

AEWV Capability Building: Onshore Application & Work Experience Assessments

30 September 2025

Presented by
Technical Advisors – Archana & Taufu
Verification Officer - Mo



Overview

- Purpose
- Relevant Immigration Instructions
- Examples of work experience documents
- How to assess work experience documents
- Team activity
- Q&A

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Relevant Immigration Instructions

- Immigration instruction WA4.10(a)(iii) states an Accredited Employer work visa may be granted if an immigration officer is satisfied that an applicant is suitably qualified by training and experience to do the job they have been offered, as set out at WA4.10.5 and meet the minimum skills threshold as set out at WA4.10.6.
- WA4.10.5 - Determining whether an applicant is suitably qualified to do the job they have been offered.
- WA4.10.6 - Determining whether an applicant meets the minimum skills threshold.
- WA4.10.6(a)(i) - An applicant meets the minimum skills threshold if an immigration officer is satisfied that they can demonstrate two years or more of relevant work experience with sufficient evidence from a third party.

Relevant Immigration Instructions

- Bona fide (E5.1/W2.10.1(a)(ii)) - applicants must have a genuine lawful purpose in New Zealand and unlikely to remain unlawfully; or breach any visa conditions; or be unable to leave or deported.
- Genuine and sustainable employment (W2.10.10/WA4.10.1(a)) - all offers of employment must be genuine and sustainable.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Examples of onshore work experience information & documents

- Bank statements
- Pay slips
- Tax records e.g., IRD summary of earning
- Timesheets
- Reference letter
- Employment agreement
- E-visa letter
- INZ immigration history

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



How to assess financial documents

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Bank statements

s6(c)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

- Visa conditions

Bank statements

Indicators of concern:

s6(c)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Pay slips

A pay slip is a document that an employer provides to an employee each time they are paid. It outlines the details of the employee's earnings and deductions for a specific pay period.

Section	What it means
Employee details	Name, employee ID, job title, department
Employer details	Company name, address, contact info
Pay period	Start and end dates of the pay cycle
Payment date	When the salary was deposited
Gross pay	Total earnings before deductions
Net pay	Final amount received after deductions
Hours worked	Regular, overtime, and leave hours
Hourly rate/Salary	Pay rate per hour or fixed salary
Deductions	PAYE tax, KiwiSaver, student loan, ACC levy
Leave balances	Annual leave, sick leave, etc. (if applicable)
Tax code	Used to calculate PAYE (e.g., M, M SL, S)
IRD number	Inland Revenue Department number

IRD summary of Earnings

- Overview of applicant's income which includes the source of their income, amount (income before tax) and any deductions.
- Applicant's income may include salary, wages, ACC payments, New Zealand interest received etc.
- Deductions may include PAYE, ACC earner's levy deducted etc.
- There are 2 exportable PDF's that clients can provide from IRD:
 - Proof of Income – Total of their income and deductions by source type (for example salary or a benefit) for a selected date range.
 - Income details – More detailed PDF that provides monthly income details. It breaks down the income and deduction totals by source type for each tax year in the date range selected. It can show ACC earner levy and the total tax paid.
- Applicants can access their income information anytime in their myIR (IRD account) and filter their income information to specific financial periods.

IRD – Employers obligation

Employers are required to make deductions from employees earning a wage, salary or schedular payments. This is known as PAYE (pay as you earn). Employers must deduct and pay PAYE tax on their employees' behalf.

Some employer obligation include:

- **Deductions from income**

Need to deduct tax from employees who receive salary or wages - including student loan repayments, if they have them.

- **Deductions from other payments**

If employers pay their employees other benefits and allowances, they need to work out the tax value and pay it to IRD .

- **Payday filing**

They must file employment information every time they pay their employees.

Note - You may come across IRD summary of earnings which show income missing for some months and/or unusually high/low income. We may need to RFI for an explanation. Is the response from the applicant/client plausible/credible? May need to raise concerns in a PPI if non-compliance is identified.

Non-compliance identified from assessing applicant's financials?

For example:

- Bank statements showing salary deposits from a different employer to that specified in visa conditions.
- Pay slips showing hours of work as less than 30 hours per week.
- IRD summary of earnings may have income missing for some months and/or unusually high/low income.

In cases where concerns may be identified, then we may in the first instance need to request for further information/explanation (e.g., when IRD shows missing income). Assess the RFI response. Is the response from the applicant plausible/credible? Or does the employer meet immigration/employment standards? If not, then we may need to raise concerns of non-compliance in a PPI.

PPI concerns may include:

- SQ and MST – e.g., insufficient evidence to demonstrate years of work experience.
- Bona fide – e.g., applicant may not be working in line with their visa conditions.
- Genuine job offer – e.g., employer may not be able to offer full time hours of work or be compliant with employment agreement terms and conditions.



Example – Case 1

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Examining Pay slips/Bank statements/IRD Summary of Earnings/Time & wage records/NZ Visa history

s6(c)

- Current visa conditions

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case 1 - Comparing Visa to Bank statements

- Current visa & visa conditions

s6(c)

remuneration if requested. Return/onward ticket not required. Stay subject to grant of entry permission. The holder may only work as s9(2)(a) The holder of this visa must comply with any instruction from a Medical Officer of Health which relates to a notifiable or quarantinable disease. The holder of this visa must comply with any

Posted	Eff Tran Date	Description	Cheque	Debit Amt	Credit Amt	Balance
16 Sep 2025	16 Sep 2025	s9(2)(a)		\$4.00		\$22,529.12
15 Sep 2025	15 Sep 2025				\$23.00	\$22,533.12
15 Sep 2025	15 Sep 2025			\$150.00		\$22,510.12
15 Sep 2025	14 Sep 2025			\$18.49		\$22,660.12
15 Sep 2025	15 Sep 2025				\$750.00	\$22,678.61
15 Sep 2025	15 Sep 2025				\$552.87	\$21,928.61
14 Sep 2025	14 Sep 2025			\$54.93		\$21,375.74
14 Sep 2025	13 Sep 2025			\$100.00		\$21,430.67
11 Sep 2025	11 Sep 2025			\$68.00		\$21,530.67
09 Sep 2025	09 Sep 2025			\$300.00		\$21,598.67
09 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025			\$7.60		\$21,898.67
08 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025			\$39.97		\$21,906.27
08 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025				\$23.00	\$21,946.24
08 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025			\$150.00		\$21,923.24
08 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025				\$750.00	\$22,073.24
08 Sep 2025	08 Sep 2025				\$552.87	\$21,323.24
08 Sep 2025	07 Sep 2025			\$88.49		\$20,770.37
07 Sep 2025	07 Sep 2025			\$51.99		\$20,858.86
05 Sep 2025	05 Sep 2025			\$14.14		\$20,910.85
05 Sep 2025	04 Sep 2025			\$6.32		\$20,924.99
04 Sep 2025	04 Sep 2025			\$70.00		\$20,931.31
04 Sep 2025	04 Sep 2025			\$9.00		\$21,001.31

Case 1 - Checking IEA & INZ Systems Checks

- Check current & previous Employment Agreement
- Check Employer's accreditation type, status & other details

INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT

s9(2)(b)(ii) (Employer)

s9(2)(b)(ii)

and

Item 5 Location

The Employer may require you to work at the Market location from time to time as required based at:

s9(2)(b)(ii)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Accreditation details

Current Accreditation   **s9(2)(b)(ii)** [Standard employer accreditation](#)

Accreditation type   [Standard employer accreditation](#)

Expiry Date  28-March-2027

Accreditation status  Active

Accreditation details

Current Accreditation   **s9(2)(b)(ii)** [High Volume employer accreditation](#)

Accreditation type   [High Volume employer accreditation](#)

Expiry Date  15-October-2026

Accreditation status  Active

Case 1 – Linking Concerns to Instructions

- **Genuine Employment** - It appears the employer has placed the applicant in a triangular employment arrangement with another organization [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii) [REDACTED] which breaches the applicant's current visa conditions. None of the employers hold the necessary Triangular accreditation to place migrants in a triangular employment arrangement. So, we are not yet satisfied the applicant's offer of employment is genuine – WA4.10.1(a)/WA4.10.1(e) /WA3.15(I)
- **Bonafide** - It appears the applicant may have breached her visa condition by working in a triangular employment arrangement for [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii) [REDACTED] It appears the applicant may not be a bona fide applicant - WA4.10(a)(i)/W2.10.1(a)(ii)/E5.1/E5.10

Case 1 – Assessing Response to Concerns

- Plausible Explanation - The applicant's partner works for [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii) and his income is deposited into her personal account.
- Credible Evidence – Marriage certificate, Pay slip issued by [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii) to the partner, Partnership work visa, IRD statement.
- INZ System Checks – Partner is onshore since May 2024 and he currently holds open work visa with the condition "Holder may work for any employer accredited under the Accredited Employer Work Visa scheme anywhere in New Zealand, except in a role covered by a capped sector agreement."



Example – Case 2

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case 2 - Comparing Visa, IEA & Pay slips

- Check the Employer on the visa
- Check the current IEA to determine the applicant's hours of work & pay rate(s)
- On the pay slips, check the applicant has worked at least the minimum guaranteed hours and is paid the hourly rate for each hour of employment
- In this case, the applicant is paid monthly and his total hours showing is for 1 month.

Stay subject to grant of entry permission. You must leave before visa expiry or face deportation. Financial support evidence not required. Return/onward ticket not required. The holder may only work as Junior Plasterboard Worker in Auckland and Wellington Regions for s9(2)(b)(ii)

5.2 Hours of work

- a) The Employee will be guaranteed minimum 30 hours per week, from Monday to Saturday, between the hours of 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

6. Remuneration and Benefits

6.1 Payment of wages

- a) The Employee will be paid \$29.66 gross per hour.
b) The Employee will be paid monthly on [the 10th of every month] by internet banking into the Employee's nominated NZ bank account.
c) The Employer may change how often the Employee is paid and will give reasonable notice in writing.



PAID BY

s9(2)(b)(ii)

Pay Period: 1 - 31 May 2025		Payment Date: 30 Jun 2025		Total Earnings: \$4,893.90	Net Pay: \$3,992.35
	QUANTITY	RATE	THIS PAY	YTD	
EARNINGS					
Ordinary Time	165.0000 hours	\$29.660000	\$4,893.90	\$13,836.39	
Other Earnings				\$533.88	
		TOTAL	\$4,893.90	\$14,370.27	
TAX					
PAYE			\$901.55	\$2,606.06	
		TOTAL	\$901.55	\$2,606.06	
PAYMENTS	PARTICULARS	CODE	REFERENCE		
	s9(2)(a)			\$3,992.35	
			TOTAL	\$3,992.35	

Case 2 - Comparing Pay slips to Timesheets

- Check the Timesheets to see whether applicant has worked full time, at least 30 hours of work each week.
- Compare the timesheets and pay slips to check whether the applicant is paid for all hours of work (including paid leave, working on public holiday or working overtime).

Pay Period: 1 – 31 May 2025	Payment Date: 30 Jun 2025	Total Earnings: \$4,893.90	Net Pay: \$3,992.35	
	QUANTITY	RATE	THIS PAY	YTD
EARNINGS				
Ordinary Time	165.0000 hours	\$29.660000	\$4,893.90	\$13,836.39
Other Earnings				\$533.88
		TOTAL	\$4,893.90	\$14,370.27

Time Wage and Record (automatic calculation)							
Date	Name	Work Start Time	Work End Time	Work Project Address	Total Hours	Hours Rate	Amount
2025/5/1		8:30	16:00	s9(2)(a)	7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/2		8:30	16:00		7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/3		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/4		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/5		8:00	16:30		8.0	\$29.66	\$237.28
2025/5/6		8:30	16:00		7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/7		8:30	16:00		7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/8		8:30	16:00		7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/9		8:30	15:00		6.0	\$29.66	\$177.96
2025/5/10		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/11		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/12		8:30	17:30		8.5	\$29.66	\$252.11
2025/5/13		8:30	16:30		7.5	\$29.66	\$222.45
2025/5/14		8:30	17:00		8.0	\$29.66	\$237.28
2025/5/15		8:30	17:00		8.0	\$29.66	\$237.28
2025/5/16		8:30	17:00		8.0	\$29.66	\$237.28
2025/5/17		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/18		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/19		8:00	17:30		9.0	\$29.66	\$266.94
2025/5/20		8:30	17:00		8.0	\$29.66	\$237.28
2025/5/21		8:30	15:00		6.0	\$29.66	\$177.96
2025/5/22		8:30	16:00		7.0	\$29.66	\$207.62
2025/5/23		8:30	15:00		6.0	\$29.66	\$177.96
2025/5/24		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/25		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
2025/5/26		8:30	17:30		8.5	\$29.66	\$252.11
2025/5/27		8:30	17:30		8.5	\$29.66	\$252.11
2025/5/28		8:30	17:30		8.5	\$29.66	\$252.11
2025/5/29		8:30	17:30		8.5	\$29.66	\$252.11
2025/5/30		8:30	15:00		6.0	\$29.66	\$177.96
2025/5/31		Rest	Rest		0.0	\$29.66	\$0.00
		May 2025 total amount			165	\$29.66	\$4,893.90
2025/5/31		May 2025 PAYE					-\$901.55
		May 2025 Net Pay					\$3,992.35

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case 2 - Comparing Pay slips to Bank statements & IRD

- Check the gross income (income before tax) & PAYE tax stated in the pay slips matches the gross income & PAYE tax declared with IRD.
- Check the net income (income after tax) in the pay slips matches the income paid to applicant's bank account.

Detailed income breakdown from 18-Aug-2024 to 18-Aug-2025

Salary, wages, benefits and taxable pensions

	Gross amount	PAYE deducted	Student loan repayments	Earnings not liable for ACC
s9(2)(b)(ii)	> Tax code M			
31-Aug-2024	\$4,434.17	\$755.90	\$0.00	\$0.00
30-Sep-2024	\$4,241.38	\$719.07	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-Oct-2024	\$4,048.59	\$682.24	\$0.00	\$0.00
30-Nov-2024	\$4,434.17	\$755.90	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-Dec-2024	\$4,360.02	\$741.73	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-Jan-2025	\$4,567.64	\$795.03	\$0.00	\$0.00
28-Feb-2025	\$4,686.28	\$832.56	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-Mar-2025	\$4,152.40	\$702.08	\$0.00	\$0.00
30-Apr-2025	\$4,671.45	\$831.13	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-May-2025	\$4,804.92	\$873.38	\$0.00	\$0.00
30-Jun-2025	\$4,893.90	\$901.55	\$0.00	\$0.00
31-Jul-2025	\$4,982.88	\$929.76	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$54,277.80	\$9,520.33	\$0.00	\$0.00

Pay Period: 1 - 31 May 2025		Payment Date: 30 Jun 2025	Total Earnings: \$4,893.90	Net Pay: \$3,992.35
	QUANTITY	RATE	THIS PAY	YTD
EARNINGS				
Ordinary Time	165,0000 hours	\$29.660000	\$4,893.90	\$13,836.39
Other Earnings				\$533.88
		TOTAL	\$4,893.90	\$14,370.27
TAX				
PAYE			\$901.55	\$2,606.06
		TOTAL	\$901.55	\$2,606.06
PAYMENTS				
	PARTICULARS	CODE	REFERENCE	
	s9(2)(b)(ii)			\$3,992.35
		TOTAL	\$3,992.35	

Balance summary

Opening balance	\$258.08
Total withdrawals	-\$10,535.40
Total deposits	\$10,800.65
Closing balance	\$523.33

Transaction details

Date	Transaction	Debit/Withdrawal \$	Deposit \$	Balance \$
02 Jun	Opening Balance			258.08
03 Jun	s9(2)(b)(ii)		3,992.35	4,250.43



Team activity

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Team activity – Case studies

Determine the following:

- Is Suitably Qualified and MST met?
- Are there any concerns identified from the financial documents provided? If yes, then which instructions to raise concerns on?
- What are your next steps?

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 1

Chinese national onshore since 10 May 2023.

Risk: High risk of fraudulent work experience/qualifications for applicants applying to work in Construction sector.

Job Check (JC) requirements: 2 years' work experience, no qualification.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years' work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Carpenter (Skill Level 3)

NZ employer: Construction company (high volume accreditation)

Current visa conditions: The holder may only work as Construction Worker in Auckland for **s9(2)(b)(ii)** **s9(2)(b)(ii)** Must provide evidence of remuneration if requested. May not be placed in a triangular employment arrangement with a controlling third party. Must be paid at or above \$27.76 per hour.

Case: The applicant declared that they have at least 2 years relevant work experience to meet SQ and MST.

As evidence they provided a Bachelor's Degree Certificate majoring in Business Administration from Jimei University (verified genuine), IRD income breakdown summary for the period 10 May 2023 to 06 August 2025 and Kiwibank statement for the period 07 August 2023 to 06 August 2025.

Case study 1

Is Suitably Qualified and MST met?

- MST met through bachelor's qualification
- SQ not yet met as IRD summary of earnings does not show consistent payments for the last 2 years.

Are there any concerns identified from the documents provided? If yes, then which instructions to raise concerns on?

- IRD shows missing payments for November 2024 and January, March, April 2025.

What are your next steps?

- RFI for explanation on missing IRD payments, pay slips and full bank account statements (note: applicant's bank statements only show salary credits therefore best to request full bank statements for all accounts they have).

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 2

Italian national onshore since 09 August 2024

Risk: Medium risk as Employer has warnings about allegations of:

- Migrant exploitation,
- Not compliant with Immigration and Employment laws,
- Unfair dismissal of employees,
- Premiums for visa/employment,
- No public holidays/public holiday pay
- No rest/meal entitlement

Job Check (JC) requirements: 3 years' work experience, no qualification.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years' work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Sous Chef (Skill Level 2)

NZ employer: Restaurant / Hospitality industry (high volume accreditation)

Case: The applicant declared that he has been working as Chef for the current NZ employer (s9(2)(b)(ii)) since August 2024. He also declared that he previously worked as s9(2)(b)(ii) from May 2020 to June 2024. As evidence they provided Summary of Earnings issued by the Employer dating from April 2025 to July 2025, Pay slips dating from March 2025 to July 2025, Bank Statements dating from March 2025 to June 2025, Holiday Leave History dating from August 2024 to July 2025 and his CV. The applicant's offshore work experience was assessed and accepted in previous AEWV.

Case study 2

Is Suitably Qualified and MST met?

- SQ & MST met through offshore work experience

Are there any concerns identified from the documents provided? If yes, then which instructions to raise concerns on?

- Genuine Employment - It appears the employer has placed the applicant in a triangular employment arrangement with another organization (s9(2)(b)(ii)) which breaches the applicant's current visa conditions. None of the employers hold the necessary Triangular accreditation to place migrants in a triangular employment arrangement. So, we are not yet satisfied the applicant's offer of employment is genuine – WA4.10.1(a)/WA4.10.1(e) /WA3.15(l)
- Bonafide - It appears the applicant may have breached his visa condition by working in a triangular employment arrangement for Piccolo Bar Ltd. It appears the applicant may not be a bona fide applicant - WA4.10(a)(i)/W2.10.1(a)(ii)/E5.1/E5.10
- Full Time - Appears the applicant has not worked/paid for at least 30 hours of work each week for s9(2)(b)(ii) – WA4.10.1(e)/WA4.15.10(a)(ii).

What are your next steps?

- PPI

Case study 3

USA national onshore since 23 March 2023.

Risk: No risk triggered

Job Check (JC) requirements: 2 years' work experience required or level 4 certificate in Cookery.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years' work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Chef (Skill Level 2)

NZ employer: [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii) (standard accreditation)

Current visa conditions: The holder may only work as Chef in Auckland for [REDACTED] s9(2)(b)(ii). Must provide evidence of remuneration if requested. May not be placed in a triangular employment arrangement with a controlling third party. Must be paid at or above \$28.00 per hour.

Case: The applicant has submitted a re-used job token application and has declared that they have at least 2 years relevant work experience to meet SQ and MST.

As evidence they have only provided their current e-visa letter.

Case study 3

Is Suitably Qualified and MST met?

- Yes

Are there any concerns identified from the documents provided? If yes, then which instructions to raise concerns on?

- s6(c)

What are your next steps?

- No need to RFI/PPI for any further work experience documents. Can proceed assessing the application as normal.

Things to consider after decision

- Client warning(s)
- Employer warning(s)
- Referral for employer Revocation or Suspension <RevocationSuspensionEA@mbie.govt.nz>
- Referral to National Prioritisation Process (NPP) <INZ.ComplianceInvestigations@mbie.govt.nz>
- Visa Cancellation process

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Questions?

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



Thank you

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Disclaimer: Some of the content has been generated using Copilot Chat. This has been reviewed and confirmed by the author. If there is any content that is incorrect, contact the author.



Work Experience and the Minimum Skills Threshold

AEWV Capability Building Session
24 September 2024

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Session Overview

- Relevant Instructions
- Verification Requirements (e.g. Risk Activity, when to treat)
- Tips for submitting RTR to R&V (what to do before, how to do your own verification)
- Structuring Concerns in PPI Letters
- Pre-sent Q&A
- Examples and group discussions

Why are we here?

- Quality Checks and Quality Assurance completed on AEWV applications are regularly identifying issues with risk assessment and mitigation including
 - How to mitigate risk rules
 - How to appropriately action risk advice provided by R&V
 - Appropriate thresholds for assessing work experience
- The TAs have also identified that questions around work experience are a considerable proportion of the queries received
- Poor quality assessments around the minimum skills threshold are one of the key drivers of complaints that are referred to us either before/after decision
- We want to provide you with some practical information to build your confidence in raising concerns about verification outcomes and empower you make credibly defensible decisions around the evidence provided

What have we done?

August 2024:

- ✓ Risk SOPs and Risk Referrals
- ✓ Common Risks and Instructions
- ✓ How to Treat Risk
- ✓ Rationale Writing for Risk

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



Relevant Instructions

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Relevant Instructions

- WA4.10.5 - Determining whether an applicant is suitably qualified to do the job they have been offered
- WA4.10.6 - Determining whether an applicant meets the minimum skills threshold

WA4.10.6(a)(i): An applicant meets the minimum skills threshold if an **immigration officer is satisfied** that they can demonstrate three years or more of **relevant work experience** with **sufficient evidence** from a **third party**

WA4.10.6(d): Evidence of relevant work experience from a third party **may include** but is not limited to letters of reference from an employer, certificates of employment, payslips or tax certificates

Relevant Instructions (Cont.)

- E7.5(a) It is the **responsibility of an applicant** for a visa to ensure that the information, evidence, and submissions provided demonstrates the applicant meets applicable immigration instructions to the **satisfaction of an immigration officer**
- E7.5(b) Immigration officers have a **general obligation** to take such steps as are **necessary or appropriate to verify any documentation or information** relevant to any decision under immigration instructions, whether or not a particular provision enables or obliges them to do so
- E7.30(a) Applications for temporary entry class visas ... may be approved if the **immigration officer is satisfied** that the applicant has provided the evidence required by immigration instructions, and any additional evidence requested by the immigration officer

Note: E7.5 are operational instructions rather than immigration instructions. They are not used as a basis for decline, but provide guidance that assists immigration officers to determine whether immigration instructions are met.

Relevant Instructions (Cont.)

Key Points:

- Onus remains with the applicant to demonstrate that they meet INZ requirements
- Immigration Officers have discretion within the instructions at WA4.10.5 and WA4.10.6 as to whether the information is satisfactory and sufficient
- Evidence of work experience should be viewed holistically, i.e. based on the full circumstances of the application, a reference letter may be appropriate for lower risk applications
- To be relevant to WA4.10.6, work experience needs to be in the same field or industry as a whole, i.e. not on what experience may be relevant to different tasks the role has



Verification Requirements

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Verification Requirements

When is Verification required?

What type of verification is appropriate?

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

What should an IO do before submitting RTR

- Initial assessment of application, ensuring all concerns identified
- Request for any additional evidence that would be beneficial for the RTR
- IO to complete their own due diligence on work experience evidence, e.g. request evidence of tax records or other third party information, especially for lower skilled roles as there is a potential that we can move straight to PPI if there is a lack of verifiable information
- IO to check the work experience evidence provided against the information contained in the Verification Toolkit to determine whether anything else should be requested
- Appropriate verification has already been conducted and has not been able to satisfy concerns (yes, you can do your own verification!)
 - For example, conduct open source searches before sending any referral
 - IO to primarily conduct [quick/intermediate](#) verification checks

Level of verification	Verification check
-----------------------	--------------------

Quick	General internet search
	Online database check
	AMS checks of people mentioned in application

Intermediate	Enterprise Reporting Portal searches
	s6(c)
	Correspondence with a third party or issuing authority by phone or email
	Telephone interviews
	Further document request
	Current or previous application file examination
	Document examination and comparison
	Seeking information from other agencies or 50 countries parts

Advanced	Requesting written confirmation from third party
	Forensic document examination
	Referral to external verification provider
	DNA testing
	Site visits to employers and client residence
	Face-to-face interviews with applicants and / or their sponsors

What should an IO include in an RTR?

When completing a Risk Treatment Referral an IO should include as much information as possible, to ensure that Risk and Verification are clear on what action to take, including:

- Whether an initial assessment has been completed
- What concerns have been identified and what steps have been undertaken to address these
- Whether checks of available resources (e.g. Verification Toolkit, VO Updates, OneNote, TA Updates/Consultations) have been completed and what the outcome was
- What actions you want Risk and Verification to take
- If requesting an interview, be as clear as possible as to what questions you want asked

Verification Resources

- [Global Process Manual – Verification Level Checks Table](#)
- [Verification 101: Job Aid](#)
- [Verification Toolkit](#)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Risk Treatment Referrals: Examples

Good Example 1:

- Reason for Referral: *Please verify PA's work experience in [REDACTED] s9(2)(a) [REDACTED] PA has also provided the tax documents. EPF statements showing contributions from the employer has been provided*
- Documents Provided: *Work experience reference letter, tax documents*

Good Example 2: Requesting further verification on applicants work experience as per RMR advice in the pre-decision check of this application. IO requested the applicant a list of further verifiable work experience. PA has provided pay slips and bank statements. Can i please request these to be verified if possible.

Risk Treatment Referrals: Examples

Bad Example 1:

PA submitted WE docs from [REDACTED] s9(2)(a) [REDACTED] in claiming WE in 2007. PA submitted same docs in 2019, however they have now submitted a new reference letter with the date of issue 08/04/2024.

Please verify work experience

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Offshore R&V Tips

s6(c)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

If a verification outcome is inconclusive, it is an indicator that the claimed work experience may not be credible.

When assessing claimed work experience, the onus is on the applicant to provide reliable evidence of employment. Immigration Officers should not feel obligated to accept poorly evidenced applications, even if applicants or their representatives try to portray it as INZ's problem.



Raising Concerns

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

PPI Letters

Key Principles:

- When we send a PPI letter, we need to ensure that the client is clear on the basis of the concerns that we are raising and has a fair opportunity to prepare a response, including:
 - What instruction is not met
 - What the information is that has led us to that conclusion
- We should not release information that would prejudice verification techniques, but need to provide enough information to enable them to respond
- If you are sending a PPI on the basis of a phone interview with the applicant, you should provide a copy of the correspondence with the PPI letter
- The PPI letter should be based on a holistic assessment of the risk and client circumstances

PPI Letters

Key Principles (Cont.)

- Do Not Say:
 - You do not appear to meet the minimum skills threshold as your work experience is unable to be verified
 - We are not satisfied that you meet the minimum skills threshold because we cannot locate an online record for the business that you claim to work for
- Do Say:
 - We contacted your previous employer via the publicly listed phone number, and they advised that you did not work for them during the dates listed, therefore we are not currently satisfied that your work experience is genuine/credible and you do not appear to meet the minimum skills threshold
 - In addition to this, we are not able to locate an online record for the company to verify the contact details that have been provided and this further raises concerns that you do not meet the minimum skills threshold because...

PPI Example 1

We conducted an independent verification and determined that your work experience is not credible. Therefore, we are requesting for independently verifiable documents such as but not limited to: 1. tax statements that covers the required experience duration 2. Bank statements for the period required showing salary credits.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

PPI Example 2

In the application form, you have declared that you are currently work for Wings Bakery as a baker since 01.06.2020. You further declared that you were previously working as a Pastrycook's Assistant at Sophie's Breadshop from 01.12.2019 till 01.06.2020. We also acknowledge that you have submitted copy of your certificate, work experience letters and pay slips from Wings Bakery to demonstrate that you meet suitability requirement for the role. Verification was conducted on the submitted document however, the existence of the business was unable to be established. There are also concerns noted on your declaration where you have stated that you have 4 years of work experience. However, this does not appear credible as you are currently 18 years old and based on your declaration this indicates that you began working at the age of 14. In order to further assess the work, experience you have claimed, we require further information including but not limited a copy of the business registration, licence to indicate its existence in 2020, copies of your bank statement showing wages being received and copies of your income tax statement.

PPI Example 3

In the visa application form, you declared at least 3 years relevant work experience to meet the minimum skills requirements. To support this claim, you provided one reference letter from Mr. C which states you worked for him at Mr C's Farm from August 2015 until May 2020, first as a Tractor Operator then as a General Manager. In the Curriculum Vitae (CV) provided in your prior Visitor visa application, you state it is a family-operated farm, and we note that Mr. C is your father-in-law. Given the reference letter is issued by a family member, it may not be objective and does not sufficiently demonstrate that you have 3 years full-time work experience. We were able to verify Mr. C's Financial Documents, which confirms he received secondary income from crops beginning in August 2015, however, this does not confirm that you were employed or worked on the farm. As such, you have not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate at least 3 years relevant work experience.

PPI Example 4

In the visa application form, you declared at least 3 years work experience to meet the minimum skills requirements. You provided one reference letter from and payslips dated between December 2021 to March 2024 from Mr. A's motors. The reference letter states you have been working as a Diesel Mechanic since 2020. We note the payslips and letter do not specify what hours you worked, therefore we are unable to determine that you were employed full-time for at least 3 years. We further note that there is no open-source information or additional third-party documentation provided to confirm that the business is genuinely operating. As such, we are not satisfied the documentation is sufficient to demonstrate 3 years relevant work experience.

Common Questions and Answers

Q: Should we request specific documents in a PPI Letter? (Refer: TA Update 20/08/2024)

A: Generally not, as this could create an expectation for the client that if they provide that document then the requirements will be met. You should also ensure that you are not combining an RFI and a PPI letter

Q: When we receive a PPI response with additional work experience documentation, at what point should we refer it for a Risk Treatment, or finalise the application?

A: The visa assessment is likely to be finalised post PPI - Applications can be declined if the PPI response was not sufficient to mitigate the concerns raised through the PPI. It'd be quite rare and usually not ideal to conduct significant verification on a PPI response. Hence, TA consultation is mandatory if IO wishes to refer a PPI response to R&V.

Q: What do we mean when we say that work experience cannot be independently verifiable?

A: For example, no independent contact details for the business can be identified through open source checks outside of the information contained on the letter/document itself – and there is little value in verifying the letter using the contact information provided on the letter as the immigration officer or verification officer could be speaking to anyone

Q: How do we treat risk or raise assessment concerns when there is no Risk Activity present?

A: If possible, an Assessment Concern can be raised under the most relevant Assessment Activity already generated by ADEPT. If not possible, a Risk Assessment Activity may be newly generated.

Common Questions and Answers (Cont.)

Q: The applicant has submitted WE certificate and supporting docs such as payslips. However, the payment was in cash. We need advice on how to raise the WE credibility concerns. The LIAs provides the country information about tax exemption etc, but that does not support or demonstrate that the applicant worked and was paid.

A: This is a similar answer to concerns about independently verifiable evidence. When raising concerns, the concern is not that the applicant was paid in cash or that the employer did not make tax contributions, but rather that the information provided is not **sufficient** for us to be able to verify, i.e. it's totally fine for someone to be paid in cash – but that's not something that we can use to be satisfied that immigration instructions are met

Q: Usually, the WE certificate does not have date on the letter and do not have the name of the signing authority. We need some guidance on how we could address this concern directly with the applicant or do we need to undertake the verification of the work experience before the PPI concern is raised.

A: Case-by-case when viewed in light of the information on the application. Consider things such as the credibility of the employer and whether the information on the letter itself can be verified e.g. whether there are contact details that we can use to verify the information if necessary. s6(c)

s6(c)

Common Questions and Answers (Cont.)

Q: What are some practical tips that we can consider when assessing claimed employment from PA's own business/farm or family-owned business/farm.

A: While the work experience from their own or their family's business may not be independently verifiable, it should be considered with other information or circumstances of the application e.g. the applicant's skills, the salary offered, and whether it is credible that the work experience evidence is genuine etc.

Q: Is there a chance of getting more updated samples of documents or guide in the Verification Toolkit?

A: R&V regularly updates the information in Verification Toolkit and informs us of that. If you identify more updated information that may be included to the Toolkit, you can contact R&V so that it can be considered for the Toolkit.

Common Questions Cont.

s6(c)

A: It is important that when assessing work experience that you undertake a holistic assessment of the information provided in support of the application

- Verification is not required in all cases where there is actually enough information for you to be satisfied
- Low risk = likely that you are able to accept more of the information provided at face value, provided there is evidence submitted that satisfies WA4.10.6(d)
- Such cases include where there is no Risk triggered and the applicant has obtained a job offer from an internationally well-known or credible company with a high salary, the applicant is from a s6(c)

- s6(c)

- especially if the applicant had a visa to work for that employer and in the absence of any other adverse information

Questions Cont.

The below are the questions and answers that were asked during the session:

s6(c)

Q: Hi, is there a preference for how interview transcripts are sent alongside PPI letters? e.g. is it to be emailed, uploaded as an external additional document or included in the PPI letter?

A: You can create custom letter and add the interview transcripts at the end of the letter. Convert the documents into PDF and upload and send via ADEPT. The character limits have recently been increased in the letter content fields of the assessment confirm templates (thanks to Simone and Janet for the suggestion). You might be able to fit the transcript within your system generated PPI now.

Q: Do we need to notify the applicant's LIA/lawyer before interviewing the applicant?

What if it is an offshore interview?

A: [VisaPak](#) 457 has info on this. In most cases we would need to contact the LIA, however there are certain circumstances where we can contact the PA directly.

Q: Now we need to include the interviews, especially if done by VO, do we need to format these a certain way before attaching to PPI? Thanks

A: You should remove any of VO's comments or assessment of the phone interview and concerns VO found.



Group Exercises

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Group Exercises

Task

- Review the scenario and documentation that is assigned to your group
- Identify what you think is the most appropriate action, e.g. PPI, RFI, accept with rationale
- Complete a write-up of the proposed rationale (e.g. PPI or risk mitigation)
- One presenter from each room to provide a verbal summary
- One person from each room to submit the written answer to ManukauTempTA mailbox

Scenario 1: Rooms 1, 2, 3

Scenario 2: Rooms 4, 5, 6

Scenario 3: Rooms 7, 8, 9

Scenario 4: Rooms 10, 11, 12

Note: Scenarios vary in length and complexity. If you complete your scenario, please move onto another one.

Scenario 1

Background:

Applicant has been offered a role as a 621511 - Retail Supervisor (Skill Level 4) to work at a pizza company earning \$29.70 (in line with the JC). JC requires no work experience or qualification for the role as all training will be provided on the job as per the job description. Minimum skills threshold met by PA holding bachelor's degree and satisfactory English test has also been provided.

Scenario 2

The applicant has obtained an offer of employment as a Multimedia Specialist (261211) listed on the Appendix 13 Green List and applied for an AEWV offshore. The employer did not advertise the role at the JC stage because they are willing to hire a migrant worker who meets the Green List

s6(c)



Due to the high risk of fraudulent documents triggered, IO has checked the work experience information declared for the applicant's previous General Visitor Visa application submitted and approved in 2018 and Essential Skills Work Visa (ESWV) application submitted and declined in 2019. For both applications, the applicant declared that he has been working as a Baker for s6(c) s6(c) since 2012 to present. Furthermore, he applied for an ESWV in 2019 with an offer of employment as a Baker but it was declined because he was not suitably qualified for the job: The previous IO was not satisfied with the applicant's claimed work experience due to the lack of sufficient evidence.

What would be the most appropriate next action (If PPI is the most appropriate, draft the PPI)?

Scenario 3

Background:

- Applicant is a s6(c) national applying for an AEWV from offshore. He has been offered a role as a fast food cook (ANZSCO 851111 Skill level 5) earning \$28.18 p/h. Applicant will be working 30-40 hours per week and will be based in Whanganui.
- Health, character and English requirements have been met.

s6(c)

Documents submitted with application (Please refer to PDF documents)

- CV
- Offshore work reference letter
- payslips
- Order request from the overseas' employer's supplier
- letter from his employer's suppliers confirming he's worked for the employer.

Activity 1 – Analyse the information provided (Applicant info, qualifications, work experience etc) and determine the next appropriate step(s). If a rationale, RFI or PPI is required then please write a sample.

Activity 2 – Assess the outcome of your proposed action and determine the outcome or next appropriate step.

Scenario 4

The AEWV was lodged on 29 August 2024.

PA is applying for Skill level 2 Massage Therapist, and is offshore.

JC requires 3 years of work experience and level 1 or 2 relevant qualification.

The PA has declared about 4 years of work experience with several employers (in her country):

- s9(2)(b)(ii) Sept 2020 to Dec 2022
- s9(2)(b)(ii) Dec 2022 up to date

Evidence supplied:

- Certificate of employment
- Affidavit that salary was in cash from s9(2)(b)(ii)
- Payslips from s9(2)(b)(ii)

Risk also present with application: There is a risk that this applicant may have provided fraudulent employment and /or qualification documents.

s6(c)

IO description/reason for RTR request:

I have attempted verification of PA's qualifications and WE by online search but was unsuccessful. Please verify PA's work experience and qualification.

R&V verification outcome:

General internet search conducted to obtain further information of the applicant's work claim at s9(2)(b)(ii). Multiple photos of masseuses have been posted on the employer's Facebook account since 2017 until present, but there is no photos of the applicant during the claimed working period. While there's no evidence of the applicant working at s9(2)(b)(ii) in the mentioned province, it was found that she operated a beauty salon located in Bangkok with the first photo posted in May 2018. This information is consistent with the employment evidence provided with her VVG and SV applications, where she declared to start this beauty salon in April 2019 (negligible concern on minor date difference). <https://www.facebook.com/xxx>.

VO contacted s9(2)(b)(ii) on xxx at 13:45 hrs (TH time) on 06/08/2024 to verify the applicant's work experience claims. A female officer (no name given) informed that there is no staff name "PA name" and she also confirmed with her supervisor that they never employed this person. She further stated that Ms. Rosy Rose, the claimed director, does not exist as there is no staff name Rosy Rose and the director/owner is Ms. Sunflower. Based on the available information, the claimed employment at s9(2)(b)(ii) appears to be non-genuine.

Task:

Discuss what are the relevant instructions and the most appropriate actions. Also, draft a PPI.



Thank you

Questions?

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Outright decline for Accredited Employer Work Visa (AEWV)

26 August 2025

Simone Currie
Technical Advisor
Manukau Visa Operations

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Objectives

For AEWV processing, you will be able to understand

- When is outright decline **applicable**?
- When is outright decline **defendable**?
- What **factors to consider** when doing an outright decline
- Process and rationale

When is outright decline (OD) applicable?

Outright decline: straight to decline without sending a PPI as per **E7.15.1**.

E7.15.1 Potentially prejudicial information (PPI)

Onshore applicants	Offshore applicants
PPI is factual information or material that will or may adversely affect the outcome of an application.	PPI is factual information or material that - was not obtained from the applicant or their agent; and - is not publicly available, or that the applicant is not necessarily aware of; and - will or may adversely affect the outcome of an application; and - the applicant has not previously had an opportunity to comment on.

What is factual information or material?

- Is it actually factual information or is it our assessment?
- It may be argued that not meeting the instruction is our assessment and not factual information. For this reason, consider what the relevant immigration instructions state.

- a. An applicant meets the minimum skills threshold if an immigration officer is satisfied that they:
- i. can demonstrate two years or more of relevant work experience with sufficient evidence from a third party; or
 - ii. have a relevant qualification at Level 4 or higher on the New Zealand Qualifications and Credentials Framework (NZQCF).

- e. Evidence of relevant work experience from a third party may include, but is not limited to:
- i. letters of reference from an employer; or
 - ii. certificates of employment; or
 - iii. payslips; or
 - iv. tax certificates.

Note: For the avoidance of doubt, a curriculum vitae is not sufficient unless it is provided with supporting documentation not written by the applicant that satisfies an immigration officer.

Considering outright decline

Is the applicant in New Zealand or outside of the country?

✗ Onshore

✓ Offshore

Is the OD based on information that:

✓ Is publicly available information, or is information the applicant would otherwise be aware of (it was or relates to evidence provided).

✗ Information held by INZ that applicant is not aware of and has not previously had the opportunity to comment on.

Consider other factors to determine whether decline is appropriate.



While OD is technically available, we should weigh other factors to determine whether the decision is defensible.

When is outright decline (OD) defensible?

Consider other factors and the circumstances of the application:



The significance of the concerns and potential value of the application:

- The migrant is applying for a highly skilled or hard to fill role.
- Applicant meets all other AEWV and temporary entry requirements but has not provided one specific document that can be easily requested.
- The applicant has provided evidence of applying for the required document prior to submitting visa application.



You have requested information from the applicant (RFI) and the further information received can be a reason for decline.



The applicant was previously declined for the same concerns and has now provided additional evidence and/or information on the issue.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Scenarios for outright decline

False, misleading or withheld information (A24)

- Where false, misleading or withheld information (FMWI) is identified in a current visa application. Refer to *Potentially Prejudicial information (PPI) false information guidance*.

Minimum skills threshold (WA4.10.6) & Suitably qualified (WA4.10.5)

- Consider the examples listed at WA4.10.6(e) and Visa Pak 611

Health (A4)

- Check if application was pushed to 'Under assessment' stage per Global Process Manual. No medicals or prescribed medical information is provided – this information is not PPI.

How to structure Outright Decline letter

Outright Decline	Example
Instruction: capture the applied instruction	Immigration instruction WA4.10.6 states...
Fact: “ what ” has been identified	You declared you meet the minimum skills threshold based on at least 2 years relevant work experience, and have provided a curriculum vitae (CV) listing your employment history.
Rationale: “ why ” the finding is not satisfactory	No other supporting evidence was provided to demonstrate your work experience. Per instruction WA4.10.6(e), a CV is not sufficient unless it is provided with supporting documentation.
Conclusion: we are not satisfied / you do not meet...	Therefore, you do not meet the minimum skills threshold...

Outright decline rationale

Include a blurb in the decline letter referencing E7.15.1:

For example:

We have not sought further comment from you prior to making the decision to decline this application as the information we are basing our decision on is not potentially prejudicial information (PPI), according to instructions E7.15.1.

The same should be added to your assessment in ADEPT.

Per E7.10(b), consider an exception to instructions (ETI) prior to decline and include the relevant blurb in the letter.

We have also considered if there are any special circumstances that would warrant an exception to immigration instructions, but cannot find any reason to grant you a visa as an exception.

Outstanding concerns

All the relevant visa requirements must be fully assessed for a temporary visa application, but **health (A4)**, **character (A5)** or **risks** can remain pending when declining the application.

When **health**, **character** or **risks** remain pending, this must be recorded in your assessment note in ADEPT.

Pending requirements

Summarise the findings e.g. There has been a conviction noted in your New Zealand police certificate issued XX/XX/XXXX. Immigration instruction XXXX may be applied to you, but this has not been fully assessed at this stage because your application has been declined on the above reasons. This may be further assessed if you apply for another visa in the future.

Refer to [Manukau Temp TA update - 17/09/2024](#)

Group activity: Case studies

- Is OD applicable?
- Is OD defensible/appropriate?
- Any outstanding/pending concerns.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 1: MST & SQ

Applicant is onshore.

Risk: High risk of fraudulent work experience/qualifications for applicants applying to work in Construction sector.

Job Check (JC) requirements: 3 years work experience required.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Carpenter (Skill Level 3)

NZ employer: Construction company (high volume accreditation)

Case: The applicant declared that they have at least 2 years relevant work experience to meet MST.

As evidence, they provided their CV which lists their employment with various Singaporean construction companies. No other supporting documents were provided. No qualification was provided as, per their declaration, they are claiming to meet MST based on work experience.

It is noted that the applicant's intended stay in New Zealand would exceed 24 months, therefore a police certificate is required, however they have not provided this document.

Case study 1: MST & SQ

Is OD **applicable**?

- Applicant is onshore.
- The information is PPI.

✗ No, OD is not applicable.

Is OD **defendable**?

✗ No, OD is not **defendable** because it is not **applicable**.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 2: SQ & FMI

Applicant is offshore.

Risk: High risk of fraudulent documents.

Job Check (JC) requirements: No work experience but required to hold a valid driver's license (DL).

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years work experience or qualification Level 4 or higher.

Role: Truck Driver (Skill Level 4)

NZ employer: Large delivery company (high volume accreditation)

Case: The applicant provided their bachelor's qualification to meet MST.

On online search of their student ID confirms the applicant completed the examinations. All other relevant AEWV instructions are met, but the applicant has not provided a copy of their DL. A RFI letter is sent requesting the document which is provided.

To mitigate the high risk, a online database search is conducted and the DL is unable to be found. It is noted the name on the DL does not match the name on the passport provided (the surname is different).

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 2: SQ & FMI

Is OD **applicable**?

- Applicant is offshore.
- The information is not PPI.

 Yes, OD is applicable.

Is OD **defendable**?

- Decline is based on core AEWV instruction and contains potential FMI.
- However, the concern is based on the specific document requested by INZ.
- There may be a explanation for why the applicant's name has changed and/or why it is not available on the online database.

 No, while OD is **applicable**, it may be **more defendable** to PPI.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 3: MST

Applicant is offshore.

Risk: High risk of fraudulent work experience & previously declined visa application.

Job Check (JC) requirements: None

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years work experience or qualification Level 4 or higher.

Role: Retail assistant (Skill Level 5)

NZ employer: Small grocery store (standard accreditation)

Case: The applicant had previously applied for an AEWV to work for the same employer and role, however they were declined due to not meeting MST and the JC requirements of 3 years work experience. A reference letter from the overseas employer and hand-written pay slips were provided. The previous IO had found little to no online presence of the employer and determined the employment evidence was not sufficient as there was no third-party evidence to support it. A PPI was sent and, after no response was received, it was declined.

The applicant has provided the same documents, alongside an computational Indian tax return (ITR) sheet and a personal statement explaining that he was paid in cash, therefore he does not receive income to his bank account. RMR comments that there is a Google maps result with a photo of the shopfront, however the contact information does not match the reference letter.

Case study 3: MST

Is OD **applicable**?

- Applicant is offshore.
- The information is not PPI.

 Yes, OD is applicable.

Is OD **defendable**?

- Decline is based on one of the core requirements for AEWV. The additional information does not change the assessment of work experience.
- Role is not highly skilled nor hard to fill.
- There are no specific documents that can be requested to mitigate this concern.

 Yes, OD is **defendable**.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 4: English language requirements

Applicant is offshore.

Risk: High risk of non-genuine job offers

Job Check (JC) requirements: None.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Kitchenhand (Skill Level 5)

NZ employer: Restaurant (standard accreditation)

Case: The applicant completed a Bachelor of Arts from a university in their home country (India) which they provided to meet the minimum skills threshold.

In the visa application form, the applicant declared that they have a 'PTE Academic test with overall score of 29 or more'. With the visa application, they provided a PTE Core test with a score of 45.

Case study 4: English language requirements

Is OD **applicable**?

- Applicant is offshore.
- The information is not PPI.

 Yes, OD is applicable.

Is OD **defendable**?

- Decline is based on core AEWV instruction (English language requirements).
- Role is not highly skilled nor hard to fill.
- There is no indication that the applicant may meet English language requirements by any other means under instruction WA4.12.1(a).
- The applicant was aware of specific requirement when filling in visa application form which clearly states PTE Academic.

 Yes, OD is **defendable**.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 5: MST & SQ

Applicant is offshore.

Risk: None.

Job Check (JC) requirements: 2 years work experience.

Minimum skills threshold (MST): 2 years work experience or qualification at NZQF Level 4 or higher.

Role: Retail manager (Skill Level 2)

NZ employer: Fast food retailer (standard accreditation)

Case: The applicant declared to have at least 2 years work experience.

They provided one-page reference letter which states they worked as a Sailor from 2021 to 2023 for a shipping enterprise. In the visa application form, they declared that they worked as a Manager at a gas station from 2010 to 2019, however no evidence of this was provided.

It is noted no General Medical Certificates (GMC) was provided.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Case study 5: MST & SQ

Is OD **applicable**?

- Applicant is offshore.
- The information is not PPI.

 Yes, OD is applicable.

Is OD **defendable**?

- Decline is based on core AEWV instruction
- The work as a Sailor is not relevant to the job on offer and no evidence was provided of their work as a Manager.
- There are no specific documents that can be requested to mitigate this concern.
- While it is Skill Level 2, the job only requires 2 years work experience which is not out of the ordinary.

 Yes, OD is **defendable**.

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

Thank you!

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT