

EMPLOYER BULLETIN

10 June 2024
A Weekly News Digest for Employers

EMPLOYER NEWS

Progress for fixing the Holidays Act 2003

The Minister for Workplace Relations and Safety Brooke van Velden says this Government will improve the Holidays Act 2003 [the Act] with the help of businesses and workers who will be affected by changes to the Act.

“Change has been a long time coming, and I know there are many who are frustrated with the Holidays Act. We need an Act that businesses can implement, and that makes it easy for workers to understand their entitlements. We need to do this once and do it right.

“I have heard from a number of businesses who are struggling to adjust to the previous Government’s decision to double sick leave entitlements for all eligible workers.

“Workplaces that rely on part-time workers are particularly vulnerable to unexpected staffing shortages. To explore this issue further, the exposure draft set for consultation will include a proposed approach to pro-rating sick leave, to better reflect how much an employee works,” says Ms van Velden.

“Although the previous Government spent many years working on a solution, the advice I have received from officials has led me to the conclusion that there are further opportunities to improve the simplicity and workability of the legislation. In some areas the previous Government’s decisions would end up increasing complexity and compliance costs.

For example, the exposure draft will now include a change in how annual leave is provided, moving from an entitlement system to an accrual system.

“Shifting to an accrual system for annual leave entitlements is just common sense. While workers might not notice any change in their entitlements, from a payroll perspective this should make a huge difference. An accrual system should help avoid the complex calculations that regularly stump payroll software and should therefore reduce compliance costs for employers.”

To read further, please [click here](#).

PM congratulates King's Birthday Honours recipients

Prime Minister Christopher Luxon has congratulated the recipients included on the King's Birthday 2024 Honours List, saying they reflect the best of New Zealand.

The 176 recipients include the appointments of two Dames and two Knights.

"The New Zealanders being honoured in this year's King's Birthday Honours have given decades of service to their communities and country," Mr Luxon says.

"New Zealand is a better country for the contribution that each of these people have made over many years.

"As the first female CEO of an NZX-listed company, a role she took up at just 37 years old, Dame Theresa Gattung is the definition of a trailblazer and continues to make a significant and tangible difference for women in business.

"Dame Joan Withers is deservedly recognised for her work as one of our country's leading business and governance experts. Over a truly impressive career, she has held numerous governance roles in significant New Zealand businesses where she has led major organisational transformations."

To read further, please [click here](#).

Government commences Firearms Registry review

The Government is delivering on a commitment made in the National-ACT coalition agreement by commencing a review of the Firearms Registry.

"Cabinet has agreed to the registry review terms of reference and the review is now underway," Associate Minister of Justice, Hon Nicole McKee says.

"It is important that we take stock of the available data and information so that we can establish whether the Registry is effectively and efficiently improving public safety.

"There is concern that the Registry is not tackling criminal firearms use. At the same time, I hear from licensed firearm owners that the process of registering their firearms is difficult and demanding, and there are very real concerns expressed regarding the privacy of information."

The Registry was launched on 24 June 2023 by the Firearms Safety Authority to be implemented over a five-year period. It aims to create a digital record of the possession of firearms and other arms items to help stop the diversion of firearms to criminals.

To read further, please [click here](#).

Government to sign groundbreaking Indo-Pacific agreements

Trade Minister Todd McClay and Climate Change Minister Simon Watts travel to Singapore tomorrow to sign three Indo Pacific Economic Framework (IPEF) agreements.

IPEF's 14 partners represent 40 percent of global GDP and account for 50 percent of New Zealand's exports. They include critical markets for Kiwi exporters in Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, The Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, The United States, and Vietnam.

Minister McClay will participate in the full IPEF Ministerial meeting which includes discussions on an Indo-Pacific wide trade agreement. He will participate in the formal signing of the overarching IPEF Agreement and the Fair Economy Agreement.

These agreements focus on anti-corruption efforts and labour standards across the region along with increased international tax cooperation to shape a secure and transparent investment climate in the Indo-Pacific region.

“The third IPEF pillar focuses on increasing trade efficiency. The negotiation of this pillar presents further opportunities for New Zealand to work with partners to reduce Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) and drive greater certainty for exporters.

Working with IPEF countries to increase investment flows and trade will help New Zealand meet the aspirational target of doubling exports by value in 10 years,” Mr McClay says.

While at IPEF Minister McClay will also hold bilateral meetings with Ministers from Australia, Canada, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Japan, Singapore, and The United States.

To read further, please [click here](#).

International visitor spend on the rise

The latest International Visitor Survey (IVS) results released today show international visitors are spending more while in New Zealand.

Spending by international visitors reached \$4.5 billion in the March 2024 quarter this year, an increase of 34% (adjusted for inflation) from the same quarter in 2023. Visitor arrivals also continued to trend upwards, with 3.2 million arrivals in the year ending March 2024 – 82% of pre-pandemic levels.

The strong growth in visitor spend in the March 2024 quarter saw overall visitor spend return to 80% of pre-pandemic levels, growth that can be attributed to a shift in the visitor make-up.

The number of higher spending visitors from countries such as China, and those coming for holidays or business have increased, while the proportion of lower spending visitors such as those from Australia or people staying with family and friends has decreased.

Visitor satisfaction also remains high, with almost all visitors (90%) saying they were satisfied or very satisfied with their visit to New Zealand.

To read further, please [click here](#).

International trade: March 2024 quarter

- Total exports of goods and services for the March 2024 quarter were \$24.7 billion, up from \$24.0 billion in the March 2023 quarter.
- Total imports of goods and services for the March 2024 quarter were \$26.0 billion, down from \$26.7 billion in the March 2023 quarter.
- The total two-way trade for the March 2024 quarter was \$50.7 billion.

To read further, please [click here](#).

Six unlawful migrants located by compliance officers

On 27 May, Immigration Compliance officers located the unlawful migrants following an investigation after the individuals failed to depart New Zealand in accordance with their visa requirements.

The individual who overstayed their visa the longest arrived in New Zealand in 2013 on a 12-day Limited Visa to attend a business symposium in New Zealand.

3 individuals arrived between 2018 and 2022 on Visitor Visas. Another arrived in 2022 with a Maritime Crew visa to allow him to join a vessel in New Zealand as a crew member.

The 6th individual absconded from a maritime vessel in 2023 when it paid a scheduled visit to New Zealand.

When interviewed by Compliance Officers, the 6 migrants acknowledged that they were aware they did not hold valid visas and had failed to depart New Zealand or regularise their immigration status. The individuals will remain in immigration custody until their deportation takes place. Immigration New Zealand (INZ) will make the necessary travel arrangements and ensure they depart safely from New Zealand to their home countries.

Steve Watson, General Manager Immigration Compliance and Investigations, says the legal obligation to leave New Zealand before a temporary visa expires is clearly communicated on visas.

To read further, please [click here](#).

\$36 million commitment for local catchment groups

The Government is backing farmers to improve land management practices with a \$36 million commitment to support locally led catchment groups, \$7 million of which will go directly to catchment groups across the country, Agriculture Minister Todd McClay has announced.

“Budget 2024 provides \$36 million over four years for regionally based Ministry for Primary Industries staff who support catchment groups on-the-ground.

“We’re also announcing a direct investment of \$7 million into 11 catchment groups and collectives,” Mr McClay says.

This is in addition to MPI’s current investment in 46 catchment-based projects, which support 290 groups and over 9,000 farmers.

Significant new funding includes:

- \$2 million over four years to catchment groups across Tairāwhiti;
- \$980,000 over four years, to 13 catchment groups within the Manawatū River Catchment Collective;
- \$950,000 over four years to the Ōtūwharekai/Ashburton Lakes Catchment Group, in conjunction with the Mid Canterbury Catchment Collective.

To read further, please [click here](#).

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY: FIVE CASES

Union breaches duty it owed to a member

Ms Harte, a midwife, asked the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) to address her claims that her union, the Midwife Employee Representation and Advisory Service Inc (the Union), breached duties it owed to her.

Ms Harte was the subject of an abandoned employment investigation instigated by her former employer, Te Whatu Ora – Health New Zealand, following the Union advancing concerns on behalf of a group of her colleagues who were also union members. Ms Harte contended the Union unlawfully interfered and undermined her employment relationship and breached a statutory duty of good faith owed to her. She sought various compensatory remedies.

The Union said no good faith breaches occurred and denied unlawfully interfering in the employment relationship. The Union said they were properly engaged in attempting to resolve conflict between their members and that the Union organiser involved merely functioned as a conduit, highlighting the existence of workplace conflict.

Ms Harte worked at Nelson Hospital from November 2014 to January 2023. In March 2022, Ms Harte's colleague approached a Union official based in Waikato to raise concerns about her interactions with Ms Harte. The colleague initially made it clear she wanted to remain anonymous. She detailed various negative interactions between herself, Ms Harte, and other team members.

The Union official said they sought advice from a local Union workplace representative on the veracity of the concerns and spoke to various identified team members. After informally approaching the midwifery manager, they put the details in writing. The Union did not approach Ms Harte or other midwives known to be supportive of her. The Nelson Hospital management then wrote to Ms Harte outlining a planned independent investigation.

The investigator interviewed the Waikato Union official and the Nelson workplace representative. When asked why they consented to being interviewed, the Union official said that they felt their task was to relate the midwives' stories and they did not consider the potentially tricky situation that they would place themselves in. The Authority found the Union official genuinely believed that they were simply relaying concerns and generalised observations, with no suggestion of a personal agenda.

The Authority then considered what duties the Union owed to Ms Harte and the nature of the relationship between the Union and its member. There was no guidance in the rules or any policy document on how the Union manages conflicts of interest between members or for handling employment-related conflict between midwives.

In terms of the law, the Employment Relations Act (the Act) outlines good faith requirements which include relationships between a union and a member of the union. Ms Harte's counsel suggested, without Ms Harte's knowledge, the Union advanced what she perceived as false complaints to her employer. In doing so, the Union official and workplace representative also became personally involved in advancing and advocating the complaints.

The Authority did not find that the Union had misled Ms Harte, intentionally or otherwise, and raising the membership concern was not a breach of good faith. The Authority found the Union did not have an obligation to communicate its concerns to Ms Harte.

The only mistake that the Union official made was agreeing to be interviewed as part of the employer investigation and expressing a personal assessment of Ms Harte's capabilities based largely upon what she had been told by anonymous sources. A prudent course of action would have been to refuse the investigator's interview, inform the employer that the Union's task was confined to acting as a conduit for the anonymous concerns and not to make subjective comment on such, or if interviewed, strictly confine comments to contextual matters.

The Authority found the Union breached an obligation it owed to Ms Harte. This breach was a failure of the Union to take due care to remain neutral during an employer investigation.

In the overall circumstances, although a breach of good faith had occurred, the Authority determined it was not of such a gravity to warrant a penalty or any other remedy in favour of Ms Harte. The breach was not deliberate, sustained or objectively intended to undermine the employment relationship. The Union legitimately advocated for the interests of its members, and simply found itself in a conflicting situation. It had not inappropriately interfered with the employment relationship.

The Authority said the finding should not be seen to condone the Union's identified breach. It considered it appropriate to issue a recommendation that the Union develop and publish guidelines to assist their employees in dealing with raising inter-member conflict, and what role Union officials should undertake in employer investigations, to avoid committing breaches where conflicting interests are an issue. The Authority also recommended that the Union publish separate guidance for their members setting out what can be expected of the Union when dealing with intermember conflict. Costs were reserved.

Harte v Midwife Employee Representation and Advisory Service Incorporated [[2024] NZERA 65; 07/02/24; D Beck]

Employer blackmails employee causing unjustified constructive dismissal

Ms Burn began working for TSP Construction Limited (TSP) on 21 April 2021 in an administrative support role. On 29 November 2021, Ms Burn resigned. She stated in her resignation letter that she had been severely disadvantaged and discriminated against after telling TSP she was pregnant. She argued she had been unjustifiably disadvantaged, improperly treated regarding her parental leave, and unjustifiably constructively dismissed. Ms Burn brought her claims to the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority). TSP rejected each claim.

On 7 October 2021, TSP was made aware that Ms Burn was pregnant. On 22 October, TSP informed Ms Burn that a restructuring process was underway that involved the creation of a new "Admin Manager" role. On 19 November 2021, Ms Burn was given a restructure proposal. It stated the duties of her role were to be taken over by whoever occupied the new Admin Manager role on 10 January 2022, until "an employee then on maternity leave" returned in April 2022, while Ms Burn would finish up in December 2021.

Ms Burn argued that proposal was evidence of predetermination. TSP later claimed that Ms Burn should never have been given that restructure proposal, as it was not the correct one. Ms Burn requested a copy of that document but was refused. On 24 November 2021, Ms Burn was undertaking her normal duties at TSP's offices when she decided to access her colleague's email and send herself a copy of the proposed restructure document. The next day, she instructed her lawyer to raise a personal grievance claim against TSP.

On 26 November 2021, TSP became aware that Ms Burn had accessed her colleague's email account. TSP immediately held a without prejudice conversation with Ms Burn's lawyer.

That was followed by an email from TSP stating that if Ms Burn did not withdraw her claim, TSP would bring criminal charges against Ms Burn for theft. It sent Ms Burn a message saying, "that unless the claim Ms Burn has submitted is withdrawn immediately we will be escalating to the police for the Theft of Intellectual Property as covered in her current contract (Breach of employment contract) we will then continue to prosecution". That was followed up by TSP telling Ms Burn that her employment agreement would not be affected by the restructure. Nevertheless, Ms Burn decided to submit her resignation.

The Authority assessed whether Ms Burn had been unjustifiably constructively dismissed. The Authority explained that a constructive dismissal can involve instances where an employer breached its duty to an employee that caused them to resign. The breach must be repudiatory as opposed to a nuisance or unpleasantness, and there must be a causal link between the employer's conduct and the employee's decision to resign. The employee's decision to resign in response to the employer's conduct must be foreseeable.

Ms Burn's main argument was that TSP sought to get rid of her on the pretext of a sham redundancy. She also argued that despite that, TSP breached its duty causing Ms Burn to resign. The Authority described TSP's message as blackmail, which is illegal. The Authority found TSP had committed a serious breach in an effort to deprive Ms Burn of her statutory right to raise grievances. The Authority decided Ms Burns had been unjustifiably constructively dismissed.

Ms Burn went on to claim she had been disadvantaged because she was pregnant. The Authority looked at the evidence and decided she had not been disadvantaged as she had merely been involved in discussions which her employer was entitled to have with her. It followed that the restructuring process undertaken by TSP was not a sham redundancy.

The Authority ordered TSP to pay Ms Burn three months' wages, \$18,000 as compensation for humiliation, loss of dignity and injury to feelings, and 26 weeks' pay being reimbursement for the paid parental leave she otherwise would have received. Costs were reserved.

Burn v TSP Construction Limited [[2024] NZERA 10; 12/01/24; M Loftus]

Recovering training costs from employee that resigned

In 2021, Mr Rudkin was employed by Combined Logistics Limited (Combined Logistics) as a truck driver. He took leave in advance and resigned after three months. The amount paid to him for this annual leave in advance was not recovered by Combined Logistics.

In April 2022, Combined Logistics employed Mr Rudkin again. During this time, he undertook training for his Class 5 Driver's Licence, which included a Dangerous Goods training course. His employment agreement stated that he had to repay the training costs if he left Combined Logistics before his one-year work anniversary. He took 4 weeks of leave in advance and resigned in July 2022.

Combined Logistics tried to recover both the annual leave paid in advance and the training costs. Mr Rudkin refused to pay the training costs but acknowledged that he owed them for his annual leave taken in advance. He was advised that he would pay them \$50 per week when he stopped receiving compensation from ACC. No payments were made by Mr Rudkin, so Combined Logistics applied to the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) and sought to recover the payments of annual leave in advance, the cost of the training courses, interest, and costs. Mr Rudkin decided not to engage in the Authority's investigation at all.

Combined Logistics said it could not deduct the leave paid in advance in Mr Rudkin's first period of employment from his first final pay because the amount Mr Rudkin owed the company exceeded the total final pay amount. When Mr Rudkin was re-employed by Combined Logistics in 2022, they verbally agreed that he would repay the debt once he was earning wages again. That did not happen.

The Authority was satisfied that Mr Rudkin acknowledged he owed Combined Logistics a debt, including annual leave paid in advance and training costs. It decided that Mr Rudkin owed Combined Logistics \$4,468.27 for annual leave taken in advance from both periods of employment. It ordered \$1,766.40 for the training courses to be paid by Mr Rudkin, as he resigned within the first year, invoking the conditions of repayment. The Authority also ordered payment of interest of \$434.14. Costs were reserved.

Combined Logistics Limited v Rudkin [[2024] NZERA 64; 07/02/24; N Szeto]

Restructuring process found not to be genuine

Mr Singh was employed by Surf 'N' Turf Hospitality Limited (SNT) from 7 October 2020 until 4 July 2021 when he resigned. Mr Singh's employment was based on a work visa that recorded he was employed as a venue general manager. He claimed that the restructuring process to disestablish that role was not genuine and the decision was predetermined, resulting in his resignation. Mr Singh also said he

resigned because he was not getting enough hours of work as was agreed to and was not getting statutory breaks. Mr Singh claimed compensation and lost earnings because he was disadvantaged and constructively dismissed.

The Authority found that Mr Singh's individual employment agreement (IEA) showed that his hours were agreed to be a minimum of 30 hours per week and not the 40 that his claim for wage arrears was based on. The Authority's review of SNT's payroll records showed that of the 32 weeks he worked for SNT, it was only the final week that Mr Singh worked 28 hours instead of 30. The Authority noted that the final week was when Mr Singh resigned without notice on 4 July 2021. The Authority dismissed Mr Singh's claim to be reimbursed based on a breach of his IEA for hours up to 40 hours.

Mr Singh said there was a verbal agreement that SNT would pay his first three months of accommodation. He relied on an advertisement that attracted him to the position. The Authority accepted that an immigration agent for Mr Singh had contacted SNT's director, Mr Zandbergen, first about the advertisement. The Authority dismissed the claim for reimbursement of the three months' accommodation. It found SNT likely did not agree to pay this as part of Mr Singh's employment.

The Authority found that Mr Singh only generalised about what breaks he believed he was not able to take. To find a statutory breach, the Authority would need to consider it at least more than likely that Mr Singh did not receive the breaks he complained of. The Authority did not have that evidence and dismissed that part of his claim.

Before Mr Singh resigned, Mr Zandbergen had commenced a restructuring process, including letters that invited Mr Singh to give feedback on a proposal for a "flat management structure". His venue general manager role would be disestablished and replaced with a new permanent duty manager role. Mr Singh provided feedback. The Authority found that the venue general manager role was likely a title used for the purpose of getting Mr Singh's required visa to work for SNT and work in New Zealand. Mr Zandbergen's oral evidence to the Authority was that the role did not exist.

Mr Zandbergen gave Mr Singh an IEA to take away to his agent for the role of venue general manager and an attached job description. Mr Singh initially said he made no alterations. In cross examination, Mr Singh conceded that he did add the job description for the venue duty manager and explained that was the standard job description for that title. The job description was extensive, and the Authority found it unlikely that Mr Singh performed many of the tasks outlined.

The Authority found that this was a situation where the application to get a work visa with SNT was likely more important to both parties than the IEA accurately recording the role done. The Authority found that SNT had already decided to go ahead with its proposal to disestablish the venue general manager role before Mr Singh resigned. Based on the reading of the letter from SNT to Mr Singh on 24 June 2021, it included that SNT proposed to advertise the new position for duty manager "immediately" and then "after completion of three weeks of advertisement which is generally required by INZ".

The Authority found that SNT breached its duty of good faith owed to Mr Singh. This is because the restructuring process was not genuine – the role that was disestablished did not in reality exist. Mr Singh provided oral evidence that the reductions in his hours (based on not receiving 40 hours per week) took a financial strain and a toll on his relationship with his wife. SNT were made to pay Mr Singh \$11,400 as compensation for the personal grievance raised. Costs were reserved.

Singh v Surf 'N' Turf Hospitality Limited [[2024] NZERA 68; 07/02/24; A Baker]

Employee secretly monitored found to be unjustifiably disadvantaged

Mr Kalic was employed as a beekeeper by Manuka Health New Zealand Limited (MHNZL) from 29 July 2019 until his resignation on 1 December 2019. This was the second period of his employment with MHNZL. He was first employed from August 2015 until 15 April 2019 when his employment ended by way of redundancy. He was reinstated on 29 July 2019 and commenced work on 19 August 2019.

In early September 2019, MHNZL proposed all staff to sign their new employment agreement. Mr Kalic was unhappy with the new terms and met with MHNZL's general manager, Mr Campbell, to clear up any misunderstandings of the new terms. The meeting did not fully address Mr Kalic's concerns so his representative, Mr Halse, wrote to MHNZL asking to make certain alterations. MHNZL did not send a corrected proposed employment agreement, so Mr Kalic remained on his existing employment agreement.

After this, MHNZL monitored Mr Kalic without informing him. It found that he left a smoker in the forest, causing a significant fire risk potentially, and failed to remove sponges from some beehives which could have caused a loss of bees with a consequent impact on production. MHNZL invited Mr Kalic to a disciplinary meeting but not Mr Halse.

On 14 October, Mr Kalic attended the meeting with a co-worker as his support person, as Mr Halse could not be contacted. Mr Kalic denied he was at fault for the allegations. He suggested MHNZL wanted to blame him, when there were other people involved in the incidents, because they wanted to dismiss him. MHNZL investigated further.

When Mr Halse found out about the meeting, he raised concerns about not being contacted as Mr Kalic's support person and mistreatment of Mr Kalic since his return to work. He asked for the information supporting the disciplinary investigation to be sent to him and proposed a meeting date. MHNZL advised that Mr Kalic "had been represented" at the meeting and suggested that they all attend mediation to address issues. Mediation was not organised, but later MHNZL proposed to give a written warning as the incidents constituted health and safety breaches.

Mr Halse advised that MHNZL redo the disciplinary process completely as there were several defects in their process including not inviting him to the first meeting, not acting in good faith and punishing Mr Kalic for the failures of four people. MHNZL redid the entire disciplinary process. Mr Kalic claimed he felt bullied, was treated badly, and was concerned about the safety of vehicles he was using, as one of the trailers he was using was sabotaged. MHNZL did not find any tampering of the trailer. It followed a fair process, gave Mr Kalic a written warning, and found that he was not bullied. Mr Kalic secured another job before giving notice and resigning.

Mr Kalic raised a personal grievance for unjustified dismissal on the basis of constructive dismissal. The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found that he was not unjustifiably dismissed, as he was not coerced to leave. His decision to resign was also not foreseeable. MHNZL investigated his concerns about bullying and tampering of the trailer. He resigned during the investigation and secured new employment.

The Authority found that MHNZL unjustifiably disadvantaged Mr Kalic, because it failed to put in place a fair and reasonable system to support him when he returned to work. It also did not act in good faith by not notifying him from the outset that he was being monitored. If it had done so, the disciplinary investigations may have been avoided because Mr Kalic would have been engaged in a process where he knew clearly what was expected of him on a day-to-day basis. MHNZL's handling of the proposed employment agreement, though untidy, was an admitted error which was communicated to his representative. \$18,000 was awarded as compensation for hurt and humiliation. Costs were reserved.

Kalic v Manuka Health New Zealand Limited [[2024] NZERA; 26/02/24; M Ulrich]

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: Nine Bills

[Local Government \(Water Services Preliminary Arrangements\) Bill](#) (13 June 2024)

[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 \(Extended Duration of Coastal Permits for Marine Farms\) Amendment Bill](#) (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.