2008.

To read further, please click here.

Statistics New Zealand [24 May 2024]

EMPLOYMENT COURT: ONE CASE

Employee misuses company vehicle and resigns

Ultimate Siteworks Ltd (Ultimate Siteworks) hired Mr Joyce on 27 September 2021. On 5 January 2022, he resigned but alleged Ultimate Siteworks dismissed him. The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found Ultimate Siteworks did not unjustifiably dismiss or disadvantage him. Mr Joyce challenged this determination and sought for the Employment Court (the Court) to find he was unjustifiably dismissed. He also challenged the Authority's order to pay $5,750 to Ultimate Siteworks as a contribution to its costs for the Authority hearing. In turn, Ultimate Siteworks applied for sanctions against Mr Joyce, for breaching the Authority's order to pay the award, and enforcement of him paying it.

Mr Joyce incurred six speeding tickets on Ultimate Sitework's ute during his employment, damaging the front after he said he missed a turn and slid into a barrier. On 5 January 2022, director Mr Rowe instructed Mr Joyce that the ute was to be used for work purposes only. Mr Joyce protested that he had put his personal car into storage in order to make space for the truck, so he had no other vehicle to drive. Notwithstanding this, Mr Rowe maintained his position.

"Are you serious bro[?] Well I'm going to have to hand my notice in then," Mr Joyce texted. The two sorted details for ending Mr Joyce's employment over the rest of the week, including that Mr Rowe instructed the return of company property. On 9 January 2022, Mr Joyce sought for Ultimate Siteworks to pay for additional hours. Mr Rowe maintained he would pay everything Mr Joyce was owed, but not until the company property was returned. This began a dispute where Mr Joyce felt he was still owed wages and public holidays.

On 14 January 2022, Ultimate Siteworks' other director, Mrs Rowe, asked if Mr Joyce could confirm whether he had resigned. She clarified that if he was employed, she wanted to know if he would work his notice. When Mr Joyce said he hadn't resigned, she wrote out the timeline that Ultimate Siteworks had rejected a reduced notice period but did not terminate his employment. Therefore, if he did not resign, he needed to confirm he was available for work. In the end, Mr Joyce did not return and instead owed the company $500 in leave in advance from the 2021 Christmas closedown.

The Court found Mr Joyce's texts proved he initiated the termination of his employment. Ultimate Siteworks had no desire to end his employment and did not set out to do so. In their discussions the parties reached agreement to end the employment on 8 January 2022. When this agreement became disputed, Ultimate Siteworks sought to understand the full situation.

Meanwhile, Mr Joyce had no reason to believe that Ultimate Siteworks would not pay him what he was due. On 17 January 2022, he started a new job and spent a total of five days unpaid. The circumstances would have only justified a small award for humiliation, loss of dignity, and injury to his feelings. The Court agreed with the Authority that Mr Joyce was not unjustifiably dismissed or disadvantaged.

Mr Joyce suggested the costs ordered by the Authority should have been lower because some matters raised by Ultimate Siteworks made the investigation meeting longer than it needed to be. The Court disagreed, considering that Ultimate Siteworks raised matters reasonably and that the Authority's assessment of costs was appropriate.

The Court decided his non-compliance was based in the optimism of winning his challenge to the determination. A fine would have been warranted for breaches that were deliberate, wilful, repeated, ongoing, or without excuse or explanation. The proportionality of the breach's value and circumstances of the parties, including financial circumstances, was also relevant.

Mr Joyce's non-compliance did not comprise any of these traits and was for a modest, not very long breach. He was otherwise not in a strong financial position, having suffered an injury and been out of work, and had no past record of non-compliance. The Court concluded it would not order a fine, but emphasised Mr Joyce was to pay the Authority's original compliance order. It encouraged the parties to agree on costs for the proceeding this time round.

Joyce v Ultimate Siteworks Limited [[2024] NZEmpC 64; 18/04/24; Judge Holden]

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY: FOUR CASES

Employer sends away employee by suggesting resignation

Grenadier Real Estate Limited (Grenadier) employed THR as an office administrator on 7 June 2022. In February 2023, THR raised a work issue with Grenadier. She escalated it to Grenadier's chief operating officer, Mr Bloomfield, who raised the prospect of THR resigning with an exit package. THR accepted this, then raised personal grievances for unjustifiable dismissal and unjustified disadvantage.

During 2023, THR's branch took on new employees, increasing her workload. A new office manager, Ms Toughey, commenced work in February 2023. THR felt stressed by the workload and that Ms Toughey was ignoring her. On 10 February 2023, she raised her concerns with the business operating officer, Ms Penny. The two explored solutions including that THR said she did not have an opportunity to have a meeting with Ms Toughey. Ms Penny noted she had worked with Ms Toughey before and would arrange a catch-up with both parties. THR claimed Ms Penny said she was good friends with Ms Toughey. THR decided not to mention anything further about her work concerns.

On 10 February 2023, the parties held a meeting but THR left it feeling not much had changed. Over the next few days THR felt her concerns had not been addressed and her work environment was worsening. She perceived negative attitudes towards her and that some agents were critical of her work. The issues with Ms Toughey continued, who then also had agents report THR's mistakes.

On 21 February 2023, THR rang Mr Bloomfield upset. They met the following morning. THR said in the meeting Ms Toughey was rude and dismissive of her as well as being unsupportive. She asked Mr Bloomfield to speak to Ms Toughey and seek a resolution.

Mr Bloomfield said that if THR thought Grenadier was not right for her, she could leave and it would pay THR six weeks' settlement wages. THR said she felt shocked and overwhelmed by this turn of the conversation. She left the meeting and called her sister for advice. Afterward, she emailed Mr Bloomfield: "You have made me an offer to leave my employment. Please email me the paperwork to sign." Mr Bloomfield did so. THR treated Mr Bloomfield's action as a dismissal and she did not return to work with Grenadier.

THR claimed Grenadier did not investigate her concerns from 10 February 2023, unjustifiably disadvantaging her. The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found THR did not express these concerns clearly enough. Ms Penny did not receive sufficiently clear or specific complaints for her and Grenadier to be obliged to investigate. Grenadier may have failed to investigate the complaints, usually a disadvantage, but the failure was justified.

The Authority then considered whether Grenadier unjustifiably dismissed THR. An employer could send away an employee by unequivocally acting to dismiss. Mr Bloomfield's actions were unclear. He did not intend to dismiss her but wanted to explore the option. The Authority said even if not intending to dismiss, the language an employer uses can still equate to a dismissal. It assessed if it was reasonable for a person in THR's position to interpret Grenadier's actions as a sending away.

THR was relatively junior and just starting an office career. She was vulnerable because of her limited experience and the issues she wanted to raise. She believed that she acted correctly but worried about what the other staff all told each other about the matter. She did not feel any change and was concerned about the impact the environment was having on her.

Mr Bloomfield knew THR was upset about the issue. When THR asked him to try resolve matters with Ms Toughey, she indicated she wanted to continue with Grenadier and recognised she needed to improve her relationship. THR did not refuse to work with Ms Toughey. Mr Bloomfield could have intervened simply yet productively.

Instead, without prompting or any indication from THR that she was thinking about resigning, Mr Bloomfield told her another option was to leave Grenadier. Telling an employee they should resign was sending them away, particularly where an employer does not appear interested in maintaining the employment relationship by addressing the employee's concerns. The Authority found it reasonable

for someone in THR's position to think Mr Bloomfield considered her issues would cause too many problems or that her request was too difficult. It was reasonable that she felt Mr Bloomfield was saying the only option was to be paid to leave. Based on this, Grenadier dismissed THR.

THR felt humiliated by her dismissal. She lost faith in employers and became concerned and anxious in her new employment. She suffered from anxiety, panic attacks, and sleeplessness. She became withdrawn, losing confidence and trust in others. The Authority awarded compensation of $28,000 and her lost remuneration of $7,692.32. Costs were reserved.

THR v Grenadier Real Estate Limited [[2024] NZERA 60; 02/02/24; P van Keulen]

Employee holiday pay claims

Mr Stringer was employed by Mr McBride as an architect assistant and became a qualified architect before the end of his employment. He was employed for eight years and approximately 11 months when he resigned in June 2022 to start work on his own business. Mr Stringer claimed he was unpaid for his last day and his holiday pay at the end of his employment. After it became apparent that Mr McBride did not agree that annual holiday pay was owed or that Mr Stringer's calculations were accurate, Mr Stringer raised a personal grievance in September 2022. He said he was disadvantaged in his employment by the unjustified actions of Mr McBride in relation to non-payment of his holiday pay. He sought compensation and claimed that a penalty should be ordered against Mr McBride for breaches of the Holidays Act 2003.

Mr McBride said he kept compliant records, that there was no holiday pay owing and disputed Mr Stringer's interpretation of holiday leave entitlements. That included saying that some other types of leave or time off was paid as annual leave taken. Mr McBride further said that leave taken in advance of entitlement was granted unlawfully and that annual leave only accrued from the second year of employment onwards rather than taking that leave in the first year as part of the entitlement crystallising at the end of that year.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) investigated the issues raised, heard evidence from the parties and gave them the opportunity to ask questions of the other about the evidence. Written submissions were also submitted.

The parties agreed on much of the leave taken since the issue arose, but there were several points that Mr McBride disputed that the Authority considered. In relation to leave taken in advance in the first year, the Authority did not accept Mr McBride's continued insistence that the annual leave in advance of entitlement in Mr Stringer's first year was unlawful or somehow a difficult legal situation. In short, an employer could allow an employee to take annual leave in advance of their entitlement. Mr McBride allowed the leave in advance in the first year. Accordingly, the assessment of what leave entitlement was taken was based on 160 days for eight years and not 140 days, which had been the effect of Mr McBride's position.

The Authority found from 160 days of paid annual leave that Mr Stringer was entitled to, 145 annual leave days had been taken, leaving him to be paid out 15 days at $250 gross each day and 8 per cent of his gross earnings for the final part year.

The Authority accepted Mr Stringer's evidence that he felt humiliated by Mr McBride's actions and considered that he had been disadvantaged in his employment. The Authority found that a lower level of compensation than claimed was appropriate and ordered Mr McBride to pay Mr Stringer $4,000.

Mr McBride was ordered to pay Mr Stringer $250 for wage arrears for his final day of employment, $9,470 for unpaid holiday pay at the end of employment and $4,000 compensation. No penalties were ordered and costs were reserved.

Stringer v McBride [[2024] NZERA 59; 2/2/2024; A Baker]

Employer could not reasonably accommodate pilot over 65

Captain McGearty worked for Air New Zealand as a pilot on its wide-bodied Boeing fleet (B777). Air New Zealand, in accordance with a practice utilised since about 2005 for pilots turning 65 years of age (known as age-restricted pilots or ARPs), asked Captain McGearty to stipulate whether upon turning 65 he intended to transfer from the B777 fleet to its narrower body A320 fleet as international regulations significantly reduced the number of destinations he would be permitted to fly to. He declined to make any stipulation after a number of requests. In February 2018, he formally advised his belief that he could be accommodated on the B777 fleet and expected to return to the fleet after a period of retirement leave. Although Captain McGearty returned to the B777 pursuant to an "ARP trial" in October 2019, when COVID-19 seriously affected Air New Zealand's operations in March 2020, the trial was suspended. Captain McGearty was not part of the ARP trial when it resumed in 2022, and he remained on leave without pay.

Captain McGearty raised personal grievances under the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act) claiming that he was unjustifiably disadvantaged on the grounds that Air New Zealand would not roster him duties on the B777 and by electing to take leave without pay, which he says was under duress. He also raised a grievance under the Act that he was unlawfully discriminated against because Air New Zealand would not roster him duties on the B777 on the grounds of his age. He sought reimbursement of lost wages, compensation for humiliation, loss of dignity and injury to feelings, and compensation for lost benefits.

Air New Zealand denied Captain McGearty's claims by reason of international and foreign law restrictions that prohibited pilots from operating as pilots once they turned 65. It stated age was a genuine occupational qualification for pilots operating to territories affected by age-related restrictions, and it reasonably accommodated Captain McGearty once he no longer held the genuine occupational qualification of age. Air New Zealand believed its actions and how it acted were what a fair and reasonable employer could have done in all the circumstances.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) heard extensive evidence about the challenges faced by Air New Zealand in attempting to manage the emotive situation of pilots who wished to continue to fly the B777 fleet. Age restrictions, a limited number of locations the pilots could fly to, and a very complex and a highly detailed rostering system, created a situation where not every request could be accommodated.

The Authority observed that if Air New Zealand treated age as a qualification for Captain McGearty's position on the B777, it would have to justify the treatment as both a genuine occupational qualification and as one that was not reasonably able to be accommodated by requiring other employees to undertake the work for which age is a genuine occupational qualification. The Authority ruled that, as defined by the Human Rights Act 1993, age was a genuine occupational qualification.

The Authority felt that, given rostering requirements set out in successive collective agreements, it was not reasonable to expect Air New Zealand to build a bespoke roster for Captain McGearty or assign him (or other pilots aged 65 or over) unrestricted flying.

Consequently, the Authority ruled that Captain McGearty's claims were unsuccessful. Air New Zealand's actions, and how it had acted, were what a fair and reasonable employer could have done in all the circumstances at the time those actions occurred. Costs were reserved.

McGearty v Air New Zealand Limited [[2024] NZERA 55; 01/02/24; S Blick]

Employee successfully argues for backpay

Ms Kaur was employed by Surf 'N' Turf Hospitality Limited (SNT) from 10 August 2020 until 4 June 2021. During her employment, her husband's work visa was being sponsored by SNT.

Upon her resignation, she raised a claim with the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) alleging that SNT breached her individual employment agreement (IEA) because she was not given 40 hours of work per week, as per the IEA, because a variation to reduce her weekly pay from $25.50 to $22.50 was not recorded in writing. She claimed that she did not receive paid 10-minute breaks and that SNT verbally agreed to pay for family accommodation for three months and did not do this.

On 1 September 2021, personal grievance claims were advanced for unjustified disadvantage and unjustified constructive dismissal along with claims for various penalties. SNT objected to the personal grievances being raised out of the statutory timeframe and refuted all the claims.

The Authority heard conflicting evidence about Ms Kaur's hourly rate. SNT claimed this was an error, whereas Ms Kaur said the reduction was not agreed to. She said she raised this with SNT and it told her to accept it, which she reluctantly did to avoid jeopardising her husband's sponsorship. The Authority preferred the evidence of Ms Kaur. It was noted that, consistent with the IEA, any variation needed to be in writing and there was no evidence of any written variation. The Authority found that Ms Kaur's hourly rate was $25.50 and she was entitled to receive payment based on that rate.

The Authority considered that a plain reading of the IEA established that minimum hours for Ms Kaur were 30 hours per week and not 40 hours, as was claimed by Ms Kaur. Although the IEA referenced flexible hours, the Authority observed that for 21 weeks Ms Kaur's hours were less than 30 per week, which was in breach of her IEA, and she was entitled to receive payment for this shortfall. If SNT was not able to provide sufficient work for Ms Kaur, it could have proposed to restructure her role, which it did not do.

Ms Kaur alleged that she was told not to take breaks. The Authority found this evidence implausible and preferred the evidence of SNT that the nature of the business meant breaks needed to be taken during less busy times. The Authority found that there were sufficient times for breaks and, with a lack of supporting evidence to the contrary, dismissed this claim.

Conflicting evidence was also heard about the claim for three months of accommodation. While the job advertisement included accommodation for the right candidate, this did not form part of the IEA. The Authority observed that this issue only came up after the employment concluded and it would have expected the issue would have been raised earlier while Ms. Kaur was employed. Accordingly, and with no evidence to the contrary, the claim was not supported.

The Authority supported the submission of SNT that the personal grievance claims for unjustified disadvantage and constructive dismissal were raised outside the 90-day statutory limit. There was no evidence before the Authority to indicate the matters had been raised with SNT prior to the grievances being lodged. The claims relating to wages were not subject to the same time limit so could be considered.

The Authority concluded by noting that there was insufficient detail advanced in the penalties claim and therefore did not give it further consideration.

SNT was ordered to pay Ms Kaur $6,932.06 for breaching her employment agreement as to hours and rate of pay, and $554.57 as holiday pay based on 8 per cent of the above. Costs were reserved.

Kaur v Surf 'N' Turf Hospitality Limited [[2024] NZERA 69; 07/02/24; A Baker]

LEGISLATION

Note: Bills go through several stages before becoming an Act of Parliament: Introduction; First Reading; Referral to Select Committee; Select Committee Report, Consideration of Report; Committee Stage; Second Reading; Third Reading; and Royal Assent.

Bills open for submissions to select committee: Seven Bills

Te Pire mō Ō-Rākau, Te Pae o Maumahara/Ō-Rākau Remembrance Bill (14 June 2024)

Privacy Amendment Bill (14 June 2024)

Inquiry Into Climate Adaptation (16 June 2024)

Resource Management (Freshwater and Other Matters) Amendment Bill (30 June 2024)

Residential Tenancies Amendment Bill (3 July 2024)

Oranga Tamariki (Repeal Of Section 7AA) Amendment Bill (3 July 2024)

Regulatory Systems (Primary Industries) Amendment Bill (8 July 2024)

Overviews of bills-and advice on how to make a select committee submission-are available at: https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/sc/make-a-submission/

The purpose of the Employer Bulletin is to provide and to promote best practice in employment relations.

If you would like to provide feedback about the Employer Bulletin, contact: comms@businesscentral.org.nz
or for further information, call the AdviceLine on 0800 800 362

ENTERPRISE SERVICES

0800 800 362
advice@businesscentral.org.nz
www.businesscentral.org.nz

ADVICELINE

AdviceLine is your link to first-rate employment relations advice. Business Central understands the difficulties employers can have with managing employees, so supports you with dedicated employer advisors.

TRAINING SERVICES

Our training team provide you with practical training solutions across various employment topics to help upskill your staff, giving your business a competitive edge.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSULTANTS

Health and Safety and the well-being of your employees should be of paramount importance to any employer. To help you along the way, we have a friendly and knowledgeable Health and Safety Consultant.

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANTS

Employment Relations can be a difficult area to navigate. When you need close guidance on employment matters, you can rely upon our seasoned ER Consultants to be there to help.

LEGAL

When employees test the waters with a personal grievance, Business Central Legal are here to help. We offer representation in all employment law matters.

ENTERPRISE SERVICES

0800 800 362
advice@businesscentral.org.nz
businesscentral.org.nz

ADVICELINE

AdviceLine is your link to first-rate employment relations advice. Business Central understands the difficulties employers can have with managing employees, so supports you with dedicated employer advisors.

This service is 100% inclusive of your membership. There is no time limit to your call, and the team is available 8am–8pm Monday to Thursday and 8am–6pm Friday.

Our Employer Advisors are well trained and comprise a mixture of legal and business backgrounds. They understand your issues and can help advise you on legal requirements and best practices. They are backed up by a large resource base they can call on to support with you with written resources, guides, and templates.

TRAINING SERVICES

Our training team provide you with practical training solutions across various employment topics to help upskill your staff, giving your business a competitive edge.

Whether it be best practice processes under the Employment Relations Act and the Health and Safety at Work Act, leadership training or personal development, the Business Central training team are dedicated to facilitating your business's professional learning.

For more information about Business Central's public and customised in-house courses, or to register for a course, contact the team today.

For regular training updates in your area, subscribe to our Training Update newsletter.

04 470 9930, training@businesscentral.org.nz, businesscentral.org.nz

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSULTANTS

Health and Safety and the well-being of your employees should be of paramount importance to any employer. To help you along the way, we have a friendly and knowledgeable Health and Safety Consultant.

Adrienne has extensive experience with helping companies navigate Health and Safety requirements. She understands companies need to see sound return on investment for their well-being initiatives. Adrienne offers full support with compliance issues such as induction training and hazard identification and management. Additionally she can help with preparation for ACC 'Workplace Safety Management Practices'.

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANTS

Employment Relations can be a difficult area to navigate. When you need close guidance on employment matters, you can rely upon our seasoned ER Consultants to be there to help.

Having someone equipped to help you do the work can take the stress out of a tricky situation.

Our Consultants have a wide range of experience and are prepared to help. Whether you need to update your agreements or policies, or embark on performance management, they have the experience to make a difference. There are so many areas they can help; it may be union issues and managing a difficult relationship or it could be confirming a restructuring selection matrix.

LEGAL

When employees test the waters with a personal grievance, Business Central Legal are here to help. We offer representation in all employment law matters.

Business Central Legal provides you best return on investment for legal advice on employment law matters. Our team of lawyers are only available to members, and can help solve your tricky issues.

While you may think of lawyers as representing people in court, this is far from everything they do. Employers take advantage of the value of the Business Central Legal team to help in drafting documents such as tailored employment agreements and offers of employment. Additionally they can help with key guidance on difficult issues as restructuring processes and rock solid performance management plans.