

## **Ian Rennie – Statement to the PNB Full Board, Tuesday 26 July 2011**

We have held 10 meetings of the PNB Working Group to consider the recommendations made by Winsor in Part One of his Review and we have now reached the deadline set by the Home Secretary to complete our negotiations.

Over the course of our meetings, Staff Side have set out our concerns about the practical implications of some of Winsor's recommendations, which we believe will have a detrimental impact on the Service in terms of diversity, bureaucracy and morale.

Staff Side recognise the Official Side's desire to save money and to change the culture of police pay.

Staff Side has previously made a 'without prejudice' proposal to the Official Side, which today Staff Side is now tabling as a formal offer. This offer delivers as much and possibly more in savings than the proposals in the Winsor Report. It also delivers a change in the reward mechanisms for police pay. Unlike Winsor's recommendations it will not increase the administrative burden for forces and allows for a more flexible approach to pay, which should allow for a narrowing of the gender pay gap.

The Staff Side letter of today outlines our formal proposals. These concessions amount to a total saving of between £374 million and £422 million by 2014 and, if the savings from the reduction in housing allowance are removed from these figures, this will still realise savings of £319 million to £367 million. The difference between our savings and Winsor's savings of £387 million is, therefore, between £20 million and £68 million over the next three years.

As Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary stated in its report last week, *Adapting to Austerity*, the Winsor recommendations, "if implemented will affect forces differently according to their workforce profile: in fact, some forces have claimed that for them the costs will exceed the savings."

Our alternative proposals involve no additional costs to forces. Therefore, there should be no situation in which a force is not financially better off as a result of Staff Side's offer.

Failure to agree to these savings today and the likely timescale of the PAT could mean that forces will miss out some £65 million worth of savings in 2011 alone, that will not only be unavailable for redistribution within policing, but will be an actual cost to forces as pay to police officers.

In addition, recognising the desire of the Official Side to see a movement in the way police pay is determined, Staff Side has proposed that pay progression within the rank and retention of a CRTP should be based upon an annual review linked to

performance appraisal. In the absence of a PDR, progression and retention would be automatic.

Staff Side believes that together these two proposals should provide the basis for a change in the culture of pay in the service.

As I have said previously, since the pay reform talks broke down five years ago, Staff Side has been awaiting the Official Side's proposals on the future direction of police pay. These negotiations on Winsor Part One have now given Staff Side its clearest indication to date of the principles that are most important to the Official Side. Aside from the urgent need to find cost-savings, it is clear that the Official Side has a strong interest in pay linked to the acquisition and use of skills in particular roles.

At this stage it must be clear that Staff Side is reluctant to agree to a particular direction of travel in advance of the publication of the final part of the Winsor Review.

It must also be clear that Staff Side has particular difficulty agreeing to specific proposals where the evidence does not support the recommendations. Nowhere is this more so than in the case of those Winsor recommendations in which there is a real possibility of a disproportionate discriminatory impact against officers with certain protected characteristics that, Staff Side believes, cannot be justified without proper job evaluation. Disappointingly these proposals have not been adequately assessed for equality impact. Staff Side believes that our proposals, unlike Winsor's, are non-discriminatory.

The recommendations in Winsor Part 1 are interim arrangements and we must ensure that any changes to the current arrangements meet the long term needs of both the service and the public. However, if the Official Side can agree to make the savings proposed by Staff Side, I believe that this will afford us the time and space we need to engage in a proper, meaningful discussion on longer term reform.

I say to the Official Side as I have also said to my Staff Side colleagues, let us accept the challenge to shape the future of police officer pay and conditions by recognising that the second part of the Winsor Review could be a unique opportunity.

But opportunity means nothing unless both Sides are prepared to grasp it.

I would hope that neither Side has any desire to leave here today without an agreement or with any desire to leave these matters to the PAT. I know that today will not necessarily be an easy meeting for either Side, however, the significant concession by Staff Side to agree to a reduction in the pay and conditions of its members which, together with agreement to the two-year pay freeze, is a clear indication of Staff Sides' desire to reach an agreement that meets the fundamental requirements of both Sides.