

## Submitter information

Please provide your name and phone number, and preferred email address for contact if it is different from the one used to send this form:

s 9(2)(g)(i), s 9(2)(a)

In what capacity are you providing feedback?

e.g. on behalf of: your company, the company you work for, an industry organisation, a union, a licensed immigration adviser etc.

On behalf of my own capacity

If you are representing a company or group, what is the name of that group?

What industry or industries does that group work in?

Consulting Engineers

In your company or industry, what are the most common occupations for migrant workers?

Engineering technicians, Engineers and draftsman

What visa categories are commonly used by those workers?

I.e. resident visa, Essential Skills work visa, Work-to-Residence work visa (under the Talent or Long Term Skill Shortage List categories), Post-Study work visa (open or employer assisted), open work visa.

Essential Skills work visa, Post-Study work visa, Working-Holiday visa

**Only answer the following questions if you directly employ migrant workers:**

How many migrant workers do you currently employ? (Refer to the visa categories in the question above)

Have you supported an Essential Skills visa application for any of these workers?

## Using wage or salary information to help determine skill level and access to Essential Skills migrants

*Proposal 1: Introduction of remuneration thresholds to determine skill levels and associated visa conditions for Essential Skills visas*

Consider the proposal of aligning the remuneration thresholds for the Essential Skills visa with the remuneration thresholds for the Skilled Migrant Category.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from defining lower-, mid- and higher-skilled Essential Skills migrants in this way?

Give details of the occupations or sectors and wage or salary levels you are thinking of.

I think that the proposal will deter migrant workers and put more economic strain on the companies. Companies that use welders or plumbers for example will not pay a lot for entry level employees. Companies usually provide tools required for the job already that is sometimes not cheap and then they have to pay even more on salaries also. I feel that one can't always define one's skills with the amount of money they earn. If someone goes to a small-medium size company they will get a lower salary than someone that has equal qualifications and experience employed in corporate or bigger companies. On the long term bigger companies will smother smaller companies by being able to tap into the unique skills of migrants. I am thinking of draughtsman also. If you received an offer at a small company for 50k per year but received an offer for 65k at another employer. The other employer had a much better standing than the smaller company. Take for instance if salary restrictions is implemented and the smaller company requires someone urgently. They are forced to pay a higher salary for the employees and if it turns out it was not the right placement then they wasted a lot of money for 3 months. Employers sometime need urgent placements due to sudden dismissal or death maybe. They then need someone with specific skills like Revit and AutoCAD for instance. They don't have anyone to train it to new employees due to circumstances so it is then easier to employ migrants that already have the skills and can in turn train kiwi perhaps on the long run as the company expands.

If one will be introducing salary limits try to also assign points to them as with the other categories maybe. This will also create more competition among companies. One can allocate that someone earning 48k-55k is 5 points, 55k-62k is 10 points then 62k to 72k is 15 points then above that it can be distributed and then the bonus points for above 92k for example.

Also I strongly feel that the points should be lowered to 140 or 100 for migrants who have been living/contributing to the economy in New Zealand for a year or 2 period. The reason being is that migrants, who come alone and can be regarded as mid-level, find it very difficult to apply for residency on their own. They won't get residency without someone assisting their application. And also in some case for instance a Welder and his wife (General administration), will also struggle together to apply for residency, because they won't reach the high 160 mark. In this instance I think that lowering the points for if they are contributing to New Zealand for two or more years are beneficial for the country. In time they will probably have children that can contribute a lot more to the economy. So it is a win-win situation.

On the other hand most employees will usually struggle to get high salaries. IT people don't have to worry because their starting salaries are high for example. Employers are sceptical to

employ migrants because they don't know what they are capable off and they don't know them.

## **Reinforcing the temporary nature of the Essential Skills visa and managing the settlement expectations of temporary migrants**

### *Proposal 2a: Introduction of a maximum duration for lower-skilled Essential Skills migrants*

Consider the option of a three years for a maximum duration for lower-skilled Essential Skills visas.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from the proposed maximum duration for lower-skilled Essential Skills visa holders?

Give details of the occupations and industries you are thinking of.

I think that three years is a bit tight. In the construction companies for example, you only reach full efficiency after a year. After a year one is confident with the standards, procedures and all the workings of the company. In that time you will also start getting your own projects. If it is a big project that spans more than 3 years it will mean that the companies must employ someone new that is not familiar with the project and standards, and will have additional expenses. Also after three years one would already feel like family in the company and if one then should leave due to your visa not being able to renew or something it would be a sad affair for both parties.

### *Proposal 2b: Introduction of stand down period for lower-skilled Essential Skills migrants*

Consider the option for a year-long stand down period following the maximum duration for lower-skilled Essential Skills visas.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from these proposed changes?

Give details of the occupations and industries you are thinking of.

I think that the stand down period is not a good idea. Employees pay taxes and contribute to the economy for three years. They also usually buy vehicles and sometimes properties. This contributes a lot to New Zealand economy and also one can see what your tax is used for, that is a good thing. If after three years they must leave work it will put employees in a difficult position that for three years in a career /of one's live to leave your work then start again new. Is not at all easy to get a job that quick and not to mention expensive. I am referring to the construction industry. They will in time lose a lot of migrants because they will only be able to work for 3 years and then return to their home country for a year and most probably not return.

Also most companies invest and train employees while in the work environment to conform to

standards. This will discourage these incentives and lead to substandard work and employees. Companies won't use resources and invest in employees if they know that after 3 years they won't get a new visa, return home for a year and then most probably not return.

*Proposal 3: Require the partners of lower-skilled Essential Skills visa holders to meet the requirements for a visa in their own right*

Consider the proposal to require the partners of lower-skilled Essential Skills visa holders to meet the requirements for a visa in their own right.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from these proposed changes?

Give details of the occupations and industries you are thinking of.

I don't think this will have a big impact. One thing is for certain that visa holder's partners will then apply for a visitor's visa then convert it to a work visa if I understood it correct. Overall I think it is a good idea to ensure that the country keeps up a healthy migrant population. Also deter migrants who is only after the visa of the main applicant and then they go their separate ways after they receive the visa.

On the other hand it will make it difficult for people in industries like welders who don't earn a lot, if there is only one salary earner.

*Proposal 4: Require the children of lower-skilled Essential Skills visa holders to meet the requirements for a visa in their own right*

Consider the proposal to require the children of lower-skilled Essential Skills visa holders to meet the requirements for a visa in their own right.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from these proposed changes?

Give details of the occupations and industries you are thinking of.

I think this will have a big impact. Children can study on student visas and then go to universities. They can study engineering for instance and after studies they can maybe be the next big thinker in the housing crises. Children and the young population is the key to ensuring that a nation grows. I don't think making it difficult for children to obtain visas is a good idea because this will deter parents to not immigrate and New Zealand may miss an opportunity to discover the next big scientist or superstar.

This will also deter growth for the younger population that will seek opportunities somewhere else.

## Reinforce that Essential Skills visas should only be granted for the period for which the employment is offered

*Proposal 5: Make it explicit how the 'period of employment' condition applies to seasonal work*

Consider the option to reinforce that Essential Skills visas for seasonal work are only for the length of the season and that the offer of employment must match the length of the season.

What impacts or implications do you foresee from these options?

Give details of the occupations or sectors you think are likely to be affected.

I don't think that this will have a very big impact. Seasonal work is what the word says. It is only for summer or so for instance. I do think that seasonal workers who have been doing it for ten years or so should have the option to have a seasonal visa for 10 years that can allow them to work in New Zealand in the summer or whatever season. Occupations like workers on apple farms.

The visa will be valid for 5 years and allow them to be in the country for the season specified and they may return (if they still meet the immigration and character requirements) during the season/time period as specified in their visa.

Consider the list of seasonal occupations being considered.

Are there any seasonal occupations that should be added or removed from this list? Why?

Maybe if New Zealand government creates a task force that cleans up our rivers and beaches that uses seasonal workers. Maybe something like "green" workers. This will also create an opportunity for migrants that want to explore New Zealand and then also work a unique opportunity. I may also be a boost for Tourism.

They can also perhaps have something for volunteers. Volunteers whom are in conservation. This will boost New Zealand's work for the conservation of forests and Island, help the pest free cause and they gain knowledge of how New Zealanders do things that they might in turn implement in their own home countries.

Take also for instance seasonal workers who work at the carnivals in America. Their contracts make it clear that they can only work for the Carnivals and must return after the carnival is done. It is also quite an expensive trip to do and workers usually must support themselves with the money they earn.

Consider the list of seasonal occupations being considered.

If you employ seasonal staff, or represent a sector with seasonal staff:

- What are the occupations of the seasonal staff within the sector that you are

commenting on?

- For each of the occupations that you have identified, what is the typical period that you require seasonal staff to cover (e.g the peak of the season)?

--

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982