

Thursday, 11 November 2010

Review of remuneration and conditions of service
for police officers and staff: seminar on
performance and post related pay

White & Case, 5 Old Broad Street, London EC2N 1DW

Tom Winsor: Independent Reviewer

Chair: Ted Crew

Attendees:

Carol Brady, *Greater Manchester Police*

Graham Cassidy, *National Deputy Secretary,
Superintendents Association*

Kevin Courtney, *Head of Pay and Benefits, Met Police*

Liz Davidson, *HM Treasury*

Tara Deshpande, *Police Reward and Employee Relations
Team, Home Office.*

Raj Jethwa, *Police Federation*

Inspector Craig Knight, *Surrey Police*

Joscelin Lawson, *Northumbria Police*

John Marsh, *Ernst & Young*

Sarah Mott, *Reward & Benefits Manager, Kent Police*

Caryl Nobbs, *Chairperson of Unison's Police and Justice
Executive*

Rob Price, *ACPO*

Ian Rennie, *General Secretary, Police Federation*

Laura Welsh, *Workforce Change Manager, NPIA*

Alan Williams, *Director of Finance, ACPO TAM*

Paul Wylie, *Secretary to the Review*

Elizabeth Allen, *Deputy Secretary to the Review*

Thursday, 11 November 2010

(3.00 pm)

Introduction

MR CREW: Good afternoon, my name is Ted Crew for those who of you who don't know me. I am the former Chief Constable of the West Midlands and I am the policing adviser to the review and on my left is Mr Tom Winsor who is the reviewer. And this afternoon we want to understand, for people who have heard this before, those of you who have been on previous days, it is good to see you and welcome you back and good to see new people who haven't been here as well, but the purpose is to understand from people directly engaged with policing, in policing, around policing what the issues are with the status quo, good and bad, and ask for the bad things, the things that we need to improve, what practical solutions there are.

I am going to hand over to Tom because he wants to talk a bit about the review itself and then we will kick off and I will give you some detail about today's session.

MR WINSOR: Thank you. I have said this in the other

seminars but for those who weren't there before, we are charged by the Home Office to produce a new system of pay and conditions for police officers and police staff. This is or could be a once in a generation opportunity to dissolve some aspects, the nonsenses, the anomalies, the inefficiencies of the existing system and to create something that will endure far longer than the present financial mess that the country faces at the moment.

I do not anticipate that this opportunity will come again for a long time, particularly because if you look at the history of police pay in particular, the police staff pay which is an entirely different genesis, you will realise that what has grown up over the years is a system fit for the 1970s to which there have been bolt on extras and sticking plaster applied and the current system, therefore, is not an attractive holistic one. It has many incoherencies and unsatisfactory features. It also has many strengths and we want to maintain and build on those strengths, so it is not a question of tearing the whole thing down by any means whatsoever.

What I would also say is that as Ted and I make

interventions, and Ted has kindly agreed to chair these sessions so that I can concentrate on what I am hearing and make interventions without the burden of also holding the ring, but if we do ask questions and make interventions, it should not be interpreted we have made our minds up on anything because we have made our minds up on hardly anything at all, but we are testing propositions, things that have been put to us, things that we have heard in order that we can get the issue properly discussed, shot down, built up, improved whatever may happen. Thank you.

MR CREW: Thank you very much.

What we did on the first day, and I think your agendas might show this still, is that we went through a process of trying to identify the issues and then we came back for a second session which was to look at the future and how that might look, what improvements might be made. It proved I think, most people felt, certainly Tom and I felt, that it was an unnecessary distinction and a confusing distinction really because it is inevitable that in the course of the discussion of the first aspect that people were starting to talk about the second

aspect.

So yesterday we went into amalgamating the two aspects of the agenda into one chunk, so to speak, so looking at what the problems were and what the solutions might be together. So where you identify problems it is also useful to identify what the solutions might be to it.

We have focused in the seminars on different aspects of the issues that we are looking at and this afternoon we want to focus in particular on bonuses, SPPs¹, CRTPs², post and performance related pay, ex-gratia payments, the question of regional allowances, pay progression, how all that takes place. So a big chunk around, I say this very broadly, add-ons, and that is not meant to be pejorative. It is just a way I think of describing the way they are bunched together.

That is what I want you to apply your minds to and indeed I hope you have been doing that before you came to the meeting so that you are prepared to talk.

This afternoon won't work unless we get your views. If you don't talk to us we will assume there is

¹ Special Priority Payment

² Competency Related Threshold Payment

nothing to be said. So we do need people to talk and to give us their views.

What I would like to do, I will try and manage this process and I should say if by the end you think, "Goodness we have missed out a chunk" or "there is something I feel passionately about", then that is the time to put it in because we won't get the opportunity to talk to you again probably. So please use this opportunity.

Pay Progression

MR CREW: We want to focus to start with, I think, on the question of pay progression within ranks. So how do people at the moment make progress? What qualifies for progress within a rank in terms of uplifts? Is that right the way it is currently done? Is it too long? Is it too short? Should it be done differently? Should you have to have qualifications other than time to achieve it? Around that sort of area.

Who feels they would like to talk to me? Sarah is from Kent and, as I worked in Kent at some stage in my career I would invite you to talk first, thank you.

MS MOTT: I think we have come to the conclusion, and

we have a different set of conditions in our service for our staff so I will talk about the staff and the police officers, that time served isn't necessarily a good way to progress our people through our pay bands. When we are looking at, certainly on the police side, when we have very different technical jobs, for example, our forensic collision investigators, some of those people go on to do degrees so that they can be an expert witness in court and successfully get the cases through. They don't get any different payment to other constables who are doing okay, yes, an equally difficult job but they haven't gone that extra mile to get that extra professional qualification.

I think that is the thing we found difficult to reward. Yes, we have gone down the route of special priority payments but that is so divisive -- I know we will come on to that later -- that it doesn't seem equitable that there is a blanket pay even when some of our people have very specialist qualifications to deliver the job that we need to actually police the county. So that is that side of thing.

On the staff side we do have progression by time served

through the grades. We have put in extra boundaries around that to actually try and manage and assess performance so that performance is tied up with that but it is a fairly limited way that we have been able to do that at the moment, and if we were to move a lot further that requires more detailed negotiation with Unison to actually put something different in place.

We do have a different set of conditions of service for staff in our operation centre. They have a single spot point of pay and that is reflected on the skills they have. So they come in. They start on telephony. They have a single spot point for that pay. As they build their experience and qualifications they move on to call handling and resourcing. We move them through different pay points. That does seem to work in that environment because we have very clear different technical needs.

So we tried that and that has been in for about seven years now. It seems to work well, but of course if we then try to do a similar thing for general admin staff, that is when we come unstuck because there is no clarity between the different

types of professionalism you might need in there.
So that is where we are at the moment in Kent.

MR CREW: Have you actually extrapolated it beyond the control room at all?

MS MOTT: We have done some. We were just working on things like crime scene investigators but they don't have spot points. They have a wider band of pay. But we are looking to more push down. For example, for the crime scene investigators they start off on a training rate. They move through to volume crime issues they can deal with. When they can then deal with major crime issues they get a different pay rate and then they move on to more professional managerial or technical ability and that progresses them again.

So there are elements where this is working but in very professional parts where you have very clear distinct professional qualifications or technical aspects to the job where we can progress them.

It does work similarly in things like HR and finance again because you have professional bodies, but it is a slow starter to actually progress people through that and the main thing that falls down is the general clerical support that is hard to

quantify. Because with the police service, and we have recently civilianised some more roles, there isn't a professional body attached with it outside whereby we can hang some sort of continuous professional development on it or give them a qualification to actually reflect their skills and input. So that is where it sort of peters out, I think the clerical administration end.

MR CREW: Carol, do you need to add to that from a different part of the country?

MS BRADY: Yes. First of all, I would just like to say that I am here on behalf of Cathy Butterworth so apologies if I am unable to provide a strategic opinion/direction from Greater Manchester Police. As far as I can add from the Greater Manchester Police staff side, I think the career grade system that we have works for HR finance but very much what Sarah is saying in Kent, for general clerical jobs it is very difficult to hang anything on it because there are no professional qualification requirements. However, GMP has brought in career grades for certain posts and it has worked up to a level.

MR CREW: Any observations as far as police officers

are concerned?

MS BRADY: I haven't got any at this stage, no.

MR CASSIDY: I have to say I think this question centres very much around question 40 on the list of questions and I think our response makes it clear that there are advantages and disadvantages to the current system.

MR CREW: Yes.

MR CASSIDY: The advantages being very much that it rewards experience. The progression currently as it is established, it is important to remember is based upon satisfactory performance so it is not a given, and it encourages officers to develop themselves over a 30 year career and have something realistic to achieve over that timescale.

I think probably the biggest disadvantage we have outlined is that sometimes there are some issues about the probity and honesty of the PDR³ system which could, I think, be usefully looked at but also the current system makes it quite difficult to sufficiently reward outstanding officers coming through.

Oddly enough in the case of superintendents that is not

³ Performance & Development Review

the case because they have the opportunity with the 2003 arrangements to do a double increment on the basis of exceptional performance. But that is the only rank where that currently applies to.

MR CREW: Is that negotiated by the superintendents through the PNB?

MR CASSIDY: That was through the 2003 PNB⁴ agreement, yes. So pros and cons but I think probably mainly pros.

MR CREW: I accept what you say about satisfactory performance. Other than discipline are you aware of anybody not getting the increments?

MR CASSIDY: It is very rare.

MR CREW: Because of the PDR?

MR CASSIDY: Yes.

MR COURTNEY: I suppose I would start off by saying it depends on your concept of the role of the officer, let us say, and are we talking about all officers being equally interchangeable or are we talking about, which I think is a fact of life, that the role of officers is becoming more specialised and more distinct in many ways. So all officers are not quite the same. I think that is the kind of

⁴ Police Negotiating Board

principle that underpins the current arrangements that officers are more or less interchangeable and one can do another's job and they are multi-competent and so forth, and that is possibly something that is open to challenge.

If you then say they are less multi-competent and more specialised, then I think there is a stronger case for saying you need to look at the different combinations of skill and experience and so forth that are needed in various roles. That then takes us perhaps down the road of looking at job sizing or job evaluation which I think is something that the service as a whole is a bit nervous about but it is something we might have to.

MR CREW: Wisely or otherwise? Why is it nervous about it?

MR COURTNEY: I think based on quite a lot of experience, wisely I would guess looking back at recent NHS experience of Agenda for Change, so we don't want to go into an orgy of job evaluation and think that is a solution to everything.

I suppose that is one of the conceptual things is: are all jobs the same in various rates?

There is another question about what is the rate for

the job which is linked to that? So if all jobs are not the same should constables, for example, all end up at the same point, therefore, or should we distinguish between different roles and different skills and those kind of issues?

If we are going to do that, what is the mechanism for doing it? Probably the current mechanisms, things like PDRs and maybe competency frameworks don't work very satisfactorily at the moment, so there needs to be something underneath that to enable us to make that sort of change and move to that structure.

Of course then that brings in issues I think from officers whose traditional view is that all officers have been treated as a sort of mass and all the same and if you start making distinctions and differences is that helpful to things like, I don't know, working together as parts of teams? Is it helpful to career development? Is it helpful to those sorts of things? So there are other spin-off issues.

MR CREW: I see you are head of pay and benefits, would you comment for me about the length of, the chain for increments, how many years are involved in that

for constables.

MR COURTNEY: I expect you would say it is a sort of proxy for experience. Then you would say, well, how long does it take to become competent, and in the case of constables you would say probably a lot less than ten years. That equally offends against equal pay type of legislation. So you would say something needs to be done about that.

Then that goes back to, okay, what is the rate for the job? Is there one job rather than many jobs and how long should people then take to progress to those sorts of jobs? And what are the standards and measures that we are going to use to assess whether they have got there or not?

MR CREW: It has been suggested to us it is discriminatory.

MR COURTNEY: I think most people would agree.

MR CREW: Is anybody aware of any ...?

MR MARSH: It is discriminatory. I used to be the HR director at the Home Office and I have worked in the prison service. We got hit by a multi-million pound equal pay claim and had to settle and there were a couple of areas that we were vulnerable on. One was comparing uniformed staff doing very

similar jobs to non-uniformed staff and not being able to do an objective justification because the evaluation system was not robust enough for that. The second area of vulnerability as well, as you were saying there, is a length of the scales because it is much less likely that women are going to reach the top of the scale, particularly one that is ten years long, due to maybe taking leave for family reasons.

So there is a lot of vulnerability, I would suggest, in your current pay scales.

MR PRICE: I guess ACPO's point of view is pretty clear in the document that we submitted. Just in the broadest terms supporting what I have heard so far, we don't see that a time served method of reward is consistent, I guess outside looking in, with a modern service quite frankly, setting aside the issues we have just heard.

We think there are better ways of motivating staff, recognising performance and one way, albeit ACPO still needs to do quite a bit of thinking on this, could be recognising continued professional development. Some of the things we heard, the creative stuff we have heard, in Kent for example,

we think is a very very positive step forward.

Again, in terms of what a professional modern organisation should look like, rewarding on a continual basis for a period of decade somebody on the basis of satisfactory performance, we do not think that is appropriate. Albeit we do recognise competence. We do recognise that there should be some stages where an officer, and indeed a police staff member, should acquire competence and over and above that there should be the professionalising of reward.

So they are the two main points that I wanted to just state on that. There is the issue of fairness and fairness I think is at the foremost of this review and that has already been stated in terms of things like equal pay.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR WILLIAMS: I am representing ACPO TAM which is distinct from ACPO and many of you may not have heard it, TAM stands for Terrorism and Allied Matters, so we fund all counter terrorist policing which is interesting why I am sitting next to the Met who obviously do the most --

MR CREW: The most spending of it.

MR WILLIAMS: The most spending of it, yes. My point very much backs up what Kevin has said. The specialist officers we have, some of whom by applying regulations are more than doubling their salary, overtime and things like that. I think the day of a generalist police officer has gone. I am talking about people who are routinely armed, that sort of thing and I really think that is the area we need to be looking at a professional evaluation and very much agreeing competency based rather than time served. I don't think that is a theme you can justify in the public sector compared to the private sector any more.

But as somebody who pays for a lot of specialists it really is a key point but that is very much a selfish point as well.

MR CREW: Thank you for that. Subject to Tom's wishes I would just like to explore the tangent you raise which is that officers are doubling their pay. Could you explain some of that?

MR WILLIAMS: Well, the issue being, the sort of work we do I wouldn't want to get too ...

MR CREW: I don't want you to get into cases.

MR WILLIAMS: But there are royalty and protection

officers, those sort of officers who have to protect VIPs et cetera and because regulations don't work you have to pay very very significant amounts of overtime for allowances. To be fair, the regulations -- somebody made the point -- weren't built for these people and there are an increasing number of these people. There are people who do very specialist surveillance work for whom the regulations just don't cater.

MR CREW: But they are working those hours? You are not suggesting they are fiddling?

MR WILLIAMS: I am not suggesting anything illegal. I am saying because you have to apply the rates as they are you end up paying sums that a lot of people would regard as excessive.

MR COURTNEY: Some of them might be illegal in the sense of working time regulations.

MR CREW: Yes.

MR COURTNEY: We have a similar issue with similar roles where there is a high -- let us say protection officers -- personal component to the job. The principals often like the same person to be with them because they understand how things work. So they want that person and they don't want

anybody else so that person accompanies them on a 12 hour day or an 18 hour day and the pay flows from those sorts of commitments.

MR CREW: Forgive me everybody if you don't want to get into this trap. I do just want to pursue it a little bit. Having set the hare running, how do you deal with the issue? What would be your solution to it? We are not talking about the whole service here. We are talking about a small group of officers.

MR COURTNEY: We are. These are the officers who come up in the Daily Mail. Those are the ones who feature, £100,000 police officers. Those are the ones that feature then.

MR CREW: They are also the ones, if I might say so, because I am sure others here will tell me if I don't say it, that distort the whole figure for police pay in terms of the means and the average and the rest of it.

MR COURTNEY: They are certainly I think probably outliers, yes.

MR CREW: Outliers, but they have that impact don't they?

MR WINSOR: How significant a number of people are we

talking about?

MR WILLIAMS: Quite a few.

MR WINSOR: Give me something more than quite a few.

MR CREW: Ballpark.

MR WINSOR: 200, 400?

MR COURTNEY: I would guess in the Met and it tends to be terrorism, counter terrorism, protection, those kind of people. I guess we are looking at the hundreds, yes.

MR WINSOR: Several hundred?

MR COURTNEY: Yes.

MR WINSOR: Under 500?

MR COURTNEY: About that sort of figure I would guess.

MR WINSOR: Out of 144,000.

MR COURTNEY: 500 in the Met and let us say 20,000.

MR WINSOR: But nationally --

MR COURTNEY: Say four times that.

MR WILLIAMS: I would say double that at most.

MR WINSOR: What are we talking about, 500 or 1,500?

MR CREW: Are we talking about 1,000 for the whole country?

MR WILLIAMS: It might be that much.

MR CREW: Okay.

MR WILLIAMS: Probably lower. I mean I have some

difficulty in saying too much publically.

MR CREW: I have some sympathy for your position.

MR WILLIAMS: It is not thousands.

MR WINSOR: Before Ian Rennie says that these guys are working very long hours, so if they are not going to be paid the overtime rates in question, and I understand the attachment point et cetera, then how else should they be remunerated? Do they tell you how they think they should be remunerated other than doubling their salaries?

MR CREW: Or are they very happy to double their salaries?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, they are very happy.

MR CREW: I understand that, yes.

MR WILLIAMS: I think what you have to look at, as in the private sector, you have things like annualised hours contracts, flexible packages. The regulations cause them to get paid because if you roster somebody on a rest day, four hours minimum payment of those sort of issues, all those sort of issues get triggered and that is why you end up with these high level of payments. I think you would find the private sector would -- the ability, if you like, to negotiate a deal for a specific

role taking into account the unsocial working et cetera et cetera, I would say from my perspective, funding a lot of this is something we would want to explore but at the moment we can't. So hence raising it.

MR CREW: You would certainly be very welcome to submit a paper to us, to give a submission on the scale of the issue and possible solutions to it. I am not suggesting we could solve it but it would be helpful to understand it in a lot more depth than I think we do.

MR WILLIAMS: The other factor, just to give some balance, is these officers are carrying out very sensitive and very highly trained duties and have skills in terms of being armed et cetera.

MR CREW: Yes, one recognises that.

MR COURTNEY: And equally we wouldn't want to design a whole package around, as you pointed out, a very small number of officers.

MR CREW: And that is one of the difficulties.

MR CASSIDY: There has to be a balance to this job but I am alarmed to hear what colleagues are saying because somebody at our level ought to be managing that better because you can just imagine somebody,

albeit with a massive amount of dedication, highly valued skills and training, something going wrong after 20 hours on duty, somebody ending up dead where it leaves the service when the enquiry kicks in. It isn't sensible.

MR PRICE: That is a point I am sure the review gets but the service has to take a long hard look at itself in terms of how it has managed this system. Our view is -- Ian knows my view on it -- that we don't think this is a good system for a modern system. But any system we introduce thereafter has to be well led and managed and I don't think we have done that particularly well.

So I don't always think it is useful blaming regulations. I think there is flexibility within those regulations but from a fundamental point of view what ACPO is saying is that that is not representative of how a modern organisation should look but I think we really do need to take a long hard look ourselves, and this review may just reveal that, as to how we have managed, whatever it is, whether it is conciliated payment, whether it is the PDR system, whether it is sick leave, whatever. I think the service really needs to use

this review as a check on how we have managed and led the service.

MR CREW: There is a downside to paying some compensatory allowance. There's a few of us who have been around long enough to remember when that was done for detectives and detectives worked longer hours than they have ever worked since because frankly, they were abused by management. The hours they worked they felt under pressure to work and I don't think anybody would want to go back to that sort of arrangement either.

Anyway, this is a tangent. By all means, Ian, comment on that as well but you will no doubt want to comment on the other issue.

MR RENNIE: Yes, if I may. This is my third one and it is going to turn out as enjoyable as the other two, extremely interesting.

MR WINSOR: We hope you are not running out of steam.

MR RENNIE: No.

MR PRICE: One senses not.

MR RENNIE: I understand what people are talking about and yes, it does recognise time served currently and the gaining of experience. I think it is right to say that in October 2005 the Official Side of

the Home Office tabled a paper recognising some need for change with reward and recognition. This was part of the discussion about perhaps tailoring it to satisfactory performance through a PDR process, and we still haven't got a satisfactory PDR process in the country. In fact, even the latest work that has been done to bring that process over -- there is a national process -- has fallen into disrepute because they won't accept it as a national process. So that goes back to the management of the service. I will come back to that shortly.

What we have at the moment with that regard is those discussions fell down in 2006 and 2007 and because of the differences of opinion on the way pay was to be updated in September of those years, and eventually in 2008 we managed to agree a three-year deal and we were hopeful that that would give us some time to consider perhaps a number of the issues that you are currently considering. Disappointingly nothing ever came forward again from the Official Side.

Certainly, not just as a General Secretary of the Police Federation but as Secretary of the Staff

Side we have always welcomed some discussions around that area and we were quite supportive at the time when that was talked about.

Moving on from that, we have a simple, uncomplicated pay mechanism that is easy to manage, relatively inexpensive to manage with no appeals from any quarter with the exception of one particular part of the pay package, which is the SPPs and we will talk about that more later, but with regard to other things it is a genuinely simple package. If we are going to move away from that, I think it is going to cause us significant cost, significant time, significantly more bureaucracy in managing this process and will increase the cost of managing pay.

I am intrigued with the view of professional qualification, getting additional money, particularly for doing a specialist role. Those officers can be redeployed at any time by the chief constable. But I do find it quite strange in the time of austerity that we are looking to pay people more for doing a job that they currently do. I just find that strange, quite a perverse situation. They are doing it now for no extra

money and you want to give them more money to do it. That in a time of austerity is perverse.

Moving on, the length of the constable's pay scale is ten years and I think it is right that through the PNB the Staff Side funded an equal pay audit because we recognised that there were issues and that has clearly identified a gender pay gap, the largest part of which is the constable's pay scale which ten years is not able to be justified.

Clearly with the increase in numbers of women coming into the service in the last five years it is causing us a problem or is likely to cause a problem potentially if we don't get it down to seven years which would be really a figure that could be justified, although it is the courts that decide, but I say seven years because there are two years of that which they are student officers until they are confirmed in the rank and then it would leave five more years.

So we accept that and we hope that that would be addressed within this review. The equal pay audit report is available should you require it to do that.

If we move to anything other than the structure that we

have we are going to have to do some kind of job evaluation and that is going to cost money, and if we go looking at Agenda for Change, that costs a significant amount of money, at a time when there was significant investment in the Health Service, and that investment is not there. So whatever we do we have to find within not just the existing budget but a reducing budget.

They are still, in parts of the Health Service trying to resolve some of those issues from that job evaluation and I welcome the opportunity that we can set an agenda that will last into the future and certainly setting the agenda for 20 years. But for those 20 years we don't want to be trying to resolve a pay structure that continues to create problems and appeals that have to be resolved which will get expensive.

There is nothing wrong with the structure. You might tweak around the edges of it slightly, with the length of it, with how people move through progression, but any significant change will cost money and I think will increase bureaucracy in the service at a time when we can ill afford to do it, and that is my big concern.

I am absolutely delighted with the comments of Rob Price. I am pleased that there has been recognition about the management of some of these processes and I think that is clear, that there has been certain failings in the way the process has been managed.

I am grateful that that has been acknowledged by ACPO. I still don't think there is too much wrong and broken with what currently exists. And I think some tweaking round the edges may assist that but I still think it is about people understanding the rules of engagement in the way police officers are different to other employees and their contracts of employment are enshrined in regulations and determinations. If you understand regulations and determinations they are very very flexible and it is about understanding them.

I think what encouraged me greatly at the beginning -- Carol and I have known each other a number of years -- Carol understands regulations and is in HR in Manchester and will tell you that quite categorically.

MS BRADY: Yes.

MR RENNIE: And when she passed I said, "You could have

said something positive." And for me this is about managers understanding the rules, whether they are these rules or other rules. If you are going to work with people, you have to understand the terms under which they are employed and if you don't it is always going to be difficult to manage. I don't think there is too much working.

I just want to touch on the role of protection, if I may. Doubling of pay. It is a management issue. They shouldn't be working all those hours, I am very sorry, and if you are going to direct people to work those hours then let us not forget who they are protecting, and I am sure the Prime Minister would be upset if he didn't have his royal protection team to do whatever it needs to do, because that is the level we are talking at, and Her Majesty, and if we are not going to have sufficient officers so that they only work the right hours and you are going to have smaller teams and make them work the excessive hours, then I am sorry, if they are working the hours, they should be entitled to be compensated for that. I think that is only right. And I look forward to the figures being produced from my colleague who sits

on the Metropolitan side in relation to the numbers of those officers, because it is a concern that has been raised with us from the Metropolitan Police Federation.

MR CREW: Thank you. Could we make sure, Ian, we do get a copy of that?

MR RENNIE: I will certainly send that to you, sir.

MR CREW: Thank you very much. Do we want to go anywhere else with these issues that we have been talking about here? Does anybody feel that they have not had an opportunity to say anything they want to?

MR PRICE: I don't want to hold up the debate at all, but the issue of inflation and this could be paying people more I think is a very serious one obviously in times of austerity. What ACPO have said in our initial submission is that we recognise there is probably going to be a smaller, better qualified workforce. The two things that ACPO desperately needs is flexibility and reduction of the unit costs of policing in order to meet the challenges of the next five to 10 to 15. You have said it, this is a generational opportunity. This is not just about the next five years. This is about the

next 15 years, so we need that reduction in units of policing. We are also very conscious, we haven't done the maths yet, we need to do the maths very quickly to actually cost our proposal. But our philosophy, our principle is around managing and controlling unit costs which we think should be lower than it currently is and we will demonstrate that hopefully with some costings.

MR MARSH: I didn't know if you were going to return to the question of specialist pay again for qualifications because certainly for the staff side --

MR CREW: We are going to come on to SPPs later specifically.

MR MARSH: It is different, isn't it, really?

MS BRADY: It is different from police staff, yes.

MR CREW: Okay, we will carry on with that.

MR MARSH: My concern is that there is a risk of creating another overcomplicated pay --

MR CREW: This is for police staff we are talking about?

MR MARSH: For police staff, yes. It is absolutely right to have a system that encourages development and I agree with Rob around competency assessment

in terms of the quicker progression through a pay scale, but I would be a bit nervous about then paying extra allowances every time someone gains a formal qualification. In my view as an employer you are offering the opportunity to gain a qualification and it should be an essential requirement of the job rather than being an additional bolt on.

I think in the same way that the civil service has moved away from the notion of a generalist civil service into the professional skills of government approach with specialisms within that it is still being able to do that within a common pay framework. And I think the aspiration ought to have something which looks more like a common pay framework.

MS BRADY: Just to reiterate, we don't pay additional and add-ons. It is within the common framework. It is just that we do a career grade. So you progress through the career grade dependent upon your professional --

MR MARSH: Absolutely, I understand.

MS BRADY: It is not additional add-ons.

MR MARSH: Again, I just thought it was interesting in

terms of Kent, Sarah, is there a problem with administrative and clerical staff? Again, there is little opportunity for progression. I have to say my view is the job is the job. It is not one that requires high levels of experience and competency. Those pay scales do tend in most industries to be very small, about two years and then you think about how you motivate and engage those staff in other ways.

MS NOBBS: Caryl Nobbs, Chairperson of Unison's Police and Justice Executive and also Chairperson of the Police Staff Council who is responsible for negotiating police staff terms and conditions. So I will take responsibility as part of that in my role.

Just talking about obviously officer and staff pay progression, I am not going to touch on officers because that is not added in, but in relation to police staff I think one of the biggest problems that we have is we have 43 forces who pay police staff in totally different ways, and that is a big issue. So you have got 43 forces doing the same thing 43 times over. There has to be a massive cost element in that.

We have from the Police Staff Council a national pay spine. It is up to individual forces where they set the salaries on those pay spines. Individual forces use different job evaluations schemes and in our submission we have done a lot of comparative data amongst forces just looking at the disparity in salaries. Carol has mentioned about career grades of posts. Some forces use career grade of posts, other forces don't in exactly the same job. Part of the Unison submission is, and we are very very firmly in favour of this, a national pay and grading for police staff based on using one national job evaluation scheme, which has been paid for by the Home Office, it is already there, it is ready to take off the shelves, and to do some work around that and you could actually see reductions in your pay bill by doing that. It would mirror to a certain degree what the police officers have. It saves all of this about people doing comparisons, coming along and saying, "Well Greater Manchester pay this for the job." My home force is Northumbria by the way. "And Northumbria, you don't pay this. Why do you pay that?" and everything and it would take away an awful lot of

those kind of issues.

But I cannot understand why we allow forces in this day and age to do things, especially when it comes to pay, 43 different ways. It just seems ludicrous to us as a trade union.

MR RENNIE: I think that supports the argument for the police pay structure to be quite honest because it is a national pay structure. There are not 43 variations. Why try to introduce them and go to that?

There is another issue. I just want to come back to Rob's comment about trying to reduce the unit costs et cetera. Let us not forget why police officer pay is set at the level it currently is. It is to ensure when we recruit and we retain experienced people, and I understand that we are in a time of austerity and things are tight. I understand that. But when you start to reduce police pay there are a certain things that could happen. People may leave if it picks up, but the other big thing is, and people talk about it, you have to go back to the 70s, the potential corruption and the temptations that come with that. With the authority in the Office of Constable we are in

a state of where there is terrorism, all sorts of things, so to make sure we keep and retain and reward people who are at that level of police officer to ensure security and that there is no corruption and temptation we need to do it. Particularly if things get tight outside and organised crime, is looking to make inroads into police officers and make them friends all the time. We know this is happening. The intelligence is there. So we really have to be careful what we do if we start to look to reduce the police pay package.

MR MARSH: Do you mind if I ask, Ted, on that point in terms of the vulnerability point, again speaking to some officers, the concern was this was a grab for overtime and I didn't know if there was a heightened risk of vulnerability on the discretionary payments, that people really hold on to those as opposed to the base pay point. I didn't know what your experience was, Ian, on that.

MR RENNIE: I was only responding. There has been a clear steer by ACPO and the argument has been put forward: if we reduce the pay bill we can have more officers and won't have to lose as many officers.

But it is about, if you do that and reduce the pay bill, and basic pay bill is the main pay bill. We are talking a lot of money. We are not talking about the £320 million for overtime. We are talking about the larger, billions of pounds that is in the pay bill. Clearly the constables are the largest number, those are 108,000. If you start to reduce that, then that is where your big savings are but your problem is that you then potentially introduce other problem issues into the service.

MR PRICE: Just to respond on that one. The point was debated and discussed at this morning's ACPO conference in Northamptonshire and the ACPO lead raised this point around the issue of potential corruption. Of course, at what point where is the tipping point in that? And, Ian, really keen to work with you on that to see actually what the facts and figures say, particularly in other places in the world where perhaps they do have a corruption problem. That is a live piece of work. We recognise it and it is something we need to research.

Competency related threshold payments

MR CREW: Thank you. Let us turn to Competency Related Threshold Payments. Does anyone have any feelings about CRTPs? Any observations they want to make? Are they the right thing?

MR WINSOR: If you are competent why do you need a supplement?

MR RENNIE: This was introduced as part of the provisions within 2002 that ACPO wanted a provision to ensure that people who were at the top of the scale remained motivated, competent and performing. People had to apply for it. Some do apply for it and some people don't apply for it because they don't fulfil the criteria or they just don't. Clearly there are people who don't apply. The figures in respect of this are in the equal pay audit and will be available because they are collected as part of the police pay data.

The point is that it is there, and I will let Rob speak for himself but he will say it doesn't work. It just sits there. It is a process that could work and it is removed if people's attendance is not there or if they don't perform properly and they are not competent. So it can be removed and it is a management tool. The fact that it is not used by

management as a tool to ensure and maintain competency in performance is another matter but it was brought in to make officers who were top of the scale then continue to perform, and that was reflected in the payments and was part of giving up some other aspect within the police pay negotiations at that time.

MR PRICE: I don't want it to become an ACPO ping pong with the Federation, but for us competency, satisfactory performance is about doing a job actually and I think we think that is what the public expect us to do and should you get career enhancements, financial reward on top of doing your job we would critically say no.

MR RENNIE: So ACPO has changed its position.

MR PRICE: ACPO believes there is a better way of rewarding people who perform and achieve in the workplace.

MR RENNIE: I just want to ask what that is.

MR CREW: Would you like to articulate that?

MR PRICE: Accepting that we need to detail this through, but we think, going back to what he said before, the terms we have used in the report are in terms of some form of accreditational

professionalisation. We have mentioned that in terms of collision investigators or scenes of crimes officer. Some form of professional accreditation that recognises the skills that those people have within that role. We think that is fundamental to reward.

Achievement we think is very very important within the workplace. That should be recognised. We absolutely do not hold that somebody effectively attending their workplace and applying a competent level of performance is satisfactory to generate over and above anything else the means that they are rewarded, and in significant high numbers than it is in terms of any other performance related pay.

MR CREW: Ian, before you come back so we don't have a ping pong I will see if there are any other observations anybody wants to make on this otherwise we will carry on with the ping pong.

MR CASSIDY: It is our view that there is a business case for the current situation.

MR CREW: I have read the submission. Would you like to talk it through.

MR CASSIDY: Just on the basis as Ian has outlined. It

incentivises people with a significant amount of service.

MR RENNIE: Can I just say, the thing about performance related pay, this is a competence. It should be done on appraisal, on sound performance over the year and letting you keep it if you are performing satisfactorily and you are competent. That is fine. If you are not, it can be removed. It has reduced sickness levels in the police significantly. As a management tool it has reduced it significantly.

Can I just say that if you change from that basic level of managing this process of a process and you introduce accreditation and professionalism and all this, there is no difference for anything else. Any way where there is a performance to be proved to get money will direct what the officer does and they will do it to get that money. We have seen it with evidence. You have to evidence your performance. It is like this. Because what police officers do, they put sufficient evidence in to convict a murderer just to prove that they are competent. At what level do you want to put it in? If you are going to put in these sorts of things to

justify a payment officers will do it. It will increase bureaucracy, it will increase cost, it will increase appeals and it will focus officers' minds away from what they should be doing, and that is actually policing.

MR MARSH: Can I just ask though why they even allowed it in the first place. If we believe that it should be an addition to the pay scale to reflect again competency, then the range ought to be reflecting that.

When I was listening to, Ian, what you were saying there: if they are not competent they don't get the allowance. If they are not competent they should be dismissed would be my view, or performance managed to get right up to the required level would be the ideal way of dealing with it. But I am sorry, the notion you get an allowance just doesn't sit comfortably again with how you would normally look to a reward.

MR CREW: You are nodding your head, Craig.

MR KNIGHTS: It is a really interesting debate and I have to say that from Surrey's perspective we have been trying very very hard to ensure that we have a flexible framework of paying reward. But

I have to say the discussion about CRTPs, and I think John is absolutely right, it should be part of the salary. If we are saying it is based on competence, once you have reached competence in that role it should be part of your salary and if they are not competent we should be removing these people from the organisation as quickly as possible.

I do think that we need some sort of core framework for pay and reward but also an element of flexibility that allows 43 or however many chief constables there are in the future to reward locally based on market forces. I don't think competency related pay is the way to do that and I think the PDR structure is wrong to allow us to do that right now, but there does need to be an element of flexibility for chief constables to have effective operational command of their organisations.

MR CREW: If there is nothing else on that we will move on to SPPs.

MS MOTT: I would just like to comment. Of our eligible officers who claim this payment we pay 92 per cent of our officers this payment. So in effect it has almost become an extra pay point on

the pay scale which seems to say: why have the admin and the bureaucracy around it when by default we are almost giving it to every single officer? And the reason why we are not giving 100 per cent are, as Ian said, people sometimes say, I don't want to apply because I don't feel that I should be claiming it for altruistic reasons or perhaps they have missed it because they didn't know they were actually eligible for it. They seem to be the two main reasons. A very small amount of those are for performance issues. So it almost seems like why have those hoops in there if by default most of our officers will get it paid?

MR WINSOR: 92 per cent of all eligible officers get it. How many apply for it and don't get it?

MS MOTT: I think we have had one in our history. This is Kent. In 2003 there was one that applied and appealed and was still refused it.

MR WINSOR: A very competent workforce.

MR CREW: Is Surrey a really competent police, Craig?

MR KNIGHT: We are at present in a similar sort of position. However, we are looking at being far more robust in the future about how we use competency related pay, and we are reviewing PDRs

and reviewing a whole number of other issues to ensure that that level probably falls to 50 to 70 per cent, something in those regions.

MR CREW: Thank you. Any experience from other forces at all?

MR WILLIAMS: From my former force of someone who ran the payroll there, 90 plus per cent, and to be totally honest except for a disciplinary failure of management we ended up saying we will pay it unless you put a report in otherwise because the bureaucracy involved --

MR CREW: It was cheaper.

MR WILLIAMS: Nobody was bothering to do it properly.

MS BRADY: Actually GMP do that as well. We just pay it unless there is an issue.

MR WILLIAMS: And I accept that could be a management issue but it is effectively resulting in an extra pay point.

MR WINSOR: What about people who got it and then lost it because management operating the regulations as they should be, simple regulations as we are told they are, have determined that somebody who is in receipt of CRTP should no longer have it. Have you instances of somebody losing it?

MS BRADY: Yes, we have in GMP. It tends to be those who are on long-term illness or actually going through the UPP process anyway.

MR WINSOR: So long-term illness and UPP I understand, but any other cases where somebody who believes himself or herself to be competent, has the discussion with his or her manager and the payment is taken away? Nobody around the table can think of any. That doesn't mean to say they don't exist.

MS MOTT: Only as part of a formal performance procedure.

MR WINSOR: Which is UPP⁵. So it is another point on the pay scale.

MR COURTNEY: And just to add to the other points, it lengthens further in effect the already long constable pay scale which we say is already a challenging feature, and another design fault you could say is why is it the same value then for all ranks because it becomes progressively less as you go up the rank structure. The value is the same for all ranks. So it is worth less as a percentage of pay to a more senior person.

MR CREW: Okay. Let us have a look at special priority

⁵ Unsatisfactory Performance Procedures

payments. John, you laughed first.

Special Priority Payments

MS BRADY: We sympathise with each other. I have worked through SPP tirelessly since 2003 and it is extremely bureaucratic and extremely divisive and apart from the staff who do get it calling it their Christmas bonus it serves absolutely no purpose.

MR CREW: Just help me to understand that. Is that because it was never used properly or it was wrongly designed?

MS BRADY: I think it is badly designed. To actually only pay 40 per cent of your workforce is divisive. The guidelines that came out, ie 24/7 highly demanding. It is very very subjective. What is highly demanding in one department is very much different in another department. Hence the divisive nature of the payment, and it just causes problems every single year, obviously for the 60 per cent who are not getting it. But we have changed it from one year to the next over the last couple of years and it has gone even worse.

MR CREW: How have you changed it? Take it in turns.

MS BRADY: No, what we tried to do was look at the

principles of what we were looking at so when local neighbourhood policing came in everything was changed, we honed in on neighbourhood policing, so whatever was at the forefront that is what we were trying to --

MR CREW: I understand.

MS BRADY: But not all of neighbourhood policing was 24/7 highly demanding in comparison to other posts. And then obviously when we were talking before about 43 different forces having 43 different career grades for police staff with SPP I phoned every single police force and it is just not consistent. So if you are an able police officer in one force you might get it and if you are in another you may not. Again that causes more and more problems.

MR CREW: Craig, talk to me about Surrey.

MR KNIGHT: The Surrey position is that we have challenged the numbers that we are paying. We have gone slightly above the figures that are in regulations to pay. It is frustrating. It is bureaucratic. Certainly from an HR perspective every year there are the same frustrations. The notice to actually pay and the agreement to pay it

from the Home Office is slow to arrive. When it does arrive there's arguments around obviously who will finally get it and it is seen as a Christmas bonus. It isn't a Christmas bonus and it is just divisive and is seen as divisive by the force.

MR PRICE: I am going to take a slightly different view on SPP, and I say this having chaired it for the last three years. I think if we are looking at ourselves round the table and we are saying there is £97 million that we don't think we can spend wisely, I think that is a sad reflection on looking to the future.

I would certainly say in Surrey, Craig, I slightly disagree with your view in the sense of how we have used it, I think there is evidence in Surrey, I would be more than willing to table that to the enquiry around using a geographical element, not in the script, not in the criteria but we have had it agreed to stop people going to the Met, particularly on the northern sections of our force.

The second point is we have introduced attendance criteria for SPP which for us was important in terms of fairness because we do the same for police staff.

And the third element is we have used SPP, and the Home Office have not challenged us, around workforce modernisation.

So I would contend that where there is a will and a degree of innovation you can use SPP. I just think you have to be careful what you wish for around the table and hearing what I have heard generally around SPP if I was the Treasury I know what I would do.

MR CREW: Kevin, what is the position in the Met?

MR COURTNEY: I would be echoing comments made already I think in the sense of the frustration at the bureaucracy over making payments to, in our case, a very large number of individuals and I think organisationally a problem in making the discrimination between those who should have it and those who should not and the desire always to expand the numbers to grow the eligibility and to say: this group is doing a very similar job to that group and so forth. So there is always that pressure to bring in more people. So organisationally it is quite a challenging process for us.

There were some good examples about it might have

worked well for Surrey. I don't think we could offer very many good examples. We have used it to support some organisational change initiatives like safer neighbourhoods and we have used it around some recruitment and retention issues to address some of those around more inner London areas, but I think the need to do that now has diminished quite a lot.

MR CREW: If I understood the Surrey position what you are actually saying is: give us more freedom about the way we use it.

MR PRICE: Yes, in terms of our principles, it is national framework local flexibility and I think that can work and certainly in the southeast we think we have used that and other means to keep officers in Surrey, not lose them to the Met.

MR RENNIE: SPPs, again part of the 2002 pay package. Again proposed by ACPO, not supported by the Police Federation of England and Wales who at the time said it would be divisive and difficult to manage and bureaucracy would rule, which it has.

Interesting with Surrey that they have used it a little more adventurously than some. In fact, paying up to £8,000 to some people because there is a claim

within PNB to increase it to £8,000 and that was simply quite clearly to cover the ultra vires payment because it was in the process of being negotiated.

Whilst we didn't support it originally, we accepted it when it came in because it is very difficult as a representative organisation if the employer wants to pay the employees to actually oppose it being paid, so we went along with it. And it has run its course through a process. It has not been particularly well managed. It has been at PNB with a couple of claims. I said the 8,000 to increase because of the workforce modernisation.

The other one was for it to be paid more flexibly rather than annually, and we agreed that pretty quickly and that forces could pay it on a monthly basis. In fact, and I am going back a little while, we have always said it originally came in for 30 per cent to be paid. It was very quickly within 12 months increased to 40 per cent of the force. We have said, let's talk about increasing it wider. This is the local flexibility that ACPO wanted and probably still wants but haven't been able to manage this process.

There is nothing wrong with the SPP scheme. It might be a bit restrictive on the principles but those can be ironed out and made more flexible for people to manage the process better than chief constables according to the local or market forces. But let us not forget you will then get variations, that is fine. But there will come with it bureaucracy and costs and management. We spoke about trying to get rid of CRTP because of the bureaucracy of it and just nodding it on, and this is a similar situation. Once you start to reward locally there are costs and people's time and appeals so it has to be really managed well and I don't think we have been particularly good at that in the past. But this is a payment that ACPO has supported in the past and I would hope support in the future with more flexibility if that's what they require.

MR MARSH: Ted, the question for me is: what is the purpose of the payment? So I went on the website for the Police Negotiating Board; it is awarded where officers carry a significantly higher responsibility level than they normally would have done and because there are cases of difficulty in recruitment and retention. Some have specially

demanding working conditions and working environments.

I have to say when I see that that looks like an excuse for senior ranks to pay -- well I am not going to quite say their mates, but it does look like to use a local budget to just reward officers a bit of extra money.

Recruitment and retention you should deal with separately, and there is a separate agenda item that we are going to come on to. Some of those other areas I think can be very legitimate. They can be particularly demanding locations but in my view it should be very few and far between. Again, you need to look at officer rotation and whatever it might require. It just seems a lot of vulnerability about this particular allowance.

MR KNIGHT: If I may come in there. Certainly Surrey's position is we looked at those criteria and the SPP payments we had to use in a more creative fashion because of the pressures that we faced locally. We were losing many officers to the Metropolitan Police. We went down the road of workforce modernisation in a big way in the force, quite rightly I think, and that meant that there are

constables and sergeants that have additional responsibility way beyond what they would normally have held. And the SPP structure was used to reward that.

It did go outside the SPP original agreements and it is that flexibility that we are seeking in force. It is that flexibility to be able to reward based on market forces. If the Metropolitan Police suddenly decide they want 10,000 police officers, unlikely but possible, then we want the ability to pay an additional £500 a year to our staff to try and stop them from going. That is market forces.

MR CREW: Isn't that you arguing, Craig, for an SPP to fill in for a shortfall in some other arrangement? That wasn't the purpose of the SPPs, was it?

MR KNIGHT: No. What I am arguing for is flexibility for operational commanders to allow for market forces. Whether that is in an SPP structure or another structure, but the complete flexibility for a base framework for pay and then the flexibility based on market forces.

MR CREW: John, would you react to that?

MR MARSH: Yes. Craig, there seem to be two very separate requirements. One is around recruitment

and retention and I understand exactly the impact in terms of again when the Met increased their particular weighting, and, picking up your point Ted, that is trying to make good a problem with another part of the pay system, so there is a requirement around that.

The second one is interesting then in terms of where additional responsibility is given to a constable or a sergeant, how do you deal with that? And a lot of other public sectors have been grappling with that problem. So teachers for example, have introduced a performance related threshold, again in a very similar way.

I do think there is a legitimate question about recognising those duties over and above what a basic grade person is doing and in an organisation which is actually quite flat, about three quarters of officers are constables, aren't they, as opposed to the other grades.

So I recognise the challenge there about how you can reward and motivate people to go much more than just the extra mile, take on additional responsibilities without having to seek promotion to do so.

MR KNIGHT: Exactly.

MR RENNIE: If I may come back on that. We recognised that this is an issue for the forces and as recent as the previous PNB meeting have agreed to increase the southeast allowance to give chief constables the ability to pay an extra £1,000 on top of the existing southeast allowance. So we are not blind to this. We accept this and that is why we have agreed it at the PNB to ensure that chief constables have the flexibility. The fact is that nobody can afford to pay it at the moment. That is the problem.

MR CREW: I accept that. I think we are looking at wider principles than the current circumstances but clearly that is right.

John, is there anything else you would like to say specifically around performance pay and we will move on slightly if we might into this.

MR MARSH: Yes. In terms of performance pay, and I was looking at various reports such as the Office of Manpower Economics commissioned work on the impact of performance pay and whether it works and research which was on the CIPD website and there are just two very different schools of thought.

There are clearly trade offs in terms of impact on rewarding individual/team performance.

I have to say my own personal experience and feeling is that the implementation of it is very challenging. I think it is very difficult in the police environment to fix on what it is that you need to measure. My own experience in the civil service where we have had it for a number of years is you use the PDR system and then you do a ranking and I have been down the road of forced ranking, which was incredibly painful, and I just felt, and this is a personal view, it seemed to come down to the advocacy of the line manager in terms of being able to make a strong business case for individuals to see whatever the level of bonus might be rather than necessarily the absolute performance. It is incredibly difficult to apply performance pay as a science and, therefore, that personal part comes back into it.

My own view with the police is I would much prefer to see more of a competency approach rather than a performance related approach.

MR CREW: Given that everybody has to perform, has to come to work and be paid, have that as a given,

should you, nonetheless, have some arrangement to recognise when people seem to be going that extra mile? And if you should, how should you do that? If not, then so be it.

MR MARSH: Yes. If you are going to do that, the system we introduced in the Home Office civil service, for example, was to say that 70 per cent of people do a good job and they therefore ought to be paid accordingly. Then we introduced two different levels of bonuses, a 10 per cent and a 30 per cent and it was possible to look at where there was an additional added value in terms of those people's performances. I would certainly recommend a system though where the large majority do tend to get the same level rather than trying to break it down to about five or six different levels because again my previous experience of doing that was you'd end up with about £100 or £200 difference.

We are talking about pay ranges and scales here where there isn't a lot to play with and particularly as you go ahead with austerity over the next few years you are not going to be in an easy place to reward substantial bonuses and small bonuses are not great

incentivisers for people. Again, the bureaucracy and the relative feeling, why have they got it and I haven't got it, it doesn't seem to be worth a candle.

So bonuses can work well when you have a lot to play with.

MR CREW: Any other views on that at all?

MR WILLIAMS: A bit of evidence to support what someone has previously said of the national units of officers doing exactly the same job. There is absolutely no consistency in terms of SPPs. I am not saying that is right or wrong.

MR CREW: So you have some officers doing exactly the same job.

MR WILLIAMS: Some forces get it for doing surveillance work. Some don't. There is no consistency.

MR CREW: So with ACPO TAM, with the counter terrorist groups that must be divisive.

MR WILLIAMS: Yes. And what you get is pressure with the have nots and inevitable upward pressure. I am not saying it is necessarily right or wrong. I am just saying it is a fact and yes, obviously those that then end up doing exactly the same job with people who get rewards you know what is going to

happen and it inevitably happens. Because there is so much local discretion about rightly or wrongly you don't get any consistency.

MR CREW: And the discretion isn't given to commanders within the counter terrorism unit to make its decisions.

MR WILLIAMS: All the units operate on the basis of a lead force so it is that lead force policy that applies.

MR PRICE: Can I just come in on the point of performance related pay. Again, it is ACPO's view that is linked to professionalising the police service. Myself and Ian had a debate as to at what point is the police service at, and ACPO thinks that it is at the cusp of moving from a craft and entering a profession and having a performance related pay mechanism. What that looks like needs to be defined and needs to be defined in a collaborative way and is very important in terms of recognising professionalisation of the police service.

In terms of Ian's point about it needs to be simple, needs to be unbureaucratic and it should be easy, actually this is difficult. It should be

difficult, and in my view supervisors, leaders and managers are paid to make difficult decisions and it should be part of that process. Yes, it should shouldn't be 11, it should be more like 5 or 6 but this is about making difficult decisions and there are risks in terms of making those decisions but that is, I think, what the public expect of people who take the oath, take the salary of a sergeant and inspector, and that is ACPO's view, it goes with the territory.

MR CREW: Rob, thanks for that, and I am going to go down a tangent if the two parties will permit me. This issue, because it was Rob and Ian so it might have been a private conversation, say so if you want it to be, but I am interested in this, Ian, because we have heard it in several places, this cusp of becoming a profession moving from -- you had a lovely phrase, "the blue collar professionals" I think it was you used the other day. Could you expose us to some of that discussion because that is quite an interesting area.

MR PRICE: It is absolutely. It is linked to other things like pre-entry qualification,

professionalising the service is a big issue for ACPO, and that is an important issue for the public because actually if you look at which professions enjoy the highest confidence it is those that are professionalised and the police service is beneath teachers, which is considered to be a profession, obviously beneath doctors. We are about 60 per cent confidence level. So we think it is linked into the issue of things like pre-entry qualifications.

It occurs in teaching. It occurs actually in the police staff. You cannot be a personnel manager in policing unless you have a pre-entry qualification. So we think it is linked to that issue as well.

The debate we simply had is that at what point do we think we are, and we do not think that the police service is considered by the public as fully professional.

MR CREW: Yes. I will do what I don't normally do which is just to expose a view and then we will probably have a cup of coffee so it doesn't get debated.

I actually think there is a paradox here and the police service actually finds itself facing in different

directions, that in some ways the police service are rewarded well financially, and I am not saying that is a bad thing, far from it. But different people have different expectations from the police and they are constantly moving so sometimes police officers are expected to be the blue collar worker and then there are other occasions they are expected to be these arch professionals. It is this continuing movement of demand that makes it so particularly difficult, so unique, if you like, to be a police officer.

MR WINSOR: There are so few professionals who are expected to take a kick and a punch. I think that is the tipover point.

MR RENNIE: If I may. I am disappointed at Rob's central statement. The one thing that really upsets me, and we had this conversation, professionalising the police service, I find that a little insulting to be quite honest, not just as an individual who has 30 years' policing experience but for all the police officers out on the streets delivering a professional service who are behaving professionally and they are doing it on a day-to-day basis. To say we need to

professionalise the police service, all this is about is a discussion about raising the professional status of policing, not professionalising the police service.

MR WINSOR: Exactly right.

MR RENNIE: I think there is a real difference in the debate.

MR WINSOR: I fundamentally agree with you on that.

Maybe the tag is wrong, but it is not a question of how the job is done because in the time that I have been looking at this very closely it is starkly clear to me that the job is done on a very very significant scale to a very high professional standard. The question is how people from outside, the people that are served by police, regard the job of policing as a profession in the way that they regard the law, medicine, education, healthcare, et cetera. There is this extraordinary disconnect between a job that is actually critical to public safety, which is done to a very high standard, and then what people think about the professionals who do that job. They don't see them as professionals even though they are to my mind undoubtedly professionals behaving in a highly

professional way. I think that is the debate.

MR RENNIE: Yes.

MR CREW: Thank you.

(4.27 pm)

(A short break)

(4.40 pm)

Payment of Regional Allowances

MR CREW: What I would like to look at, and we have a fair bit of time and we are not unnecessarily going to drag this out for the purpose of filling the time and, as I said to you at the start, I will leave space for you to pick up issues around this aspect of the review that I might not have dealt with this afternoon. I know Tom will certainly do that.

What I would like to look at now is the payment of regional allowances. At the moment, and I will soon be corrected if I am wrong, but my understanding is that there are two London payments called different things, a net amount of London money and then there is a southeast payment. Other than that there are no regional allowances as I understand it.

Does anybody want to talk to me about those current arrangements and how they should be or how they might be in the future? Whether they are right, whether they are wrong? Good, bad? Ian.

MR RENNIE: Yes, up to probably about 12, 18 months we had claims in the police negotiating board to increase the London and Southeast Allowances. As I indicated before, we have agreed that the Southeast Allowance can be increased by £1,000 subject to recruitment retention issues, by the chief constables in the doughnut forces around London. And as part of that, the Staff Side took the view at the time that we would, to get the agreement with the Official Side, withdraw the London Allowance part of the claim but reserved the right to bring it back at an appropriate time.

Both claims have been on the table and not been upgraded for a long long time but we recognised the need of the forces in the southeast who were losing people to the Met to try and support them, much to the disdain of our Metropolitan colleagues who got really upset. But that is where we are.

We feel that within our submission there should be an increase in the London aspects of it and it is

within there and I am not going to go into details. Any claim has yet to be introduced. I am just saying it is there. Our working out is that is the current value it should be uprated by to recognise the expense within working and living in London et cetera.

And that is the position, the difficulty we find ourselves with the South East Allowance, having agreed it and it comes into effect from 1 April next year. The agreement for that was because it was in a new financial year. So that is why it comes into effect next April.

So for us we recognise that even though that facility is there the money won't be available for that but we recognise the importance, certainly for the southeast forces and the Metropolitan, to retain officers within the forces, around trying to keep a balance otherwise they're poaching each other's people and it gets expensive. It makes a cheap form of recruitment for certain forces, bringing trained staff in rather than starting with new recruitments and it becomes a very big expense for forces that then have to recruit from outside and keep losing people to the Met.

It is a problem that has gone on for some time and it needs some serious thought as to how that can be resolved. It works at the moment but I am not so sure whether it is the total answer to the problem. I will be guided by the people who work within the forces around allowances.

MR PRICE: I agree. I guess it will go into our guiding principles. National framework with local flexibility is what we support. I would be interested to see what the Kent view is on that. I don't know what systems you have in Kent, but we think it has been effective in a critical problem we had seven years ago.

MR CREW: Yes, right. In particular, that is in respect of a particular problem really which is stopping this change of move between forces.

MR PRICE: Yes.

MR CREW: It is not about reflecting different living costs in the southeast compared to London or indeed from anywhere else in the country.

We have heard, I can't remember where now, I am not sure if it is in a submission or we have just picked it up, but some suggestion that actually the police might get equal pay but they don't get equal

reward, that the reality is that some people in some of the extremities of the country in reality are financially considerably better off than those in London or those in the southeast or maybe those in Manchester, maybe those in Birmingham, I don't know, I haven't looked at all the separate figures, which is something totally different from this. This is actually saying the argument would be for equal reward as opposed to equal pay. How does anybody feel about that? Any reaction? Anything that could assist our thinking on that.

MR KNIGHT: It is a really interesting debate. If you look at the average house price in Surrey a two-bedroom house in Surrey is currently between £330,000 and £380,000 depending on where you are in Surrey, 13 times the salary of a constable. If you equate that to somewhere else in the country, my guess is it is not quite as much money. Our officers are travelling long distances because they can't afford to live in the county. They are adding a number of hours to their day as a result of that and that provides unique challenges to the force and to those officers.

It is, I think, right that we acknowledge that in pay

and conditions. How we do that is very difficult I think and the Southeast Allowance, the uplift of £3,000 is timely but we live in austere times and forces cannot afford to pay that additional money right now.

But equally, house prices have gone up since 1994/1996 five fold, ten fold in some places and that payment has maintained its position for many years. So that again, level of flexibility needs to be included, but you are right, the value of the officer's salary differs greatly depending on where they are.

MR MARSH: Ted, I have looked at this more about being an allowance for recruitment and retention purposes rather than to meet cost of living in particular areas. It surely must be a matter of looking, and I would suggest still at a national level, what your attrition turnover rates are across the England and Wales forces and to determine whether you have problems in particular areas. Other organisations who run national pay frameworks will put place/location within certain bands according to again, what their data is telling them about recruitment and retention and they can have the

flexibility to move areas in and out of those particular bands according to the times.

MR CREW: So that that would be a sort of constantly variable arrangement.

MR MARSH: Yes. So the bands could stay constant but you are right, there could be variability where each force would sit within those particular bands depending on the recruitment and retention issues.

MR KNIGHT: Can I just clarify that, are we then suggesting that the Southeast Allowance is purely on retention? Because that suggests for me some issues, on a personal basis, around such things as the cost of living because I think it is right to recognise that officers in the southeast face real challenges in purchasing property. We have spoken very briefly during the break about the level of insolvency in the police service that is potentially going to be greater in the future with police staff and police officers. That will greatly increase if we start shifting allowances around based on Greater Manchester's need to retain staff and the need to be in the southeast of England.

MR MARSH: It is certainly an interesting question for

the police as to whether there is a view that it should be local people serving in new forces. Again, if you take that particular view you are potentially having to pay more for local people therefore to work within those forces. If you don't accept that point of view, however, I would still suggest that it is about recruitment and retention into particular roles. And again, that can vary according to professional groupings too because the reality is that it could be much easier to recruit to police staff roles if it is administrative and clerical than it might be to more specialised or to officer roles and again, having the flexibility to move accordingly.

MR CREW: What about the issue of simply recognising that the cost of living in -- one's loath to pick on a particular place -- but the cost of living in Wales is less than it is in the West Midlands as I worked there. So you need to earn a great deal more in the West Midlands to have the same quality of life as you do in Wales. And if you compare average salaries in Wales, the police officers' earnings relative to those average earnings in Wales is better than the relationship of the police

officers' earnings to the average wage in the West Midlands. Is that something we should be concerned with?

MR MARSH: My suggestion, Ted, is that your base pay might be a bit high then in some of those areas. Are you, therefore, going to be starting off with a lower base pay and building in a regional element which might be reflected therefore in your cost of living or recruitment retention in each of those areas?

I honestly don't think it is for the employer to be making good labour market issues because it has ever been thus, hasn't it, in terms of cost of living, very high in the southeast. If you are able to recruit staff I don't think it is your responsibility to therefore be making good cost of living differences and fuelling mortgage and house prices accordingly. It becomes self-fulfilling if you are not careful. I am not an economist but I think you have to look at the impact of operating in that way.

MR PRICE: In short I agree. The regional allowance has enabled chief constables within the doughnut forces just to kind of manage market forces better.

Taking that a stage further, albeit we are really sensitive to the issue of hardship, I suspect ACPO, and I am guessing, but I suspect it is not territory they will probably want to get involved in. That is down to choice, down to individualised lifestyle or whatever. That is a very complex area that ACPO I think would never wish to control.

MR RENNIE: Just a couple of points to make, Ted.

These allowances are set nationally and I think it is important they are continued to be set nationally because, yes, there is some local flexibility around them but if you allow them to be determined locally all the time you will have a war, a turf war between chief constables trying to poach from others.

So I think it is important that they are still dealt with nationally and some flexibility locally around that.

About paying people different rates in different places. The police service has a position where staff move around on promotion throughout the forces. There will be forces in certain areas that will then in the circumstances if you pay on cost of living in that area an average wage will not be

able to attract police officers from other places because the wages are so low. So you are going to lose experienced skilled people coming in.

We benefit from this transferability of experience and skills moving throughout the service in the country and if you don't have that national pay structure, and you start to set different levels, some forces in certain areas will not be able to attract quality people, and that is the real problem.

MR WINSOR: Won't some forces in higher cost areas find it more difficult to attract people of ability where their relative market paying condition is better? Therefore, they will be taking an effective pay cut because they are getting the same money in a higher cost of living area.

MR RENNIE: That is where the local allowance comes in and it is quite a significant amount within the Metropolitan.

MR WINSOR: But the allowances are concentrated, as I understand it, in the southeast of England. So the average cop in Wales in his local pay market is significantly better off. He is way up at the highest levels in his local area. He would be effectively taking a significant pay cut if he

moved to Manchester; isn't that true?

MR RENNIE: Absolutely. And somebody from the Met will never move to South Wales because of the pay cut that was there.

MR CREW: But leave the Met to one side because they do get a separate allowance. So put the Met and the southeast to one side. Just use the Manchester/Wales.

MR WINSOR: So an officer in Manchester would find it significantly -- there may be other reasons why he wouldn't want to do it -- advantageous financially to move to West Wales and, therefore, an officer in West Wales whilst he might like the night life of Manchester couldn't afford it because his cost of living would be significantly higher and his wages, his pay, would not.

MR RENNIE: I understand the point.

MR WINSOR: Unless he is going on promotion.

MR RENNIE: I understand the point that you are making exactly and throughout the country there are different costs of living. But this is about the salary and people moving and not moving if the salary is less at a certain place.

MR PRICE: I think there is a distinction as well. We

do find in the southeast a high proportion of cops in Surrey don't live in Surrey. They actually live in Sussex. So this can be about moving forces but not moving accommodation.

The example you give, sir, is about moving accommodation and money, generally speaking, is one of a number of factors as to why people transfer from one force to the next. It may be career prospects. It is generally family commitments or whatever. It may be not be the only driver.

I would be very surprised if somebody moved from -- quote me if I am wrong -- Manchester to North Wales on the basis of enjoying a higher quality of life, lower cost of living. I have never heard anybody say that in my service.

MR RENNIE: Moved to South Wales.

MR WILLIAMS: There are actually a lot of Merseyside officers who live in Cheshire. I know that for a fact, going back to your earlier point. Merseyside officers living in North Wales. That has got to do with council tax and things like that, so it is the same sort of issues which you get with the Surrey/Sussex.

MR WINSOR: But is it desirable for officers to be

travelling 70 miles on a motor bike, for example, into the Met from a neighbouring county simply because the pay is greater there? If he's 70 miles on a motor bike, and we have heard of these examples, that is a long day and if he is then doing a ten hour shift and then he is getting on that motor bike at the end of that shift and going back, there is a safety issue there and also an exhaustion issue because he has to do the same journey the next day. And when does he see his kids?

MR MARSH: I would look in and suggest that the Met have been overpaying in terms of their allowance actually. That has been the serious problem. They have inflated the market to encourage people to travel these large distances because also there is free travel on public transport as well.

MR WILLIAMS: At the moment.

MR MARSH: So you get that, you get your significant London weighting. So you actually have to ask: has that market been inflated? It then led to the doughnutting allowance approach. The Met have had to close waiting lists in terms of officer numbers. The arrangement currently has given too much and it

hasn't been flexible enough to be able to rein back from that at a time now where recruitment is plentiful.

MR COURTNEY: I think the Met started from a position of some difficulties. This started out from the end of renting housing allowance when those replacement allowances were ceased in 1994 and the Met found itself in some recruitment potential problems. To address those some additional payments were negotiated through the PNB and at the same time eventually the travel deal came.

So a number of those things came together and I think resulted in very positive impact on recruitment and to some extent retention in the Met then.

There may be an argument to say that distorted the market, yes. That is possibly so, and then led to maybe an unintended consequence in the surrounding forces. But that was an essential tool as seen as essential at the time to address recruitment retention.

The other point about recruitment and retention is that it certainly helped the Met address some of its diversity issues because we were able to bring in a far more diverse range of applicants and grow the

force very quickly using those pay rates.

The problem is we wouldn't have been able to had we not had that so we were able to build numbers and build resilience and so on very quickly.

But I think there is a debate about, yes, is a national rate of pay in a number of organisations like the civil service that we have seen move away from national rates of pay on the ground that the civil service tends to dominate the market in some areas where there is high civil service employments.

Again, it could be seen as perverse, a point picked up before about police staff. We have a different approach with police staff where we have locally determined roles and locally determined rates of pay to some extent. Whereas with officers we have nationally determined roles and national rates of pay. But we seem to be quite happy to live with that arrangement. I wonder why that is. Part of it might stem from the desire of the Government to determine the overall number of officers and it is easier to control numbers of officers and finance when there is a national rate of pay and a national role than it is when it doesn't apply. So I think that might be what lies behind it.

MR MARSH: If I may also say, the police are not just this isolated part of the labour market. So again when I was in the prison service and the Met increased their London weighting it had a devastating effect again on our ability to recruit into London jails and as a result we again had to respond in increasing our London weighting at that time because we were competing in a similar labour market.

So there needs to be an awareness that we are not just looking at the police service in isolation from, in particular other public sector employers in the area.

MR RENNIE: Just one point. Just to come back on the recruitment retention issue. Yes, there are people queuing up to come into the police but it is not about the quantity. It is about attracting the quality of people to deliver policing, and if we lower standards by money going down, then it can create significant problems. So it is about attracting quality and you find the quality in the quantity that apply.

MR MARSH: Yes.

MR CREW: Any other observations on this issue?

Allowances

MR CREW: Just one last area for me really which is there are allowances like dog handlers allowances and so forth and there are other allowances. Are there any gaps in the market, if you like, are there things that allowances should be paid for that aren't paid at the moment?

MR WILLIAMS: I think there is the thorny issue of shift allowances.

MR CREW: Talk to me about that.

MR WILLIAMS: It is an age old argument. It is not a new argument. Police officers are paid irrespective of their working hours throughout the week. So you will get officers doing 9 to 5 Monday to Friday paid the same as officers working 24/7 shifts. That is completely different to the way staff are treated which is the opposite. I just think it is an issue that needs some consideration. I am not saying I know the right answer.

MR CREW: I was going to say, do you have a view on it?

MR WILLIAMS: I have a personal view. It is not necessarily the ACPO view.

MR CREW: Share you view.

MR WILLIAMS: My personal view is for things like shift allowance and standby, which is another thing which isn't in Regulations and people have used SPP/bonuses to get around that, I think you should be looking at something, and to be fair to police officers and superintendents, for example, most managers manage 9 to 5. Superintendents are subject to call-out, PACE⁶ and all that and so are supervising police officers. But I wonder how much longer you can justify paying all officers the same irrespective of their shift patterns and the disturbance to their social life.

The trouble is it could end up costing you more unless you do something radical and this may not be the time. There is no doubt in my mind that it rankles with the support staff and it depends how inclusive you may want to or not want to be, accepting staff are employees and officers are officers of the Crown.

I think that is the other issue, there are, dare I say it, despite a lot of people's intentions is, are staff treated as equals of officers? I just leave that one hanging in the air.

⁶ Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984

MR RENNIE: We had part of this discussion on Monday and yes, we recognise that was mentioned and the on-call allowance and the requirements of that so I am not going to repeat that here, because we obviously have got a PAT⁷ decision that there should be a national allowance. The only thing we can't agree on is what it should be. Then again it is money again.

The shift allowance aspects. I think the important thing is that police work is police work and it is in a 24 hour period and it doesn't matter what time of day or night it is it is police work and you can be called upon to do anything within that period. And it is recognised that a part of the police pay recognises that you can be required to work seven days a week 24/7 at various times of your career.

The issue is we talk about trying to keep it simple. We talk about trying to reduce costs and administration burdens, and I look to my HR colleagues, who are trying to manage what pay attracts what hours worked. Is 9 to 5 different to 5 to 10 and 10 to 2 and then nights till 5 in the morning? And trying to manage that and administer

⁷ Police Arbitration Tribunal

it so that people get paid the right money for doing it and putting a value on all of that. So you put in valuation. There is then potentially equal pay issues, like for like work at the different times of day and night, because we don't have that problem. Because it is within the pay and there is an expectation sometimes your job will change. You might do days. You might work lates. And this is about utilising the resources within the all encompassing package.

MR PRICE: I would contend, Ian, that people are paid to make those difficult decisions and there is a principle going back to my colleague at the end of the room there, if people are working shifts, the principle should be that they get paid for working shifts. If they are not working shifts, they are do not get paid for working shifts. That is the fundamental principle.

All the complexities that come beyond that in terms of it may cost you more, all that has to be managed within the financial programme that we have available to us. And the same applies to overtime. We would say if you work overtime, you get paid overtime. That is a basic fundamental principle.

That is ACPO's very clear position within our submission.

MR NOBBS: I would just like to comment on that in relation to the shifts. I have worked in the police for 34 years and in all of that time we have always had shift allowances, and I hate to say it but we have managed to make it work and nobody has been paid wrongly because it is set out on the hours that you work. You still have the flexible working within that and I know some in this room have been around a long time, and we have managed to make that work for police staff.

On the allowances you still get the flexibility, the change in the shift, they do bring forwards and they do drop backs and everything, they do stay on duty. I accept they cannot be instructed to stay on duty because that is overtime but the system of shifts and shift allowances works for police staff. It is there. It has been tried. It has been tested and basically, I don't know about HR people, it works. It is not over-bureaucratic or anything like that. There is a shift pattern put in. We have people who work shifts in all sorts of environments. They work on neighbourhood teams.

They work in call centres. They work as part of media teams. They do site support. They do investigations. We have people who work with coroners, do standby, call-out.

Of course some people in this room might say, well she would turn around and say that, but it does work so I just want to stress that. And it is a very important part to us. I don't work shifts so I don't get paid shift allowance. I accept that. My colleagues who work shifts get paid a shift allowance and they accept that and that is what compensates them for disruption to their lives. We have the shift planning three months in advance. But they accept as well they work for an emergency service so, therefore, sometimes they do need to change their shifts and they do that.

So shift allowances, as I said, do work and I am speaking purely from a police staff point of view, but I just want to get that in, that that is very important to us, who works shifts. We want to basically see shift allowances retained for police staff.

MR CREW: Don't come back, Ian. I know your position.

MR RENNIE: That is police staff. This is police

officers.

MR CREW: Can we just have a look, are there other allowances at all that we didn't talk about the other day? Anybody thinks that either in police staff or in police officers that there are specific areas that we should be paying that we are not?

MR RENNIE: I think the regulations cover that under 36. If there is an expenditure which is incurred through duty the chief constable can reimburse it and can remove it within 28 days of the expenditure for which it is paid ceases.

MR CREW: And that continues to be locally --

MR RENNIE: And I think people should be compensated for their cost.

The other concern for us is we've now found ourselves as police officers with vehicle allowances not uprated in line with the increase to local government rates from this year. It was uprated but the Home Secretary [Theresa May] has taken it away at the stroke of a pen. So we've now found ourselves in a position where we haven't been upgraded in accordance and police officers are using their vehicles alongside others, police staff they haven't touched, but this is an arbitrary

decision by the Home Secretary not to increase it in line with the local government which is extremely disappointing for us, to move it back. People should be compensated if there is a cost incurred for their police duties and it should be reimbursed if it exists. The regulation caters for it and I think that is sufficient.

MR CREW: Good. That is fine.

MS DESHPANDE: Since we are on the point about motor vehicle allowances the agreement was reached not by the full PNB, as has become a custom by the joint secretaries. It hadn't been approved by the Home Secretary, as it is required to be, before it comes into force and it wasn't approved. So it is not as if the Home Secretary approved it and then changed their mind. It hadn't been approved by the Home Secretary.

MR RENNIE: I do want to correct that if I may. Since 1983 PNB had agreed that the side secretaries would sign it off and uprate it in line with local government increases. We did that. The Home Office had sight of that increase and that PNB circular, which went out to the country. It was two months later when the Home Secretary reviewed

that, then withdrew it, but didn't do it retrospectively but changed it back to last year's rates from that date. She is entitled to do that I admit but it is disappointing.

MR CREW: It is not going to take the review further.

Graham, do you want to make a point?

MR CASSIDY: No.

MR COURTNEY: I would say, just to get one in, that that action probably caused far more discredit than the trifling amount of money it would have impacted. It was very badly received I think within the service.

MR CREW: Often the way.

MR COURTNEY: Particularly the comments that came out with it about the financial circumstances in the country.

MR RENNIE: I think the comments at PNB from the Home Office were: you get paid enough for your vehicles. You are not having any more.

MR COURTNEY: One point where I would take issue perhaps with Ian, this is a subject of personal sort of bug bear of mine, is meal allowances and meal expenditure claims. In some areas I think within the force, and some people would say that is

management's job to manage, but in some areas those expenses become like a little cottage industry of people filling forms in having incurred expenditure by taking meals not in the usual way and so forth. And the bureaucracy and the authorisation process around processing all these bits of paper and receipts and so forth far outweighs the time and value of the thing. I think it is time that a professional organisation, that we move away from reimbursing people for having bought an extra Cornish pasty or something because they couldn't take a meal in the usual way.

MR CREW: Thank you. Right, those are all the areas that I wanted to cover. Tom, was there anything you want to say?

MR WINSOR: No, I think we have had a very good session.

MR CREW: Is there anything at all? This is our last shot at this, our last seminar of the week.

MR WILLIAMS: Just a purely selfish issue, and I should apologise for that, if you are going to retain police regulations nationally please apply them consistently nationally. We suffer from different interpretations of regulations by different forces.

Again, nothing new. For example, we call a number of surveillance units together to do an operation from different parts of the country. They have different starts to the force day which means that if you call them at a certain time people are entitled to four hours overtime for one hour's work, re-rostered rest days. I am not saying that is right or wrong. I am saying because it is applied inconsistently it causes us unnecessary cost and winds the officers up.

And that is one issue where I would disagree with Ian. The administration of those allowances, and the point just made to you, is actually quite bureaucratic, subsistence, travel, all those sort of things.

But it is clear to me and from my previous experience -- and I can go right back to the miners strike to show my age -- they are not applied consistently throughout the country. So if they are going to be national make them national and interpret them all the same way. Then you can make other benefits like actually getting payrolls to operate across forces because that is one of your biggest bearers of money to do things like shared

services. People interpret the regulations differently. So making standard payments becomes very difficult. And I am not saying that is down to the Federation before anybody says. It just happens.

MR CREW: It is a matter of fact.

MR JETHWA: Just to add to this point. It has come out in all the sessions I think and people have alluded to it and it is slightly related to that point. It is actually about this perception that the regulations are too complex and that is the root of the problem. I am not saying I agree with this, but you could conceivably make the regulations simpler to understand and less complicated without changing the substance of what they stand for and represent, and those are two very separate issues.

The overtime rate will still remain the same but it might be easier for some managers to understand how you apply them, and that is a different issue to actually changing what the regulations actually represent. And I think we have to be very careful because it does seem to me often we slip into language about: well regulations get in the way of this. Is it the way in which the regulations are

interpreted or is what the regulations actually represent? Those are two very different issues. I just think we need to recognise that as we go forward in this discussion.

MR CREW: Thank you for that.

MR PRICE: Could I finally just say a couple of points that have reflected debate this morning at the ACPO's national conference. It is about the issue of interoperability between police staff regulations, terms and conditions and police officers' terms and conditions. We have heard about the number of regulations there are nationally around police staff and one of the issues came out this morning around how that is inhibiting collaboration amongst forces. That is my first point.

Secondly, in terms about the interoperability between police officer and police staff terms and conditions. We do recognise where the service is some forces have gone beyond 50 per cent of their people who are now police staff and some of those roles are operationally critical roles bringing them more together. We think it is a very positive thing.

Finally we hadn't discussed the kind of culture of where the service is, two services. There is desire amongst ACPO to bring the employment frameworks closer together. Where that takes the service ACPO quite frankly at the moment is still in a debate as to whether there should be one employment framework or whether there should be a closer employment framework, and we tried to tease that out this morning at the conference but we didn't quite get there. But certainly there is agreement that we should be having a closer framework because of the culture because of the need to work better and particularly work across forces.

MR WINSOR: Acknowledging Ian's point that police officers are not employees. I thought I would say it before you did.

MR MARSH: You are aware that in other non-Home Office forces they are both. So it is possible for both.

MR RENNIE: And restricted where they have their authority as officers.

MR CREW: At that point, Tom, is there anything you wanted to say?

MR WINSOR: Firstly, thank you again to everyone who

has come here today. It has been enormously valuable.

The website that we have established www.review.police.uk will, we hope by the end of tomorrow, contain PDF files so you can download of all the submissions that we have received or almost all of them, there might be one or two stragglers, all of those submissions. We have read and will re-read all of them and we would like you to read all of them too, or the most important of them. I leave you to judge which ones are the most important.

And we would like to hear from you, preferably in writing, what you think of what others have said, whether you would like to express agreement with a particular idea, whether you would like to develop something in your submission or add to your submission in the light of something that someone else has said, or if you disagree.

It is, as I said, an opportunity to dissolve and to reconstruct the terms and conditions on which police staff and police officers are paid and it is not an opportunity we should miss. We have very little time in which to do this exercise. I wish

we had a lot longer but we don't and, therefore, we are very heavily reliant upon you to let us know what you think of the emerging issues which are coming out.

Thank you for coming.

MR CASSIDY: What is the timeframe for that, for us to have read everybody else's, because I have only seen four so far and then to come back to you with those comments. What is the timeframe?

MR WINSOR: It is a flexible timeframe, as soon as possible. The sooner you let us have your response the longer we will have to read it and think about it and ask you follow-up questions about it. If you are late, then inevitably we are going to have less time with it. So it is in your interests of course to let us have your opinions as quickly as possible.

Pay and conditions is enormously important to the people who are in receipt of them and, therefore, it is incumbent upon all of us to give this our very best shot, so I ask you to give this the highest possible priority that you can.

Thank you for coming.

MR CREW: Can I just ask Kevin and Alan to let us have

papers on those issues about overtime. That would be very helpful.

Thank you very much for coming. If you do want to send anything else in by email it is contact@policereview.gsi.gov.uk.

Good to see you all and thanks ever so much to the contributions you have made.