

**Police Federation
of England and Wales**



**Ffederasiwn Heddlu
Lloegr a Chymru**

Established by Act of Parliament

Federation House, Highbury Drive, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 7UY
Telephone 01372 352022 Fax 01372 352078
Email GenSec@polfed.org www.polfed.org

FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE

IR/sg

30 September 2011

Mr Tom Winsor WS
Independent Review of Police Officers'
and Staff Remuneration and Conditions
8th Floor, Globe House
89 Ecclestone Square
LONDON
SW1V 1PN

Dear Mr Winsor

I was concerned to see that you had written to Keith Vaz MP criticising the Home Affairs Select Committee Report on the New Landscape of Policing as being "misleading" and "flawed", and published that letter on the Winsor Review website.

We know that the Committee members all have a long term interest and knowledge of policing and come from a range of political backgrounds. Their Report is littered with references to evidence and statements taken from named stakeholders. In stark contrast to Part 1 of your Review of Police Officers and Staff Terms and Conditions, their recommendations are clearly based on sound evidence and experience.

I was particularly concerned that you questioned the conclusions in the Committee's Report on the basis that you had come to different conclusions by speaking to over 200 individual police officers and staff and considering over 7,100 (albeit unattributed and unreferenced) comments from officers and staff to your online consultation. It is important to note however that your report only identified 69 federated rank officers from the forces which you visited.

These frontline officers and staff had apparently said that morale was low because they were receiving the same pay, and in some cases less, than colleagues in "back-office roles". You went on to say that if your recommendations were implemented "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".

I wrote to you on 11 July expressing my concerns about a number of statements you had made regarding comments made to you by police officers and I indicated that I



Represent • Influence • Negotiate

needed to be able to verify the evidence presented in your report, especially as these comments appeared to directly contradict the views of officers articulated to the Police Federation. You replied on 27 July that "it is not necessary as you assert for you to corroborate the conversations I have with individual police officers".

Nevertheless, the Police Federation has attempted to verify the comments allegedly made by a number of officers named in Part 1 of your Review. We have discovered that some of the officers do not actually exist and many of those that do have rejected the statements attributed to them. For example:

- Two officers named from Kent Constabulary are not known to the Constabulary and a third said he had not spoken to you because he was on holiday. Another officer said about the statement attributed to him: *"It was not me. ... I basically told him I have no money as it is, and asked him not to take any more off me, as I have three children to feed and clothe"*.
- One officer named as being from Greater Manchester Police is not known there and another commented: *"I recall the meeting with Tom Winsor quite clearly. ... At the start of the meeting he set up a digital recorder and made it quite clear that the meeting was being recorded, I suggest he discloses its contents if he believes that we have asked for these changes"*. Another officer who spent some considerable time with you is not named in your report.

I have appended the full comments from officers we have contacted who were named in your report from three Forces (Kent, Greater Manchester and Dyfed Powys).

It would appear that you are trying desperately to present a view that officers support and welcome your proposals. As the democratic representative body for all 140,000 Constables, Sergeants, Inspectors and Chief Inspectors in England and Wales the Police Federation knows this is not true. We have yet to find an officer who will not be disadvantaged if your recommendations are implemented.

Despite your protestations it is clear that your Review has already had a detrimental impact on officers' morale whatever their rank, whatever their Force and whatever their role. Officers feel undervalued and unappreciated. Furthermore, as the Home Affairs Select Committee has recognised, your recommendations have the potential to change policing to the detriment of the Service and the public we serve and undermine the Office of Constable which has been the bedrock of policing by consent in this country.

Yours sincerely



IAN RENNIE
General Secretary

cc Keith Vaz MP, Home Affairs Select Committee