

23 September 2011

Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP
Chairman
Home Affairs Select Committee
House of Commons
7 Millbank London
SW1P 3JA

Dear Chairman

NATIONAL LANDSCAPE OF POLICING

I write to express my objections to some misleading material and consequently flawed recommendations contained in your report, *New Landscape of Policing*, published today. On such a sensitive matter as pay and conditions, I suggest that there is an obligation on all concerned to ensure that the recipients of your report (including police officers and staff) are provided with reliable facts, so that they may reach sound conclusions on whether the recommendations are fair.

In this respect, I took exception to your comment at the meeting of the Police Federation of England and Wales on 13 July 2011 that I had reached some of my conclusions after just "sitting in the back of a couple of squad cars". Your report then stated that "before making any further recommendations, Tom Winsor should spend more time visiting officers and staff." Appendix 7 of my Part 1 report, which was sent to you when it was published, lists over 200 individual police officers and staff whom I met during many visits to police forces around the country, at all times of the day and night. Furthermore, the review received over 7,100 comments from officers and staff to my online consultation. I hope that you will recognise that this amounts to a much fuller and more extensive consultation than was achieved in any previous police pay review, and very significantly more than has been indicated in your remarks and report.

Indeed, it was through these invaluable meetings with frontline officers and staff that I was made aware of the importance of maintaining morale. However, hard-working, frontline police officers and staff told me that morale was already low because they were receiving the same pay, and in some cases less, than colleagues in back-office roles who were not under the same pressures. That is one of the reasons I have recommended the creation of a new unsocial hours allowance, so that officers working overnight can receive an extra 10% per hour, as well as an Expertise and Professional Accreditation Allowance that is targeted at frontline officers with especially valuable policing skills. If these recommendations are implemented, those officers who work unsocial hours and are in demanding, skills-based roles will earn more than those who do not. In some cases, a frontline officer will be earning substantially more than he or she does now, and these reforms will ameliorate the reduction in his or her take-home pay brought about by the anticipated rise in police pension contributions.

Your report also recommended the creation of a website to provide officers and staff with more information on their pay and conditions to improve morale. Such a website already exists. In March 2011, the review's website (www.review.police.uk) published an innovative 'ready reckoner' so that individual officers could input their personal pay and role details. The calculator then set out in detail how much better or worse off they are likely to be if my recommendations are implemented in full. At the same time, I published a series of fact

sheets, to ensure that some of the misinformation about my proposals was corrected. Finally, your report recommended that the Home Office obtains legal advice to ensure that my recommendations do not inadvertently undermine the special role of police officers. As I said in my evidence to your committee, constables have an original and not a delegated jurisdiction. Officers' terms and conditions are set out in regulations and not contract. None of my recommendations, if implemented, would change this. There is no question of there being any uncertainty about the legal position of police officers. I should add that I obtained legal advice before making the recommendations in Part 1 of my review, and I will do so again before publishing my Part 2 report in January 2012.

Given that your report has now been published, I have published a copy of this letter on the review's website.

Yours sincerely,

TOM WINSOR
Reviewer