



**MINISTRY OF BUSINESS,  
INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT**  
HĪKINA WHAKATUTUKI

**LABOUR AND  
IMMIGRATION  
POLICY**

---



# Consultation on International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy

**Submission document**

---

## The consultation process

---

### **The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment (MBIE) is consulting on:**

You are invited to make a submission on the proposals raised in the discussion document. Submissions are due by **Sunday 22 July 2018**.

Please email your submission to [tourism@mbie.govt.nz](mailto:tourism@mbie.govt.nz) using the below template.

Your submission may respond to any or all of the proposals. In addition, you are welcome to provide other information that you think might be relevant to this consultation. If possible, any views in your submission should be supported by evidence or examples of how the proposals would affect you.

### **Use of information**

MBIE will use the information provided in submissions to inform our analysis and the advice to Ministers. MBIE may contact submitters directly if MBIE requires clarification of any matters in the submission.

### **Confidential Information**

If your submission contains any confidential information, please indicate this on the front of the submission. In addition, the confidential information should be clearly marked within the text, for example, by including the confidential information in square brackets or as a separate appendix. Please clearly indicate in your submission any confidential information that you do not want published on MBIE's website or included in any summary of submissions that MBIE may publish.

The material identified as confidential will not be published, however if MBIE receives a request under the Official Information Act 1982 for a copy of submissions, MBIE will need to make its own assessment of whether the information should be released, including whether it is in the public interest to release the information received. In this event, MBIE will endeavour to consult with submitters that have provided confidential information prior to making its decision on the request.

### **Personal Information**

The Privacy Act 1993 establishes certain principles with respect to the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals by various agencies, including MBIE.

Please clearly indicate in your submission if you do not wish your name or contact details to be posted on MBIE's website or included in any summary of submissions that MBIE may publish.

## Submitter information

---

### Please tell us if you are submitting as a:

- Private Individual**
- Visa waiver traveller
  - New Zealand visa holder
  - New Zealand citizen or permanent resident
- Individual industry stakeholder**
- Airline
  - Cruise
  - Travel/Tourism
- Industry Association**
- Airline
  - Cruise
  - Travel/Tourism
- Other**
- Please describe: South Canterbury Chamber of Commerce

### If you would like to provide your contact details please fill in the below. MBIE may contact you if we need further clarification on any of your answers.

**Name:** Wendy Smith  
**Organisation:** South Canterbury Chamber of Commerce  
**Email address:** P.O Box 919, Timaru

**Please indicate below if you do not wish your name/contact details to be posted on MBIE's website or as part of any summary of submissions which MBIE may publish.**

- Do not publish my name/contact details.

## Proposed Introduction of International Visitor Conservation and Tourism Levy

---

### 1.1 Are there other costs and benefits derived from international visitors to New Zealand?

Clearly as the top generator of export earnings tourism is a critical industry to protect, manage and develop. In areas like the Mackenzie District income generation is achieved by the commercial sector while the local authority (and other not for profit organisations i.e. the Church of the Good Shepherd) are literally unable to cope with and fund the need for a complete review, strategy development and implementation of the necessary infrastructure. NZ is in grave danger of destroying the fabric of our iconic tourism offering and alienating local residents.

**1.2 What are your views on current funding arrangements for tourism infrastructure and conservation i.e. what are the constraints? How could users more effectively contribute to the costs they impose?**

Small councils (from lower rate payer districts) are not able to operate under the crippling demands of ongoing tourism growth. The Tourism Infrastructure Fund although in principle has value, is too demanding financially and timewise. The government needs to contribute a higher level of funding through the approximate \$2.6 billion dollars that is generated through GST towards infrastructure.

**1.3 Are there other costs and benefits of the IVL as a funding tool in relation to the funding issues above?**

As a country we need to understand the true cost of delivering a high quality tourism product, monitor tourism and resource appropriately.

**1.4 Do you agree with the criteria for a sustainable funding package?**

- Yes**  
 **No**

*Do you have any further comments?*  
[Click here to enter text.](#)

**1.5 Do you agree that an IVL is a useful component of such a package?**

- Yes**  
 **No**

*Do you have any further comments?*  
[Click here to enter text.](#)

**1.6 What are other funding tools which ensure that people who use and enjoy infrastructure make a contribution to the costs?**

Best international practice needs to be shared. Local authorities appear to be working it out for themselves with a variety of solutions from bed taxes to parking costs – better co-ordination and support for implementation needs to be provided. .e.g. Freedom camping – levies / charges, parking fees, toilet stops, sewerage and water upgrades, roading an endless list of co-ordinated actions needed.

**1.7 Do you have any comments on the potential cumulative impacts of the fee and levies, Electronic Travel Authority and IVL proposals under consultation on visitors or your industry?**

These will have a minimal impact on international visitors

**2.1 Do you support the Government's proposed targeting mechanism?**

- Yes
- No

*Do you have any comments?*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**2.2 Are there other costs and benefits of exempting certain groups of travellers we should consider (e.g. Australians and Pacific Island visitors, crew travelling on aircraft and ships)?**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**2.3 Are there other classes of visitor that should be exempted from the IVL?**

International Students

**3.1 Are there other things that should be considered when selecting the collection mechanism? How might these support or alter the preferred approach?**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**3.2 Are there other costs and benefits for the proposed mechanism, or alternatives?**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**3.3 If the Government does not proceed with an ETA, would you support collection of an IVL by another means, or in a different form?**

The International Visitor Levy should proceed and needs to be targeted and distributed on the basis of scale / visitor flow and the quantum of change / growth that has occurred.

**4.1 What are the impacts of different rates likely to be?**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**4.2 Do you have a preferred rate?**

- \$25
- \$30
- \$35
- No preference

*If you have a preferred rate, why?*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

### 5.1 What should be the funding share between tourism infrastructure and conservation? Why?

Unsure on the conservation needs, far clearer on the extreme impact being felt by areas like the Mackenzie District(part of our South Canterbury Service area)

### 5.2 How would you define tourism infrastructure and conservation for the purposes of spending the IVL? For example, do you support using IVL revenue to:

#### a) Fund basic infrastructure used by visitors and/or residents?

Yes

No

*Do you have any comments on the above?*

Infrastructure will be used by visitors and residents – the significant change and need for upgrade has been created by the increase in tourism

#### b) Develop visitor attractions?

Yes

No

*Do you have any comments on the above?*

The funds generated will be minimal and need to be targeted at infrastructure. Visitor attractions can be funded by the commercial sector or the government can identify a component of GST for this area

#### c) Support conservation and bio biodiversity activity such as predator eradication, breeding programmes, native planting?

Yes

No

*Do you have any comments on the above?*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

#### d) Protect the values of our wild places/iconic destinations including national parks and world heritage areas?

Yes

No

*Do you have any comments on the above?*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

#### e) What else could the IVL revenue be spent on?

This is a limited fund – target infrastructure

### 5.3 How should the tourism sector, local government, and/or other stakeholders inform the decision-making process?

Through consultation and an expert working group.