

AND DISTRICT HEALTH BOARD  
Te Poari Hauora Ā Rohe O Te Tai Tokerau



Postage Included



23

g/

RECEIVED

18 FEB 2022

Ministry of Business,  
Innovation and Employment

Social Unemployment Insurance Tripartite Working Group  
Ministry of Business, Innovation + Employment  
P. O. Box 1473  
Wellington 6145

Whangarei 0148

Privacy of natural persons

Sender Details

POSTCODE  
TOWN/CITY  
ADDRESS  
NAME



Postage is paid only once within New Zealand. Place in any NZ Post mailbox for delivery

Take this as a No  
Not now, not ever!

# Submission on A New Zealand Income Insurance Scheme

## Your name and organisation

Name	A. Rutherford
Organisation (if applicable)	
Contact details	Privacy of natural persons

## Responses to consultation document questions

### Chapter 4 – How a new income insurance scheme could achieve our objectives (Pg 30-48)

The Forum considers the benefits of income insurance for job loss due to displacement or health conditions would outweigh its costs.

1 Do you agree New Zealand should introduce an income insurance scheme for displacement and loss of work due to health conditions or disabilities?

No - its just a tax under another name  
there are private schemes that could cover people  
whom this interests. There are higher priority tasks  
for good governance

### Chapter 5 – Honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Pg 49-51)

Kawanatanga – Good governance and partnership

2 How can we ensure the proposed income insurance scheme honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi?

Let any maori who wants to voluntarily set  
up a scheme develop their own fund.

3 What are the opportunities for partnership and Māori representation in the proposed income insurance scheme's governance and operations?

4 How can we ensure equity of access, participation, and outcomes for Māori in the proposed income insurance scheme?

5 How can we reflect and embed te ao Māori in the proposed income insurance scheme's design?

Chapter 6 – Coverage for displaced workers (Pg 53-72)

Displacement and standard employment (full- and part-time permanent employees)

6

Do you agree with defining displacement as the involuntary loss of work due to the disestablishment of a job?

I don't believe in the scheme, in any form. I don't support it.


7

Do you agree with excluding poor performance and gross misconduct as reasons for claiming insurance?

That's a no brainer

8

Do you agree with excluding resignation as a reason for claiming insurance?



Coverage provided for complete job loss only

9

Do you agree that income insurance should cover only the complete loss of a job, and cover situations where a person loses only one of several jobs that they hold?

No  
I believe private insurance is adequate  
the govt has no place levying with the rest of

10

Do you agree that insurance would be payable only where income loss was greater than a minimum threshold, such as a 20 percent loss of total earnings, counting income from all of their jobs?

No  
I don't believe the scheme is good value  
for employees at all.

Displacement and non-standard employment – a principle-based approach

11

Do you agree that it is important to provide income insurance coverage to non-standard workers, where practical?

No

12

Do you agree that income insurance should cover the 'loss of reasonably anticipated income'?

No

13

Do you agree that income insurance entitlements should be based on an 'established pattern of work'?

No



Coverage provided for fixed-term and seasonal employees

14 Do you agree that income insurance should cover fixed-term and seasonal employees if they are displaced before the end of an employment agreement, with the duration of the payment running to the scheduled end of the employment agreement, or the maximum insurance entitlement duration, whichever is shorter?

No

15 Do you agree that income insurance should cover fixed-term and seasonal employees, where their employment agreements are not renewed, and they can show a regular pattern of work and reasonable expectation of future income?

No.

Coverage provided for casual employees

16 Do you agree that income insurance should cover casual employees who can show a regular pattern of work with an employer and a reasonable expectation of future income?

No

17 How would these design choices work in practice? What risks can you see with the approach to establishing a regular pattern of work?

No

Coverage for self-employed workers

18 What risks do you see with covering, or not covering, people in self-employment?

Self employed people should manage their own arrangements not create work for govt &

19 Are there some groups of self-employed who should and should not be covered? expenses as a result.

I believe self employed people can voluntarily make own private arrangements.

20 How can we practically distinguish between contractors who resemble employees, and those with a high degree of independence?

Forget the scheme & get on with sorting out

roads i.e. median barriers not reduced speed limits. They reduced the speed on my local road & still have regular fatalities



21

Because a self-employed person cannot technically be made redundant, what types of events would be appropriate 'triggers' for insurance payments?

as earlier stay out of this issue allow private schemes for non gov't employees.

22

How do you think the levy should be collected from self-employed workers?

I don't.

#### A modest minimum contribution period

23

Do you agree with the proposed minimum contribution period of six months over a period of 18 months preceding the claim?

No

#### Limits on subsequent claims

24

Do you agree limits should be placed on the number claims people can make?

No

25

Do you agree with limiting claims to a total of six months within an 18-month period?

No

26

Could the risks associated with a low contribution history be managed in other ways?

Yes.

Coverage for New Zealand citizens and residents

27 Do you agree with limiting coverage of the proposed income insurance scheme to New Zealand citizens and residents?

First is it 100% accepted by those citizens & residents. And if it should only be an option or voluntary scheme.

28 To ensure New Zealand workers are not disadvantaged by lower cost international workers, do you agree that working holiday makers, international students and temporary work visa holders – and their employers – should contribute to the proposed income insurance scheme's costs?

You are already disadvantaging employees by the proposed levy. How many nurses could act as a pb if they wanted.

Chapter 7 – Entitlements for displaced workers (Pg 73-95)

Income caps and income replacement rates that match the accident compensation scheme

29 Do you agree with a replacement rate set at 80 percent?

No

30 Do you agree with a cap on insurable (and leviable) income set at the same rate as the accident compensation scheme (currently \$130,911)?

No

Only personal exertion income would abate (reduce) insurance entitlements

31 Do you agree that only the insurance claimant's personal exertion income should affect their insurance entitlements?

What does this even mean.

32 Do you agree that income insurance should have individualised entitlement, meaning a partner's income would not affect the rate payable?

No a combined income should be factored in.

Abatement rates would ensure a claimant is not financially better off as a result of their loss of work

33 Do you agree that someone should be able to earn some income from paid employment before it affects their entitlements to income insurance?

No

34 Do you agree that insurance should abate 'dollar for dollar' when earned income and insurance combined reach 100 percent of previous income?

I don't want the scheme at all.

Insurance would generally be treated as income, to determine eligibility for welfare and student support

35 Do you agree that insurance should be treated as income for assessing eligibility for income support such as main benefits and Working for Families tax credits and student support?

Yes.

36 Given the purpose of the In-Work Tax Credit and Minimum Family Tax Credit in encouraging people into employment and helping with in-work costs, do you agree that income insurance claimants would not be eligible for these tax credits?

No I hate tax credits. A fair tax system adjusts for low income ~~and does~~ (they may have huge saleable assets)

Insurance claimants could also receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's Pension

37 Do you agree that income insurance claimants could also receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's Pension?

No

38 Do you think a limit should be placed on the amount of time someone can receive New Zealand Superannuation or the Veteran's pension and income insurance?

No

Where eligible, insurance claimants could choose whether to access Paid Parental Leave or income insurance and may receive both sequentially

39 Do you agree that income insurance and Paid Parental Leave could be accessed sequentially but not at the same time?

No.



Insurance claimants could also receive ACC weekly compensation where it covers a different income loss

40

*Do you agree that claimants should be able receive both ACC weekly compensation and income insurance at the same time for differing income loss subject to independently meeting the eligibility criteria for both?*

No

A sufficient base entitlement period

41

*Do you agree with a base insurance entitlement length of six months, plus a four-week bridging payment paid by the employer?*

No

42

*Would you support a longer or shorter length of base insurance entitlement?*

I don't support the scheme in any form to be managed by govt.

Extending the maximum period in specified circumstances

43

*Do you think the scheme should allow extensions to the base period of income insurance entitlements for training or vocational rehabilitation?*

No

Enhancing the income insurance scheme with notice periods

44

*Do you agree that employers should give at least four weeks' notice to employees, and the insurer, before redundancy takes effect?*

Yes.

Avoiding unnecessary redundancies

45 Do you agree that employers should pay former workers for the initial period of unemployment for four weeks?

No

46 Should bridging payments be applied to all workers, including those not eligible for income insurance?

No

47 Should the income insurance scheme finance bridging payments in circumstances where the payments are not forthcoming from employers, and refund employers for bridging payments if workers find work within this period?

No

48 Do you consider that stronger integrity measures are necessary to manage the risk of spurious claims to the income insurance scheme?

Like what ?

Chapter 8 – Coverage and entitlements for loss of work due to health conditions or disabilities (Pg 96-112)

No restrictions on the types of conditions covered by the income insurance scheme

49 Do you agree there should be no restrictions on the types of conditions covered by the scheme?

No.

No restrictions on the working arrangements covered by the scheme

50 Do you agree that all work arrangements should be covered (assuming other eligibility criteria are met)?

No

Coverage for loss of at least 50 percent of capacity to work, for at least four weeks

51

Should the scheme cover partial loss of earnings due to a health condition or disability reducing work capacity?

No

52

If partial loss is to be covered, do you agree claimants should have at least a 50 percent reduction of capacity to work caused by a health condition or disability and that reduction is expected to last for at least four working weeks?

No

Claimants' medical practitioners would assess work capacity, with final eligibility assessed by the scheme administrator

53

Do you agree that the claimants' health practitioner should be main the assessor of work capacity?

No

54

Do you agree that, where appropriate, employers could provide supporting information to inform the claimant's work capacity assessment process?

No

Employers would remain responsible for taking reasonable steps to support an employee to continue working

55

Are the current requirements on employers to make workplace changes sufficient to allow health condition and disability claimants to return to their regular employment (or alternative work)?

No

56

How could employers be supported to help workers with health conditions or disabilities to remain in or return to work?

either you are fit to work or not!  
ACC helps some people.



Employers would be expected to make reasonable efforts to keep a job open where a return to work within six months is likely

57 Where an employee must stop work entirely because of a health condition or disability, do you think employers should be expected to keep a job open and help with vocational rehabilitation where a reasonable prognosis is made of return to work within six months?

No

58 Should this be a statutory requirement placed on employers or an expectation?

No

The scheme would generally meet the full cost of income replacement once a claim is accepted

59 Do you agree that employers should only pay a bridging payment to employees leaving work because of a health condition or disability when the employment is terminated by the employer?

No

Chapter 9 – Insurance claimants' obligations (Pg 113-120)

Reasonable obligations for people receiving income insurance payments

60 Do you agree claimants should be obligated to look for work or prepare to return to work while receiving insurance?

If person was a scheme go private & take the scheme with the conditions you like.

61 Do you agree that claimants would not be expected or required to accept offers of employment that provide lower wages or conditions?

No.

62 Do you agree the insurer could waive obligations partially or fully where a claimant is unable to meet those obligations?

No.

63 Do you agree claimants should be obligated to remain in New Zealand to remain eligible for income insurance?

Yes

64

Do you think a period of time, such as 28 days, should be allowed for travel overseas, for example, to support ill family?

No, travel is a luxury

Specific obligations for claimants with a health condition or disability

65

Should claimants with health conditions or disabilities be subject to obligations to participate in rehabilitative programmes and other support, where appropriate?

If this was private scheme

66

Should claimants with health conditions and disabilities be subject to obligations to search for work or undertaking training where they are able to?

then none of this even

Consequences for non-compliance

67

Do you think financial penalties should be in place for people who do not meet their obligations while receiving insurance payments?

needs to be

68

Do you agree that payments could be fully suspended in cases of serious, intentional non-compliance with obligations?

considered

69

Do you think any other consequences should be in place for people repeatedly not meeting their obligations, such as permanent suspension of entitlements?

Not specific enough.  
depends on agreed terms between parties.  
again scheme should only be voluntary opt.in

Chapter 10 – Delivering income insurance (Pg 121-134)

Independent and effective delivery

70 Do you think it is best for ACC to deliver the income insurance scheme alongside the accident compensation scheme?

No they have enough trouble managing ACC without additional work / power / etc.

71 Would the income insurance scheme be better delivered by a government department or a new entity?

Keep govt out of this if private individuals want a scheme go private.

Accountable and effective governance

72 How could employer and worker perspectives best be incorporated to strengthen the income insurance scheme's delivery for New Zealanders?

Who even wants this. Unemployment lowest rate in yrs. Its ludicrous

73 How could Māori perspectives best be incorporated to ensure the income insurance scheme is delivered equitably and with aspiration?

~~no~~

Displaced workers: Getting back to good jobs

74 What practical support should be available to insurance claimants to return to work?

None you insure privately if ~~not~~ needed and are either fit to work or not.

75 Who should provide that return-to-work support?

See above.

76 What type of claimants would need an employment case manager, and who could self-manage?

see above

77 What do you think a 'return-to-work plan' should include?

see above.



**Health condition and disability claimants: Getting back to good jobs**

78 *What practical support should be available to income insurance claimants with a health condition or disability to return to work?*

79 *Who should provide that support to return to work?*

80 *What type of claimants would need a case manager, and who could self-manage?*

**Dispute resolution**

81 *Do you agree with the proposed four-step dispute resolution process for the scheme?*

82 *Are there specific aspects to the scheme's dispute resolution you think should be considered?*

**Scheme integrity and enforcement**

83 *Do you agree with the proposal to establish an effective offences and penalties framework to protect the scheme's integrity?*

**Information collection and sharing**

84 *Do you agree with the proposal to develop information sharing agreements and sharing arrangements with employers, other agencies and service providers?*

Chapter 11 – Funding income insurance (Pg 135-144)

Most funding would come from compulsory levy payments on income

85

Do you agree the income insurance scheme should be funded from compulsory levies on the income that is insured, rather than from general taxation?

I don't believe the scheme is warranted at all.  
No tax either levied or general keep private only.

Levy payments would be shared by employers and workers

86

Do you agree that levy contributions should be equally split between the employee and employer?

I don't believe in ~~the~~ levy we already  
suffer low wages, acc levy + high tax

87

Do you agree that levies for health conditions and disabilities and for redundancy should be set separately?

Forget the whole hair brained scheme.

Both the employee and employer would be charged at a flat rate

88

Do you agree that employees should be levied at a flat rate on income below \$130,911?

No Absolutely No levy or tax

89

Do you have any other suggestions for how the employee levy should be structured?

Forget the whole thing. There is already  
private insurance. You are costing money ~~fact~~

90

Do you agree that experience rating would not be an appropriate design setting for the employer levy?

Could well be better spent.  
What a waste. A shame  
What were you all thinking

Levies would adjust smoothly over time, with independent fund management

91

Do you agree that an independent fund with a stable levy-setting system should be established to finance the income insurance scheme?

No

92

Do you favour a Pay As You Go or Save As You Go funding approach?

No

## Building in scheme adaptability, while protecting levy sustainability

93

Do you agree that the legislation for the income insurance scheme should provide the flexibility to vary entitlements and eligibility in times of crisis, over and above the proposed income insurance scheme?

No we would simply have to waste more tax payer money on protests & overturning it.

94

Does such flexibility create risks that require additional mitigations?


## Other comments

By now you understand this is not a widely held or deeply supported scheme. It is such a

shame to waste time + money on something already available privately.

Use the money on decent roading infrastructure, flood prevention, adequate hospitals

Time to get real Please share with other political parties so they too understand this is not wanted



ps. could trust a new scheme whilst sewage runs down wall walls, buckets are needed when it rains. If our building is inadequate and you can't fix that. Or the road to the hospital which has been under road works ever since I moved north why would I trust you to do something new. Finish the projects you started eg p1001, transmission gully and sort the finances out. Repay debt don't create more!