

Tuesday, 9 November 2010

Review of Remuneration and conditions of service
for police officers and staff: seminar on deployment

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

Tom Winsor

Chair: Ted Crew

Attendees:

Derek Smith, *Director of Resources, West Midlands
Police*

Ian Drysdale, *Head of Human Resources, Kent Police*
Commander Richard Morris, *Chief of Staff to National
Olympic Security Coordinator, ACPO*

Ali Naylor, *HR Director, Leicestershire Constabulary*
Steve Corkerton, *HMIC*

Graham Cassidy, *National Deputy Secretary,
Superintendents Association*

Ian Rennie, *General Secretary, Police Federation*

Raj Jethwa, *Police Federation*

Chris Hanrahan, *UNISON's Police and Justice Executive*

David Hays, *Workforce Change Manager, NPIA*

Dale Bassett, *Research Director, Reform*

Blair Gibbs, *Head of Crime and Justice, Policy Exchange*

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

Richard Pugh, *Head of Work Force Strategy and Value for Money Team, Home Office*

Mark Stephenson, *Work Force Strategy Team, Home Office*

Liz Davidson, *HM Treasury*

David Williams, *PWC*

Anthony Gibbons, *APA*

Tuesday, 9 November 2010

(10.00 am)

Introduction

MR WINSOR: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to White & Case. I have been to so many of these meetings off my home territory I thought it was time you came to us.

My name is Tom Winsor for those of you who haven't met me but I think I have met everyone here, and the review that we are carrying out is under a considerable time pressure, as you undoubtedly know.

Just a couple of housekeeping things before I hand over to Ted Crew who is going to chair today and that is so that I don't have the burden of chairing and listening and I can concentrate, as fully as possible, on what you are saying.

This is very much an on the record meeting. It is part of our purpose in carrying out this review to be as open and transparent as possible. And so just as what others say to us will be available to you. So what you say will be available to them.

MR CREW: So the easy bit first -- that is to get you going really I think -- which is to talk about the current system. We are going to spend just under an hour talking about the current system and we want to focus, as I said before, on shift arrangements, overtime, on-call payments, mutual aid rates, use of special constabularies, those sorts of issues around what affects the deployment of officers, the reward for deployment of officers in the current system. And what is good about it, and there will be some good things, and what is bad about it and what problems it creates.

Then later on when we finish that we will come back hopefully to start saying, well how do we address those and what sort of solutions might we come up with.

Feel free to speak. Some of you will have very strong views on these issues and this is an opportunity for you to air those points of view. So I don't

know if there is anybody that feels so strongly they want to launch in straight away. If not, I have one or two questions that I will get things going with.

Shift System

MR CREW: Let us have a look at the current shift system. What are the issues around the current shift systems that are good or bad? Or are we perfectly satisfied that our current shift arrangements work very well?

MR CASSIDY: Graham Cassidy, from the Police Superintendent's Association in England and Wales. I will kick off.

With 28 years service, like a lot of people in this room, worked probably all sorts of different shift systems and what I think we have seen over time is consistent efforts, probably redoubled in the last 10 to 15 years to better match resources to demand in the police service. And that's seen the exit of the traditional three shift system and the introduction of a variety of variable shift systems. And I think in general terms the position has improved in terms of matching resources to

demand, to the demand across the board.

There is still more improvements that can be made but there is certainly no lack of a willingness to change how we deploy our staff. I think the service has a good record of showing how it has moved with the times.

The problem generically with design in any shift system at the sort of broad national level is that at a local level it may not be relevant and that's the problem I think. Shift systems, there is some general principles that you could perhaps agree but so much of it depends what happens in Doncaster town centre at 2 on a Sunday morning compared with somewhere else in the country.

MR CREW: Are there any constraints on you being able to design them locally? What are the issues which arise trying to design locally?

MR CASSIDY: Variable shift systems under current arrangements have to be agreed with the staff associations but I don't see that as a constraint and my experience of undertaking those negotiations at a local level in my force, South Yorkshire, when I was there was that it was a constructive debate at all times with all parties and systems were

developed that worked. And then if they don't work back around the table and renegotiate until they do.

MR CREW: Okay. Ian.

MR DRYSDALE: The point is coupled mainly around the localist issue and the national design. I think I would perhaps add that in terms of economic change we have seen I think up until now shift systems being developed in favour of the people that work those shifts, taking on board the comment around demand and supply. But I am not so sure that evidence could be produced that suggests that we put the user of the services at the heart of our considerations when designing shift systems.

MR CREW: Okay.

MR CORKERTON: Steve Corkerton from HMIC. I was going to echo the same point actually: that it is not the shift arrangements necessarily that are the major problem. It is actually understanding business demand and having the management focus to actually align the resources towards business needs. I think there is a fundamental structure issue for me which is that shift arrangements at the moment are built into all police officers' contracts

regardless of what they end up working and it is a lifetime commitment on the assumption they will work a variety of patterns and it will even out over time.

The world has moved on in the last ten years and we have seen a lot more about flexible working and trying to balance work and home life. Nothing wrong with that at all, but actually there is no pay consideration attached to it.

So two things for me: one is about aligning shifts to demand and perhaps the management skills and the culture that go with it rather than having a national model that is prescriptive, and second is about work/life balance and the ability to perhaps consider having people on permanent nights and paying them a premium for doing so.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR WILLIAMS: David Williams. Until March Director of Personnel at West Midlands. Now working for PricewaterhouseCoopers.

I agree with the previous speakers. I think we have got some really good intellectual property. The Accenture report in 2004 was, I think, extremely interesting in terms of demand and rostering. The

one thing I cannot work out is in some ways some of the timescales and timelines that you see within regulations from things like five and eight day notices through to publishing rosters for 3 and 12 months and I would have thought there is a debate to be had now of moving away from the traditional shift pattern more towards alternative work patterns, maybe looking at stagger patterns, maybe looking at taking specialist teams and working them in different ways. So it seems to have grown and yet we don't look at the whole work pattern, the whole year, the public requirements.

MR CREW: Any other points on shifts that people want to raise at all?

MR DRYSDALE: Just one more if I may. I think it has been picked up on, but there is a lack of incentive to stay on shifts and we pay a premium for everybody to do it but only a minority do, so I think it is an issue.

MR WINSOR: What is the lack of incentive?

MR DRYSDALE: By and large there are a small number of ways in which we can reward officers for additional duties through SPPs¹. We by and large don't do that

¹ Special Priority Payments

for people that are working full shifts.

MR CREW: But it was built into Edmund Davies and Edmund Davies built in 9 per cent for working unsocial hours.

MR DRYSDALE: But everybody gets that, and that is my point. It seems to me, and I am not an officer so I can't speak from experience, others can and I bow to their better judgment, but it seems to be a role that people don't want to do for a long period of their service. Therefore, there needs to be some interest in what incentive could be provided to reward people doing what seems to be an unpopular task.

MR WINSOR: I do stress that we have reached no conclusions whatsoever so whatever we may say to you by way of question is maybe to test the proposition with which we may have little or no sympathy.

Having said that, if 9 per cent of the pay has been built in for those who work shifts, then should there be 9 per cent reduction in pay, all other things being equal, which they are not, for those who do not or so rarely work shifts that it is almost negligible? What do you think about that

Ian?

MR DRYSDALE: Thanks for --

MR WINSOR: Anyone else?

MR DRYSDALE: I will respond. I think it is a legitimate suggestion. Of course I would respond like that, but then we get into what sort of work do other people do and are there other variants which would attract an incentive.

MR CREW: Tom did say all things being equal.

MR WILLIAMS: This would be slightly controversial, and I am not coming down one way or the other. What I would say is that the employment market and world has changed in Britain hugely and the concept of unsocial hour payments in many sectors in the British economy doesn't exist because one person's unsocial working time is actually somebody else's social working time with the way flexible working has developed. And, therefore, it is going to be an interesting debate about whether working nights, which could be very suitable for certain people, should attract premium payments both for police staff or police officers it is 9 per cent.

MR CREW: Another hand went up. In fact there was a forest of hands. Who hasn't spoken?

MR MORRIS: Richard Morris, MPS and ACPO. I broadly agree actually with the tenor of most of what has been said so far. What I would point out though in terms of differentials between those working shifts and those not I have in my own service experienced difficulties actually of occasionally attracting officers into office based roles to do officer related tasks such as occasionally things like operational planning and what have you which is my current domain that I have for the Olympics.

So whilst I do broadly agree with greater reward for those, if you like, at the coalface doing operational work on shift work and doing antisocial hours, and I hear what David says, but I think broadly there is general recognition of what is antisocial and what is not and what are popular shifts to work on and what are not, but I wouldn't want any pay disparity between those doing that and those who are doing, if you like, less antisocial hours but potentially equally valuable operational focussed work². I wouldn't want any disparity to disadvantage getting some really good people in and

² I would not wish to see too great a disparity – my position is that I do not mind a 'shift payment' to reward those working anti-social hours – in fact I think it would be very justifiable – but I would not wish the differential to be too great.

happy to do those other jobs, if you follow me. So I think we need to tread quite carefully on that one.

MR CASSIDY: I reinforce that point. It is in our submission. I would not recommend going down that very divisive route and to pick up the point my colleagues have already made, I understand the point made but I'm not aware anywhere in England and Wales where chief constables have any problem filling the shifts because they will simply tell people they are on a shift. So in that sense there isn't a problem with deployment.

MR CREW: Do you want to come back?

MR CORKERTON: Yes. I worked in the private sector for 20 years and 10 years in the police service and my experience was there you did pay a premium for working antisocial hours. People on regular nights, and not on the rotating patterns that we have in the police service, would typically get around 25 to 30 per cent premium. So the 9 per cent is probably appropriate given that it is a lifetime experience and people work rotating shifts. I wouldn't say it is enough if you are going to take away 9 per cent and leave others with

9 per cent for working more intense shift patterns. So I have a completely different view to David who is saying perhaps society has moved, and maybe it has, but I would have said the premium wasn't sufficient for people that were going to work regular patterns.

One thing that does seem strange in the police service is the rotating patterns which are very cruel on people's health and domestic lives I would have thought.

MR CREW: Sorry, the chap next to Richard. I don't know your name.

MR HANRAHAN: Chris Hanrahan from Unison. I am conscious that there is a lot of focus on police officers.

MR CREW: The review isn't. It is both, so let us be clear about that.

MR HANRAHAN: Yes, I understand that, thank you, chair. The point I would like to make of course is that for police staff if you don't work a shift pattern you don't get paid a shift allowance quite clearly, and there are a number of different types of shift allowances of different varying percentages for staff dependent on the type of unsocial and

irregular hours that they work. So it is quite important that that is recognised.

As for police officer terms and conditions I think that is a matter for the Federation and the superintendents to argue.

MR JETHWA: Raj Jethwa, Police Federation. The point I just make to add to the comments already made, it is not my view but our organisation's view, it is not strictly comparable to talk about the 9 per cent as a shift premium in the way you have in other sectors. Police officers don't have a contract of employment, can be directed to do these and over a career lifetime many will have to do them. It is probably more appropriate to see it as recognition of the fact that they can be directed to do these shifts at any particular time. Therefore, I wouldn't take a strict comparison between this and say premium for working other antisocial hours in other sectors. I just make that comment for the record.

MR CREW: Any other points?

MS DAVIDSON: Liz Davidson from the Treasury. I just wondered if I could put a question to the group. Do people have a sense of what proportion at any

given times both officers and staff require shift working? Just to get a sense of the scope of the issue we are talking about.

MR WILLIAMS: I would say at a quick estimate it is 25 per cent. You mean working at any one time or designated roles?

MS DAVIDSON: You could cut it in different ways.

MR WILLIAMS: Probably moving up to 40 per cent. I would need to check that.

MR DRYSDALE: I am sorry, I didn't hear the question.

MS DAVIDSON: My question was just to get a handle on the scale of this issue. What proportion of jobs at any given time or over a year, say, require shift working?

MR DRYSDALE: Both officers and staff?

MR CREW: Yes.

MR DRYSDALE: I think that's probably around the right figure for me. I would say around 30, 35 per cent.

MR WILLIAMS: The SPP figure, special priority payments -- I know we are not talking about that today -- was very much looking at the thresholds to exceed of 40 per cent which many of them were on an alternating pattern of work beyond normal hours of 8 to 6.

MR CORKERTON: I think you have to qualify the answer a bit more. I have just had a bit more thinking time than some of my colleagues. I think there are very different percentages between police staff and police officers. I think there is then 24/7 shift working and there is extended days and there would be a lot of police officers on extended days of somewhere between, and colleagues will help me out here, but 7 in the morning until perhaps 9/10 at night and doing double day shift type patterns but not such large numbers on 24/7.

So I would be guessing more like about 30 per cent of police officers on 24/7 shifts at any one time but a much bigger number if you started throwing in investigators and other people in the more serious crime teams who are working longer than normal office hours, I think there is a smaller number when you look at police staff because you have call centres and you have custody units and you have people in forensics. Call centres and custody do full 24/7. Other people again in police staff are on extended day type contracts with call-outs behind that. So probably 20, 25 per cent of police staff on any type of shift pattern I would think,

around that figure. Probably about 60 per cent of cops on shift patterns but the difference between full 24/7 and partial patterns.

MR CASSIDY: Just in terms of a process issue. It is a very good question but what I get from going round the table is we are not sure about the answer. So I think we have to be very careful on basing any ultimate decisions on the fact that we may have it right.

MR CREW: Can I assure you we will not take a decision based on one chunk of evidence we pick up today. That is why we want to get as wide a base of evidence as we can. This is very useful.

MR PUGH: Just to say that a couple of years ago we did a small piece of research looking at the management of overtime in forces and did some and case studies in five particular forces and in five particular BCUs in those forces. The large majority of overtime that was paid certainly -- slightly different from rostering, but probably an issue that was related -- was in the investigative function and much less so in the 24/7 sections.

MR MORRIS: If I may, if we were about to move off from shifts.

MR CREW: Deal with that and then we will move away from shifts to overtime.

MR MORRIS: The only other thing, and it is an observation really rather than a solution, is I agree with what Steve was saying around I think we tend to be a little bit rigid in terms of looking at shift patterns and a kind of team base, if you like. So you are in a particular team and you do all the shifts over a particular period of time. And I think I suspect that in terms of Ian's point about end-user and how the end-user would benefit I suspect we probably could be more intelligent in terms of the way we deploy people at particular times and hopefully fitting in with people's desire for flexible working and what have you.

Just thinking back to my own experience, when I was a PC I would have loved to have known every single Tuesday evening I was going to be off so I could have planned things because in general outside the workplace things tend to happen in a kind of fairly regular basis, so you can plan your life. For example, if you want to do evening class or something like that you could plan that quite

easily around that.

However, and this is where I come to the fact that it is more of an observation than being particularly helpful probably, is I also remember, and no doubt Raj and Ian will have a view on this, that in terms of shift officers part of the attraction of a police career is working as part of a team and that kind of spirit of camaraderie within a team. So I think we have got almost two competing issues here which, as I say, probably hasn't been particularly helpful but I think it is something to be conscious of as we proceed really and try and be as flexible as we can.

MR CREW: Okay. Very quickly then and we will move on to overtime. Last two points. Derek first.

MR SMITH: Derek Smith, Director of Resources, West Midlands. I think it is fair to say that for large forces the need for shift arrangements is paramount in the sense that the workload across the large urban force area and the demand that is placed upon it means that the shift arrangement is one of the bedrock arrangements for delivering a safe and sound service. Do we need a single shift? No. And our experience has shown that a single shift

arrangement brings with it as many difficulties as it does solutions.

But do we need to create a relationship between a structured shift arrangement that does organise teams and service delivery and at the same time match the associated overtime arrangements for which we will come on to in a minute? Yes, I do. And to take those away and try and structure something completely different around that will cause, I think, significant operational difficulties just as we work shift arrangements in its entirety.

MS NAYLOR: Ali Naylor, HR Director at Leicestershire. Just a point from me. The default eight hour shift pattern isn't particularly helpful in today's environment. It is quite restrictive if you can't get agreement around any of the flexible working, and that is something that I would appreciate if the review would have a look at. I do absolutely agree we have to have mechanisms around agreement and the negotiations et cetera, but when you can't agree having to default to an eight hour pattern doesn't reflect modern policing. It is not at all user-friendly in terms of matching demand

and meeting the needs of the customer if you want to call the people in receipt of our services customers.

Equally, it is not particularly good for police officers. So I would prefer to see a broader default position around the numbers of hours you could put into a shift pattern. I think that would be more helpful to both us and our officers.

MR CREW: So how would you adjust that? How would you adjust that default position if you wanted to, if you were able to?

MS NAYLOR: I guess I would rather it not be as simple as just you go back to an eight hour pattern default. I would rather have a range of parameters that you then agree which gave you some flexibility within the hours. I am not quite sure what they are because I think that is a more complicated system to put in but actually I think we need to be a bit more sophisticated than we have been historically. We have gone for very simple patterns.

So for me variable hours within that I think should be accommodated because there are days when policing requirements and demands are much lighter so you

might want a pattern where you work shorter hours mid week and longer hours at the weekend and vice versa in other roles. It is about having that ability to create a pattern that you can get agreed that isn't just eight, eight, eight all the way through a week.

MR WINSOR: Is agreement essential? I know it is at the moment.

MS NAYLOR: I don't want to upset my Federation and superintendent colleagues.

MR WINSOR: The Fed will say what they want to say.

MISS NAYLOR: From an employer perspective you would hope to gain agreement but it would be nice ultimately to be able to put in a shift pattern that was fair and worked.

MR WINSOR: So having carried out all the consultation that you could reasonably be expected to have done, is it attractive to you that ultimately the decision would be made by the police force?

MS NAYLOR: Yes.

MR WINSOR: And the police officers would, perhaps with reluctance, but would have to accept it because the purpose of policing is to serve the community and if that is what the judgment of the senior

management is, then that's what is going to have to happen.

MS NAYLOR: Yes.

MR WINSOR: Because ultimately somebody is going to have to make a decision unless you have a mandatory requirement for agreement which of course is a recipe for deadlock.

MS NAYLOR: Yes, I agree.

MR WINSOR: Is there any dissent? Which of our colleagues from the Police Federation is dissenting?

MR RENNIE: Apologies, I do apologise for the late arrival. I obviously missed the earlier discussions around this. But I do find it quite fascinating that variable shift arrangements are exactly what they say on the tin: variable shift arrangements. And the fact that forces can't manage them and make arrangements to cover shortfalls in demand I find quite incredible to be quite honest.

Everywhere will need a rotating 24/7 pattern to cover needs. What we should be doing is looking at the work that has been done through the Accenture report and through the recent circular on advising

on the development of shifts. We should be using more wide-ranging ways of covering those shortfalls. You will always need a 24/7, as I have said, but there are people who would be quite happy to work fixed shifts to cover those peaks, troughs et cetera through flexible working arrangements, through fixed shifts. And there are very few forces who have really totally explored the way of dealing with the shortfalls at demand times. We have 8 hours which can be imposed at any time. Forces want to extend more. There is nothing within the variable shift arrangement as it stands now. I appreciate they need agreement from creating working hours between 8 and 11 on any day within that shift pattern. I do find it quite strange for it to be said that the fact that there is need for an agreement is causing the problem.

There are forces in this country that don't have that problem who do manage their shifts and have a multitude of different shifts, so people working can get different times of the day and night to cover policing demands. There are some good models out there. It is a shame that that good practice has not been picked up by many forces who simply

want to impose a shift pattern on people. And if you are going to impose a shift pattern, then the shift has to balance the needs of three groups: one the public and the service, two, the force and three the individuals that have to work them.

Because if you want to keep a motivated workforce the last thing you want to do is start having to impose a shift pattern that is really onerous and really impacts on their work/life balance without first exploring the potential opportunities to get flexible working fixed shift working to cover the peaks and troughs.

You only have to look at the control rooms. I mean I have been a police officer for a long time. There are no surprises when it is busy. That doesn't really change throughout the country. Although forces will say they want bespoke shift arrangements to meet their actual needs, the actual peak of demand throughout the country doesn't change and you don't have to be an expert to say that Friday and Saturday nights in certain areas are busy. We expect that to be the case throughout the country.

There was an example on Merseyside and it is no longer

in existence because obviously there was a change and resources had to be found for neighbourhood policing so response obviously had to accommodate a number of resources for that.

But going back a few years, in Merseyside the perfect example was that they realised Liverpool city centre it is actually busy on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights and what they needed was some additional officers to work at those peak times. So they actually advertised for officers to work 7 to 5 Thursday, Friday, Saturday nights 10 hour shifts, that is 30 hours, and the other 10 hours could be used flexibly in agreement with their manager to deal with the follow-up enquiries, people coming back on bail, court appearances at other times throughout the week. But they would be deployed at that time, at the busy time.

And they were inundated and had to go through a selection process for people to say: I want to work this. Because it meets a lot of needs. If you said fixed shifts, who wants to work Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights, 30 hours, and your 30 hours is reflected so you don't have to go part-time and suffer the financial consequence of

reducing hours to get flexibility, which is our experience. If you offer those hours you will get people who want to work it. If somebody said to me as a young officer with a young family working in the City of Manchester, which I was at the time, "Do you want to work Thursday, Friday Saturday nights?, I would have jumped at the chance because that would have given more quality time through the week with my family. It would have assisted with childcare. Because childcare, particularly if you have a partner who works days, who is not in the police, it allows you then to do your own childcare, saves the cost of childcare and you can work at the busy times when your partner, husband, wife is at home and can do the childcare. And it was an enjoyable time to work.

MR CREW: Okay, I think you have painted the picture.

MR RENNIE: So for me the fact is they are sitting here saying they want to impose doesn't work. They haven't explored the options that are available to deal with the demands of policing that the public place upon us and we have to look more flexibly at it, and we have said that for a long time.

Overtime

MR CREW: I am going to move on from this now.

Clearly, as we said when we started out, we could talk around this these issues ad nauseum almost.

We are going to move on to overtime because that started to emerge in the earlier discussions about the complexities or non-complexities of overtime, why it is paid, how it is paid, how it is incurred. You started, David, you mentioned it to start with. Do you want to talk about overtime at all?

MR WILLIAMS: I think the comment was made earlier -- it was quite interesting -- that the officers we have been talking about through the 24/7 cycle actually are probably the lowest earners on overtime and I think some of the reports in the past have shown this, that specialist departments officers there incur quite high levels of overtime. I have to agree with Ian in part. I think the Accenture report and the PNB³ guidance of 2007 is good guidance and is a good report. What is being said there is people shouldn't be getting into excessive situations. And in fact the PNB guidance keeps referring to the working time regs. And it

³ Police Negotiating Board

is something wrong I think if someone is working consistently above 50 hours a week.

So I think in terms of overtime the questions for me are: you see the sort of press headlines of 50,000 extra in overtime. Something is going wrong in terms of management control on that and I think the reporting linked to duty management, linking to proper rostering, control, making certain people not in excess of overtime levels is very important managerially. It is not a criticism, and I have great respect for the service, but there has not been the management rigour in looking at this in the past and I think it should come given this review.

MR CREW: Any other points anyone wants to raise on overtime?

MR CORKERTON: I entirely agree with what David said. The only thing that I would add to it is I think that the culture behind that management rigour is probably worth taking account of. There is a disconnect between managers who allocate overtime without being accountable for the budget and they tend in large numbers of cases, clearly not universally, but in large numbers of cases in my

observation to do it on somewhat sentimental reasons of trying to maximise earnings for individuals rather than actually deliver the resource where it is necessary in the most effective manner. And that's part of the culture of the organisation that we built up over quite some time.

MR WILLIAMS: Could I just come back? I know I was slightly controversial about unsocial hours working and hours. I have never really worked out in my mind why overtime payments become triggered after a week of 40 hours when actually the "contract", and I will put that in inverted commas, for a police officer and for police staff is somewhere between 1,800 and 2,000 hours a year.

So in a sense -- and this is the point I made, probably not very well earlier -- is that I think the service ought to be looking at alternative work patterns. It might be thinking about things like annualised hours. It might be thinking about winter/summer stagger patterns and why is overtime kicking in after an officer has completed just 40 hours in the week when we are publishing rosters for 3 months and 12 months ahead? Should we not be

looking at the work pattern over the year, over the fiscal cycle, over the performance year et cetera et cetera?

I know that is probably slightly controversial but I think it is worth putting on the table.

MR SMITH: I think overtime is really quite an interesting and difficult issue for us. We have a number of organised and planned events which take place throughout the year that are quite resource exhaustive. That we can plan and we can plan in advance. You won't be surprised to know that there are quite often unplanned events that take place that then require resourcing quite often at short notice but quite often there is something to do with some timespan that we could put some planning into.

Does a large force need overtime as a flexible buffer?

In my view yes, it does. And managed overtime can give flexibility around normal working arrangements. And I don't think you will find many chief constables saying other than that. Overtime as a tool to create some capacity is actually extremely useful.

Where do we get to at the moment? We have real

difficulty in the time limitations around nature's delivery of overtime and overtime rates. Quite often we get caught with the idea that the rate of pay is based around a time limitation and degrees of notice that are given. Some of which we can manage quite well. Some of which we manage less well. The consequences that different events cost in our terms in resource.

MR CREW: Could you explain that in a bit more detail?

MR SMITH: Certainly. The overtime payments for officers are based upon regulations that depend upon extended hours for which a certain rate is paid and then use of rest day working officers are brought back off what is a rest day and depending on the notice given for that rest day different rates are then payable to the officers for that length of notice.

Similarly, the thing gets slightly more complex around public holidays, for which different rates are then paid, and if I throw in another complication which is when there is a large event we would, as part of operation planning, cancel some rest days in order to re-organise the force to deliver capacity. Whilst that is an acceptable planning mechanism,

the reverse then applies: if you don't reinstate rest days within a given time period then there is a sort of reverse arrangement whereby officers can, I won't say take advantage but there is a way by which there is a cost for reinstating those rest days.

People can say, well you need to make planning arrangements to minimise that situation and we do. However, I have to say that in my experience -- I would use the word slightly provocatively -- there is an industry that officers and structures know very well that require the force to understand exactly where it is in timespan terms for significant or other planned events, and to that extent the variable cost of those arrangements start to get in the way of proper deployment. And what we would like to see, I think, is a clearer, simpler way of dealing with overtime and overtime rates that is less dependent strictly on time. In other words, the short notice is to the point where we understand and it is understood for officers very clearly what that is. At the moment in my view it is too complicated. It is complicated in terms of regulations and application and actually

makes the whole organisation much more difficult than it ordinarily should do.

MR CASSIDY: Our view as senior managers is that overtime is necessary. It provides the flexibility for meeting the spikes of demand that are probably unique to the emergency services perhaps. It is a small amount of the police budget and one that is declining. I think that should be borne in mind.

I would guard against being swayed in this area in terms of thoughts and decision making in terms of what you might read in the Daily Mail from time to time. There are excesses that take place and where they are uncovered clearly they are wrong and need to be sorted out. But I would just remind everybody in terms of a process wherever it has worked overtime in England and Wales it is authorised by somebody. It is not a blank cheque that somebody signs for themselves. There should be processes around authorisation. To take up the point earlier on, and certainly in my experience with my own force, there are processes for monitoring who is earning what and we are keeping a close eye on that because as sensible managers there is a big plus in there for you to make sure

that people aren't overworking. And I think those processes are probably in place.

MR RENNIE: Failing to plan is planning to fail. If forces can't plan more than 15 days notice to re-roster rest days so people have to work on demand, then I'm sorry, there is something sadly amiss. There is nothing wrong with the regulations. Duty rosters are published. Rest days are included. If there is an event and it is in the future, there is the opportunity to plan down to 15 days at no cost and for those rest days to be re-rostered. If it is below 15 days and they have failed to plan, then the compensation is there to compensate officers who have had their days cancelled with less than 15 days notice. If forces then cancel and reinstate them again because they can't plan, then it is the officer's choice on whether to take the day off or to take the payment and work, having re-arranged their whole lives under 14 days and maybe having been doing something at the weekend.

This is about planning. The force is failing to plan for events. Christmas comes once a year. You know, these events are in the diary for 12 months.

Forces should be able to plan and manage their resources to do it. But the problem we have and the problem people fail to recognise is that if you have an 8 foot room and a 4-foot carpet you will never ever carpet the room. It is not possible at all. And overtime is vitally important to cover those shortfalls if there is a lack of resources when there is a policing demand.

I want to touch on David's point: the annualised hour time situation. It is really interesting that people should get overtime at 40 hours because if that wasn't the case and you started the year in January what are you going to do when you get to September because everybody will have used their hours because they will be deployed and you will have a period of time when officers have run out of hours. That is why overtime is there so you can roster throughout the year. There are only so many hours they can work. There are only so many resources available. What we have to do is plan better and manage the resources better. There is nothing wrong with the flexibility of the regulations for all forces to do that.

MR MORRIS: I was going to start off, but Graham

started it but obviously Ian has now come in now with a bit of a robust defence of PCs and sergeants earning overtime if they work longer hours than their rostered to.

To take you to the example of a PC on night duty making an arrest, a complicated arrest with quite a bit of paperwork including having to write up their own evidence at, say, 5 o'clock in the morning, any notion that they should not be remunerated quite substantially for staying on and working well into the morning when they are absolutely exhausted, having been there myself, I personally think that should be discounted.

However, and now for the hand grenade, having prefaced it with that bit, I do have, and I know this is kind of complicated territory in terms of administration, apart from anything else, but I would link it back a little bit to our discussion around to those on shifts and those not on shifts. I do have a bit of a kind of moral problem, I suppose, equating the situation I have just outlined with the situation where you have a PC in an 8 to 4 job who knows, in this hypothetical example, and it doesn't happen all the time by any

means, and some of it comes back to David's point about culture, but who knows that before they set out for work they will be staying on for two hours working until 6 and being paid the same as my PC who is staying on until 9 am trying to process his prisoner, I think there is a bit of a moral difference between those two examples.

How you address that is a challenge, quite obviously.

It is probably simpler frankly to revisit the general remuneration that you give to shift workers vis à vis others, but I think it is a moral issue and I think we do need to confront it.⁴

MR DRYSDALE: Sir, I think it is right to pay people according to their contributions. I think if they are there behind their hours then they should be remunerated for it, but I think it is wrong to plug poor demand planning with finances we can ill afford now. So I think the debate is somewhat linear. If we can get the shift systems and the demand and supply arrangements right, then actually a lot of the negative press that does appear over the use of overtime will disappear as a result of

⁴ This tends to reinforce my previous footnote (page 12), in terms of making it clear that my view is that there *is* a need to reward those 'at the coalface'.

that better planning.

But I do think that overtime will remain a legitimate resource tool, amongst many others, to resolve a number of uncertainties that the service will always face and I think we shouldn't lose sight of that. But equally we shouldn't be romanced by the notion that there is a lot of waste out there that isn't capable of being managed in the future because overtime never goes sick and it doesn't answer back and it is a useful tool for single managers to have all of the time.

MR CREW: Thank you for that.

MR GIBBS: Blair Gibbs, Policy Exchange. I think the point was made that the total spend on overtime is declining. I think that may be true over the last couple of years and that is perhaps to do with changes in some forces using shift handovers but I think we have to accept it is declining from a high base and it has increased quite dramatically over the last ten years. So there is clearly a problem there.

There was some recent responses in parliamentary questions on the average amount of overtime per officer per year ranging from about £1,000 or a bit

below up to about £3,500. That is an average figure and some officers will be earning as a result of overtime much more than that.

I think we would all appreciate there are pressures, for example with events, as has been mentioned, that demand that kind of flexibility and I think overtime, in a sense, is part of this flexible force that arguably we all want to see in the future. But I would question whether the demand from events now in terms of policing is more than it was ten years ago. I don't know whether the actual requirement on officer time in terms of events is more or whether we are seeing more events. But I would tend to, from my discussions with police officers, support the view that overtime for reasons of management control has become more normalised and has become more of an accepted part of an officer's job with an expectation that in a team the authorisation will be given - expected and given. And we might need to question whether that culture is part of the problem rather than the actual pressure of events.

MR PUGH: Just to add some factual information to what Blair just said. It has increased dramatically

over the last ten years and that is during a period where the number of officers has increased quite substantially as well. I know people say that the mission for police officers has increased during that time. That may or may not be true. People have their own views. But it is slightly counterintuitive to have 12,000 more officers over the last ten years and also to see spending on overtime rise by £150 million a year.

That has changed in the last couple of years and it is now coming down. I think some of that of course is the financial context which we are now in and there wasn't the incentive in earlier years to bring spending down because there was enough money in policing to pay for the overtime and I think forces are looking more at how they arrange their workforce and that has had a knock-on effect on the level of overtime paid in different forces. That does vary across the 43 forces.

MR WILLIAMS: I really want to say overtime when I have seen it in the private sector outside the police service is the most economical use of resources. It is. All the studies show that.

The only thing I would say is in the concentration on

response crime fighting neighbourhood policing I am not certain that work patterns for other groups of staff, police officers and police staff have always been looked at as imaginatively as they could have been. For instance, crime investigation intelligence. You have a feeling that those have fallen into particular patterns and some people have said there are a lot of interesting patterns around the service. I am not certain that best practice has been shared around.

I think there are ways of looking at the 24 hours or the 18 hours and looking at how you deploy other than front line officers in perhaps different ways to meet demand or future demand in different ways.

MS NAYLOR: Just a couple of points from me. Overtime is an essential tool in managing our workforce and it would be really difficult if it disappeared. But can I just say: demand profiling, the IT that helps you to do demand profiling has improved enormously over the last ten years and that is a really significant difference in bringing overtime down. If you get the demand right, if you get the profiling right, you don't have to use overtime so much.

But in defence of the forces -- I work in a rural force, Leicestershire. In the last six months we have had a bomb at the East Midlands airport, reported by the President of the United States last weekend, a planned march by the English Defence League, a number of murders that we didn't know were coming and other weather related incidents which get in the way. None of those are foreseeable. They are the things for which we generally use our overtime because they are not planned or predictable. The weather is getting better but we still don't know how many people are going to crash their car and how big the incident is going to be. So it is just a plea for some common sense around overtime.

There are some points for me. I am not so sure the bank holidays are sacrosanct in the way that they used to be, so I am not sure that paying double time is the right thing but it is not a huge part of my budget so I don't feel particularly strongly about it. But I do think that we have to have overtime. It does enable us to iron out peaks and troughs. I would echo David's comments: if we didn't have it, we would probably have to employ

more police officers and have some quite odd shifts to try and iron that out and that would be a much more expensive way of doing business.

MR CORKERTON: Just to echo some of the points and add an extra one. I am in favour of overtime as well. I would hate to see it ruled out or made totally unattractive because the work that is required of the police service does require unplanned and unexpected activities.

I also agree that we have become a lot better at resource management but I think we have got quite a long way to go still with it.

What I was going to just put on record is I think if we look back over the last ten years overtime and flexible working and shift arrangements were connected and were used by forces as one of the few areas of freedom that they had to reward staff in a very dynamic labour market. Whether that was right or wrong and we were abusing processes but in the wider set of terms and conditions and the absolute rigour that was enforced around pay increments and other reward mechanisms training, overtime, flexible working were the things that forces and managers had to try and motivate and

retain staff that they had. It was also at a time where the pressure was on operational delivery rather than resource management.

So what I am really saying is, perhaps it is not entirely the regulations that are at fault here. It is actually the culture and the way that we all operate it. I think appropriately for the time but the time has now moved on. So there might need to be some streamlining and some of the processes are somewhat bureaucratic perhaps but we wouldn't want to just throw them all out and say they've taken us to this point because they are inherently bad. They have helped us to navigate through a history in different conditions.

MR CREW: It seems a good point to move on.

MR BASSETT: Dale Bassett, Reform. I just wanted to add, I don't want too stray too far outside of the remit of this but I think it is worth, before moving on, acknowledging the relationship between overtime and issues around basic pay and particularly the questions of pay in terms of rank and in terms of role. It has been observed by a number of colleagues that in actual fact you can identify which are the types of role and

particularly specialist departments where overtime is a common thing. If one of the issues we are trying to look at is predicability of expenditure, then shouldn't we consider the possibility of having flexibility in contracts for people who are doing roles where there is likely to be overtime where actually there is a built in expectation of that that is remunerated in terms of basic salary rather than just paying overtime if we go over 40 hours?

MR RENNIE: I want to come back on the moral arguments of when overtime is paid. The example was given, and I have been through it as well, 7 o'clock in the morning stuck till mid-morning and you are shattered and really tired and it is deserving of the payment.

But actually sometimes that is not as inconvenient as being required to work beyond your hours when you are working through the day at 4 or 6 o'clock because that can seriously impact on your life, that you may have something planned.

And the other point is, I also heard what people say about public holiday working. But let us not forget one thing. Officers are required, directed

to work their paid holiday entitlement. These are the days of paid leave where they are not required to work and they are being directed to work and that is why it is compensated in such a way.

On-call payments

MR CREW: Right, let us move on because we are still talking about money around some of these issues. I just want to look at on-call payments. That is an issue that has been raised during the course of this. Ali is smiling so I come directly to you, Ali, for that one.

MS NAYLOR: It is only because it is a live issue for me of course at the moment.

MR CREW: It is appropriate then to raise it today.

MS NAYLOR: Yes. It is an interesting dilemma because we currently pay on-call by paying people a fixed amount dependent on how much overtime they actually work over the course of the year as opposed to a fixed payment for every time they are asked to be on-call. Financially for us it makes a significant difference which way you do it. The flat payment of, say, £25, £29, whatever amount you set up actually because of the amount of time we have to

have people on-call can be a very very significant cost. I am not quite sure what the answer is because I think when people are asked to be on-call then they are putting their lives on hold. They are saying they are going to stay in the area. They are not going to drink alcohol. They are going to be fit to work and drive et cetera. So I do believe they should get remunerated for it. I am just not clear in my mind because of the work we are doing at the moment what the right way to do that is.

I prefer to say that our system where we pay an allowance over the course of a year based on how many times you are asked to be on-call is more economical for us. That may not work for other forces. They may prefer to go with a fixed fee amount.

MR CREW: We will come on to solutions later on so we will have an answer for you maybe.

MS NAYLOR: Thank you.

MR CREW: Any other points we want to make about on-call payments?

MR RENNIE: Yes. The police arbitration tribunal said it should be national because there is such

a difference within the country. I am grateful for the comments in relation to recognition of the inconvenience that on-call places on individuals. And let us not forget, by placing on people on-call there is a significant saving to the service because they don't have to have someone on duty and available. So it is right that it should be compensated appropriately. All ranks.

My personal view is that this should be an allowance for each occasion that it is required to be worked and the on-call should be voluntary although it would be part of a role, which is the case now, because it is usually a specialist. That should still be voluntary as part of that because you are making a significant imposition on that person's private life and creating difficulties for them.

MR WILLIAMS: I would speak up if I can for police staff on this. I always thought it was very reassuring to have specialist staff who said for a week: I'm available for the 168 hours of the week if there is an incident. I am thinking particularly of very specialist people like occupational health. If there was a major incident we knew who to call out. They could be there and

supporting the operational policing.

Actually when I stood back from it and saw the letter signed and said what we gave them for the first six months, when you looked at the deductions after that I thought it was a goodwill gesture back from the force to individuals who had made significant sacrifices for a week, all the things that Ali has covered and Ian's covered, for quite small levels of remuneration. So I'm quite a supporter of it because it gave reassurance to people on the 11th floor in Lloyd House.

MR WINSOR: How small are these levels of remuneration?
I know it varies. Give me an idea.

MR WILLIAMS: Derek will know better than me but I think we were paying £400 for every six months for a police staff to be on a rota, named specialists. So after deductions they probably were walking away with £8 or £9 a week to cover. That was the sort of our figure at local level. Is that fair?

MR WINSOR: Is that adequate remuneration?

MR RENNIE: Our claim was in for a percentage of pay whatever rank you were at which was 0.1 per cent if it was a duty day, 0.2 per cent if it was a rest

day, 0.5 per cent if you were on leave. That was the claim that was on the table on behalf of some of the federated ranks. That would at least give some parity, if slightly more than police staff get, between £25 and £30 per occasion is my understanding around the country.

But there is some variance on this and that is why we think there should be some national allowance for this so there is some recognition of the commitment people are making from their lives to give that cover where the forces are not having to have someone on duty and employing additional people.

I think it would be more relevant as we move forward as well particularly in the current economic climate.

MR WINSOR: Chris Hanrahan, you were shaking your head when Ian Rennie said police staff get £25 or so on occasion.

MR HANRAHAN: I was shaking my head at the higher £30 a session, that much. The point I would make about on-call, it is not just the individual themselves it inconveniences. It is the whole family. So if somebody is on-call it affects their whole ability to actually engage in family life by virtue of being at the call of the employer.

So the small amount of money they get paid for being on-call is a very very small compensation for that, as David has pointed out. It doesn't actually equate much over a period of time.

Police staff rates are based on periods of on-call up to 12 hours so they get paid a certain rate for each period they are actually on-call. I think the Federation are advocating a similar set up for themselves, is my understanding.

MR RENNIE: Yes, a 24 hour period.

MR CASSIDY: Just to point out, I am sure some are aware, superintendent ranks don't get any payment for being on-call and they are probably on-call more than anybody else. As our numbers are declining at the moment quite significantly those levels of on-call commitment are increasing and we have currently some horror stories out there about our members being on-call on a day off or annual leave because there is nobody else to do it. So I think that is something that --

MR CREW: That last bit aside, is not the 24 hour availability of a superintendent part of the salary package?

MR CASSIDY: It is but that is completely different to

being on-call.

MR CREW: I accept that.

MR WINSOR: Why is it different?

MR CASSIDY: Because if you think it through nobody can be on duty 24 hours, 365 days.

MR WINSOR: Available for duty though.

MR CASSIDY: They can't realistically, can they? So we developed on-call arrangements to cover that but none of them attract any extra payment and the numbers of on-call responsibilities overtime have gone up. They have gone up for our members and they have gone down for ACPO as our members have taken on more and more of the responsibilities for operational policing from ACPO in recent years at gold and silver level.

MR RENNIE: Just to clarify, there is a recall to duty. All officers can be recalled to duty.

MR CREW: Yes.

MR RENNIE: Obviously. If you are unfit for duty because you actually have a day off and you have had a drink then you can actually say, "I'm sorry, I have had a drink. I'm not fit for duty", and it is not a disciplinary offence. Whereas the sort of situation that Graham is talking about they tell

you: you will be recalled because you are on notice that you will be recalled in the event that something happens. So the expectation is they are going to be recalled so, therefore, the restrictions are placed upon them in their family lives I think. And that is the distinction between the recall and the on-call.

MR DRYSDALE: It is a related point, sir. I think there is a difference between being on-call and being called back and I don't know if there is any sophisticated or mature data around the numbers of sessions that people are on-call and the numbers of times they are actually called back or have to interrupt their day.

I have only ever worked for the police and the military and in the military I was on-call all of the time and didn't receive any payment or overtime and yet culturally it was acceptable for me to be disturbed or be called back or work overtime any time. There is a big cultural difference between police and military and maybe if we are thinking outside of the box that is an employment model we might want to consider in terms of how that operates very effectively and efficiently and within a reducing

budget envelope.

MR WINSOR: There are many professions which have on-call at no additional payment: the legal profession, the veterinary profession and a number of others where you are required in the middle of the night to wake up very quickly and do things which could make a difference of life and death. So the police service is not unique. That is not to say it should not be adequately compensated for the disturbance.

MR CREW: Let us move on, we will come to solutions on that because I am sure they are knocking around in the room somewhere.

Mutual Aid Rates

MR CREW: We will move on to mutual aid rates now. I think we are talking about the Hertfordshire agreement, how that operates, is it satisfactory, what are the frustrations with it? What I have lost track of because I have been away from the service for a little while is just how much mutual aid is actually worked now. Clearly there have been major events historically and there have been massive amounts of mutual aid. I am not sure how

much of an issue it practically is rather than theoretically it is any more. Thanks. I feel much better informed now.

MR MORRIS: Derek and I are nodding at each because of the Olympic piece and I don't want anything said to jeopardise the ongoing discussions on the specifics around the Olympics. In general, a fairly obvious observation from me would be that people need to be compensated for being away from home for a long period of time. I think, without prejudice to any arrangement around the Olympics, in general going forward I think that the compensation needs to be revisited because I think it is probably more than it needs to be.

MR CASSIDY: To answer your first question. I think the numbers of events, big events where there has been significant mutual aid over the past years has probably not been that great but there is a lot of collaborative working arrangements which have developed in recent times that have been bound up by the existing arrangements about being on-call that are from the Hertfordshire agreement that I think lead us to a situation where we need to review it and sort it out and also you could say

I think Hertfordshire has done the service a good job in terms of being able to shift people quickly and deal with stuff in the last 20 years. It is time to look at it.

In a sense, I have been quite frustrated because we have been looking at it through a PNB working group. The association has been involved and the Federation talking through the issues and we have seen at one stage, not too far recently, away from an agreement for compensating officers in a balanced way, as Richard describes, which I think is fair and proper only for it to elude us because the official sides failed to agree. And I think we could be not far away from getting a workable solution to this and maybe part of the impetus of this review could be to get those people back round the table and to get somewhere. Without taking about figures in the room I don't think we are that far away from a workable solution that takes us forward.

MR RENNIE: I don't want to go into detail. It is subject to the PNB working group. It is on hold pending this review but obviously with the Olympics coming we recognise the importance of trying to

develop protocols, how that will work, that time period. And those discussions are ongoing. In fact we had a meeting a couple of weeks ago and those are ongoing.

We feel that bearing in mind that Hertfordshire is in fact - when you deploy somebody very quickly 24 hours payment for being away from home, being held in reserve and unable to come back for 24 hours and that was reduced to 16 as long as adequate accommodation is provided.

We still feel that that is adequate compensation and most officers who go on these events are deployed for 12 to 16 hours anyway. We feel that it is recognised within the service that this is a fair way of compensating people who are taken away from the families who are moved all around the country. So that is our position. But obviously we are discussing around the edges and margins of that in relation to the Olympic situation.

MR CREW: Yes. And I assume the collaborative working -- I am picking up Graham's point -- that really must be having an impact and will continue having an impact as they grow.

MR RENNIE: Absolutely. The other thing I want to

mention is secondments. There has been a couple of incidents recently, the Suffolk murders where mutual aid was called for and within a period of time it was clear it was going to be a long-term investigation. So what they do then, they second the officers to work there and agree the hours that they will work and where they will be put up and people then do that voluntarily. There is a difference between volunteering to go and do some work through secondments or through collaborations and being directed away and away you go for a week and you are going to have to do this and there is no choice. I think that has to be recognised.

Specials

MR CREW: We just have a few minutes for the last one to look at before we move on to trying to find some solutions. The use of specials, the use of special constabularies which has been in the news a bit later. You are smiling again, Ali. You are in great danger of having to lead on this. David.

MR WILLIAMS: I will try and put this carefully. I don't think the service has really put specials at the level that perhaps they should have done.

I know it is trotted out but this idea of the big society and the volunteer army, which I think the previous administration talked about, I think is important.

I only wished that this could have been picked up nationally much more than, if you like, at force level because at the end of the day, as Mr Winsor said at the beginning, we all rely on the police and I never understood why we couldn't reach major accommodations with major employers that they would commit some of their labour resource to be specials to police their particular sites. I am thinking about the big retailers, health trusses, local authorities. Why that concordat could never have been reached nationally. That the Tescos of this world would say, "With a similar work force to the police service we will try and find 3,000 special constables." And in return the service would then say, "We would support you in allowing you to police your environments to create a safer Britain." So that would be where I would start rather than forces locally, trying to do it in perhaps quite a patchwork way.

MR CREW: Ian, while other people are thinking you can

talk.

MR RENNIE: An interesting proposition by David and there are concerns that big organisations will be able to afford to employ people and then have them as specials over probably 40 hours a week and that will be part of their full-time job. That is my only concern at this. This is a voluntary reserve type force and it should be recognised that it is that. And yes, we should be encouraging people to become specials. In fact, we are currently exploring the possibility of bringing specials under the umbrella of the Police Federation of England and Wales and hopefully something will come to our conference next year where that might be considered. But that is the position. We recognise it.

But people have to understand that they are volunteers. They can't always be relied upon to turn up. And if you want to put some remuneration into it then that has to be considered in the round as an incentive. These people also have jobs. The working time directive has to apply with what they do in their other employment when they come in to do police duties.

Finally, I will say that there is a rigorous recruitment process for police officers who have the office of constable. There needs to be a significant rigorous process for the selection of specials otherwise you could find yourself in a situation, where it happened in GMP where a special constable goes to prison whilst undertaking his duties in that regard.

That is why I have some concern there should be a more rigorous selection process for specials.

MR WILLIAMS: Just for clarification, and I apologise to Ian if I didn't make it clear, it would not be having people working for 40 hours. It would be doing their contract with their employer and then putting on some extra duty time as a special. And total support for all the vetting and rigour that has to applied to selection of them.

MR CASSIDY: I just think it is worth mentioning certainly in the last five to ten years the number of specials has gone up significantly and I think that is a real plus for the service. We are probably better and better than we have been in recruiting specials but we still lose them more often than we need to and I think the area of

retention is something we could do more about.

A couple of threats though for me on the back of the comprehensive spending review. A lot of specials are serving members of support staff and as those numbers go down we may lose some specials on the back of that unless they continue to take on special constabulary duties when they no longer have a job. So I think that is a risk.

But we support certainly more widespread use of specials and deployment of them.

MR CREW: Okay. Thank you.

MR HANRAHAN: Just regards from a service perspective and the superintendents have alluded to that slightly. It is about how we manage our police staff. There are special constables who work for the force. At present, I'm not aware of any sort of scheme where they are allowed to undertake their special constabulary work during duty time. Surely there must be some scope if we allow them to give time off for working as specials to prevent them from clocking up too much time and also to ensure that we are using them and maximising their ability to do a useful job for the service and undertaking the duties of a constable.

I know that is slightly controversial and dangerous ground but I think if the organisation is willing to accommodate special constables that work for it, then surely there is some merit in that.

MR CREW: I think Graham is saying he does have.

MR CASSIDY: I think that is the case in a lot of forces.

MR CREW: Lots and lots of nods to that.

MR WILLIAMS: In my previous role I didn't always agree with Unison but I totally agree with that, Chris.

MR HANRAHAN: I will make a note of that.

MR WILLIAMS: There is huge value in the police staff transfer of skills across to being a special constable and then in reverse, a special constable skills back to the police staff role. Whatever happens under the spending review the service will still have a significant number of police staff working for it and they will be ripe for engaging special constables. I fully agree with you.

MR WINSOR: Just on the issue of paying specials, has anybody done any analysis on the issue of how that may trigger undue discrimination against part-time workers? Unless they are paid pro rata what a police constable is paid then there may be

a legal difficulty in terms of their being paid presumably significantly less than the pro rata of a police constable and therefore that triggering a legal claim or a difficulty of that kind. Has anybody done any analysis of that or aware of it?

MR WILLIAMS: Derek will perhaps have a slightly different view to me. We did pay -- coming back to Chris's point, an honorarium which I would probably not describe as substantive pay to police staff who became specials which we worked at something like 1,500 a year. I think it then equated to about £7 an hour. So it was above the minimum wage but it was paid as honorarium not, if you like, as a salaried. So it was an emolument really. I don't know where equality and discriminatory legislation works on emoluments to pay under the Equal Pay Act.

MR DRYSDALE: I don't think I would want to go there.

MR CREW: Derek, did you want to add to that at all?

MR SMITH: Just to come back and say, why does the police service use specials and how does it use specials because I think it is important to understand where they fit into the picture. My understanding, for what it is worth, is that there

are two elements to the use of specials. One is the broad church approach: the idea that the policing of a community is in part by that community and that the use of special constables helps to create the basis that there is a community interaction. And so you encourage specials from the community because it helps to create policing with consent.

So the idea of a volunteer force that is based on the community is an important part of delivering the service.

What it can also do is to deliver some capacity providing that specials are organised, supervised and trained. And so if you have organised, supervised and trained specials you can create some additional capacity in and around the policing environment.

Our experience is this: and that is that people come with lots of different expectations about what a special's role is. As a consequence we as a force see probably 30 to 35 per cent churn in the number of special constables in a year. So does that mean it is a successful approach? I think actually the jury is out on that.

How do you make it more successful? Partly it is cultural leadership and supervision. I wouldn't move away from those really important aspects. At the moment though there is no other remuneration other than payment for expenses around specials. So in a sense, a force is kitting these people out, and we do provide annual uniform. We then do some clear training. We put them on the streets and watch a 30 to 35 per cent churn. It would be very useful for us to create a two-sided equation, one about commitment to tours of duty and the other if it was then remunerated in a successful way. Then I think we begin to have the basis of a more stable special constabulary because at the moment I think we gain some bits but it is not altogether as successful as it could be.

MR GIBBS: I think there is huge potential here and we take the view that actually there is untapped potential to expand the special constabulary much further and there is actually, as you said, an increase in the last few years but the historic decline is well known. In the 1960s there were 55,000 specials and at a time when we had fewer officers as well and a lower population so they

were a bigger part of the mix.

There are the societal changes but there is no good reason why we couldn't increase numbers further. I think in order to do that we could look at remuneration but I don't necessarily think we need to go down that route. There are other ways of providing financial incentives for people who volunteer to encourage both a more regular commitment and better retention which is a problem. There are individual schemes with forces. For example, Hampshire has the council tax discount scheme which is an agreement with the local authority to provide specials who fulfil their allotted hours to receive council tax discounts which provides a direct financial incentive in a way that I think wouldn't obviously put a burden on police budgets in the same way. Churn is not in volunteer terms a mark of failure. If you look to churn rates --

MR SMITH: It is an administrative difficulty to do it every time.

MR GIBBS: Some of the time.

MR SMITH: It is an on cost.

MR GIBBS: But the Territorial Army, the Navy reserves

will have the same levels of churn if not more. So it is in the nature of volunteer arrangements that you have applicants who apply and for whatever reason choose not to stay on. It is not to be dismissed but I don't think it is a problem that we can't overcome. I think the scope for more use of specials is clearly there and I think the private sector avenue as well with sponsorship and corporates could be very fruitful as well.

MR CREW: Okay, we will start to talk around solutions. Steve, is this still more of the current problems we have now or is it part of the solutions? If it is solutions store it but we will move on.

MR CORKERTON: I think it is a problem and a solution. I will outline it and you can knock me back if I am going too far.

I think one of the inhibitors for specials is that they haven't been in many forces seen as part of the core resource. So the demand and shift -- it brings it back to shifts and overtime -- isn't being looked at with them in mind. It is being looked at with them as a separate group generally run by a commandant and the force is lucky to have them and some forces have drawn on them more than

others but hasn't seen them as an integral option on the menu of resource choices. I guess that is where I would stop at that point.

Solutions

MR CREW: We are going to move on now to considering where we should go from here really. This is the stage when you write the report for Tom and me, or Tom mainly. Because we need to know now given the problems that we have discussed what you would do to improve the situation if indeed you think it needs improving. And when we are talking about improving things, again, we are not talking about doing this with the Government. This is about how do we improve things for officers, for police staff, for their line managers, for the decisions they have to take, the organisations and most importantly, the public that they serve. So we are going to start and we have a fair chunks of time because that is the way we have structured the programme, but I am sure we will whiz through it, by going back right to the start today and we are going to start talking about shift arrangements.

In a sense you could approach this either by saying:

how do we improve what we have got? Or if we didn't have anything what would we have?

So I don't mind which way we come into it but the way we move forward to give better shift arrangements, if that is necessary, for those groups I have described.

MR WILLIAMS: If I can come back to a point that Richard made earlier on about the team working on shifts. I think one thing in the Accenture report of 2004, and I am not certain how it has been explored in the service, was the idea of team self-rostering. Now, I have to plead I only have limited experience of seeing this in action but I have actually found it quite powerful where the team is responsible, in a sense, reporting through to their management of how they manage to meet demand, service, all those requirements, and it does some very interesting things to attendance levels. It does some very interesting things to the morale of the team. It bonds teams together. So there is that sort of mutual, we talked about mutual aid, but it is mutual aid within teams then. So I felt that Accenture did look at that in 2004.

I thought that had some merit to be looked at and I may be hugely wrong and people will say it is working brilliantly right across the service. I can't comment on that.

MR CREW: Have you seen it working anywhere?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, we worked it in some of our telephony systems in the West Midlands and it worked well in moving up attendance levels. People were supporting each other. So if people had a crisis like childcare, given this was a predominantly female workforce in central telephony and in the control room, it worked well because people stood in and it bonded people and got that camaraderie that Richard talked about earlier.

MR RENNIE: I don't know whether it is throughout the prison service but my brother is a prison officer and they self-roster and they have to do some core mains et cetera and they do one set of nights, seven a year or something and they have to roster them all in, and it works quite well. They can pick their own days off as requested. I don't know any more details than that but I do know, he assures me, it operates extremely effectively

because people can work when they want to work. The police have this fear that everyone wants to work 9 to 5 Monday to Friday and as a police officer who used to work shifts all the time, I actually hated them. I actually preferred working shifts because it gives you more quality time off through the week when everybody else is working.

MR CREW: Any other views on shift patterns?

MR WILLIAMS: Could I just say on the prison service Accenture were only able to report on that in 2004 and weren't able to prove for the prison service that it was a well tried and tested model. It was working but I think if the review was looking at these, they would need to go back to the prison service and test that with all parties that it was effective as a team process.

MR GIBBONS: I will just re-raise a point.

MR CREW: Now you are round the table, Anthony, you are welcome to speak.

MR GIBBONS: It goes back to a previous point that was made, that it shouldn't be an automatic assumption that shift work is any type of work which is unappealing. As Ian rightly pointed out, for a young guy racing around evenings are actually

desirable in many instances. And I think that is probably where the concept of the likes of advance constable or certainly possibly paying more for senior officers to stick around those sort of roles. Experience becomes an issue. But certainly to immediately assume that assumption that shift working is unappealing or the recruitment of those roles is difficult I think is a bit of a mistake.

MR PUGH: Just on the self-rostering point, and Ian mentioned earlier about the balance between the needs of the public, the force and the individual. I am not sure self-rostering recognises the needs of the public sufficiently when going about self-rostering and we do need to remember that if it was the public who were rostering on behalf of police officers, they might self-roster in a very different way.

MR CREW: You could put parameters around the freedoms that were in there.

MR PUGH: Certainly you would need to have some parameters there but I would just like to --

MR CREW: Flag the issue.

MR PUGH: The Government is very keen that the public gets the service that it needs.

MR MORRIS: The only point I was going to make is, as I look at it, it is two separate issues in that it is deciding what the shifts would be and then filling in according to the kind of self-rostering piece, which I think is Ian's brother's situation. So you have your consultation process and decide what the shift roster is. And then as a separate phase you then organise yourselves to kind of populate it.

I must say I was taken with the example that Ian gave of Merseyside in terms of Thursday, Friday, Saturday nights and I think it is a good example of how we collectively just need to be a little bit more imaginative, and also I guess, for my own part, and the parts of other people in similar positions to me, I guess if you are put in something like that place, then to be extremely understanding about the remaining 10 hours in that example and not start getting into: who is doing what when and getting precious about when the carrot, if you like, as opposed to the stick bit is kind of being taken.

MR CREW: But it is only a stick bit if there is no reward. We touched on this earlier on about

whether --

MR MORRIS: But that is a reward, isn't it, Ted?

I think the 10 hours flexibility, as I understood it, so you take the extra 10 hours work when it suits you. You put that in when it suits you. As I understand it, that is the carrot.

MR CREW: I guess what I am asking is, should the carrot be, given the proportion of officers on shifts substantially changes Edmund Davies and the 9 per cent, should there be a separate compensation for that sort of shift work or should we pay officers for working what are described as unsocial hours?

MR MORRIS: Yes. So back to the issue about remuneration.

MR CREW: It doesn't matter what you do with the other 10 hours. The carrot actually is reward for the --

MR MORRIS: If I may, I think it does to an extent. This is where it does get quite difficult I think with shift work and with making the demarcation decisions because you have plenty of people who work antisocial hours but, for example, don't work night duty very often. So you might have, for example, an arrangement for keeping a police

station front office open by the police staff or police officers doing earlies and lates or the custody office or something like that. So then you can get into arguments: well that's not too bad because they are not having to do nights.

It comes back to our earlier discussion. It is quite difficult to differentiate and say, "Right, this package of people deserve X amount and this package of people deserve Y amount."

My own unhelpful position, as stated earlier, is that I think it is right to try to reward those who are doing antisocial hours and at the coalface but it is quite complex, I think, how you do that.

MR CORKERTON: I think you have described to me very well the sort of tension between running a cooperative and running a business - where does policing fit; it has a foot in both camps. So hearing the debate, the last couple of contributors, it sounds like we will be organising arrangements about where would people like to fit in. Surely this should be driven by the demands on the business and we are not good enough yet at all at actually understanding the incoming requirements in terms of demands on policing and then aligning

our resources to it. For me you then put fair reward to the resources for the complexities of the task that you ask them to discharge.

So I personally would be going back to, we should pay people different premia for working in different antisocial conditions but it should all be based around: what is the business demand, rather than what would they like to work? But I would accept that that goes to the heart of the team of policing, and does that change the dynamic in the way that people work in the organisation?

MR MORRIS: A very quick response. I think it does again come back to the two phases to me in that phase one I think is absolutely that piece in terms of the hours that need to be covered should be and how many people should cover them. I then think it is incumbent on all of us to get the phase two bits, such that it is done with as much agreement and consent of the workforce as possible.

MR CORKERTON: But when it isn't, when you get to that point when you can't do it by democracy?

MR MORRIS: No, I ...

MR CREW: Don't worry, I am going to work round all of you. Dale.

MR BASSETT: I actually just wanted to build on this point about the importance of being demand led and business needs and particularly the needs of the public. Tom, I appreciate what you said right at the very beginning about this not being about cuts and needing to create a system that endures. At the same time, I think we can all agree, it would be stupid to have the conversation in isolation from the budget reductions which are going to happen over the next few years. It is worth bearing in mind, I think, that as those take hold police officer numbers are probably going to fall, particularly in some forces. Police staff numbers are going to fall quite substantially and so a number of chief constables said to me, for example, that they are going to find it increasingly difficult to meet the requirements in terms of demand given the lack of flexibility in the existing shift patterns.

So I think the point that was made earlier, particularly about defaulting to the 8 hour shift pattern, is one whose importance is going to become even more important as chief constables try to meet that demand.

So I would just like us to bear in mind that sort of change in resources as we move forward.

MR CREW: Thank you. Ali.

MS NAYLOR: Just a couple of points. The first thing is whilst I am absolutely in favour of anything where people have a say in how they work their hours, my concern at the moment is we are under a lot of pressure in the police service frankly to move away from back office functions or support functions or whatever words we want to call them and redeploy our resources to the front line. What has been described to me sounds very complicated quite administratively, resource intensive and I think it would want to understand whether or not we could run one of those systems without having to have quite a complicated infrastructure supporting it and making sure it works. My gut is telling me that we will end up with more people in HR administering this shift system and I am not sure that is what our priority should be, or within functions doing that kind of thing.

So the plea from me is that when we look at shift and shift systems and how we depoloy resources we come up with something that is effective and simple to

administer and put in place and if it can accommodate the needs of the individual and give that degree of flexibility, if there is a system that would do that, that would be great but it does have to be practical and workable and it does have to be simple I think.

MR WILLIAMS: Just before we had the break Ian and I were just sharing some experiences we had mutually that the case law at the Court of Appeal did say that you can pay police officers more if they work 24/7.

MR CREW: Sorry, say that again.

MR WILLIAMS: There is strong case law which we were both involved in with previous --

MR CREW: Could we have the case so we can look at it up so we can find out what was actually said?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, we will give you the case. It was an interesting process for both sides. I agree with what has been said, but I would say, just to clarify what I did say, because I don't ever believe we should run cooperatives in that sense without a management overlay. The 2000 report did say that the demand profile for policing was very similar between even Metropolitan and rural forces

so, therefore, we have some knowledge about what demand profile looks like. I think against that, all I was suggesting is maybe these are avenues if we are looking at new solutions where I have seen in a very limited way where the teams do work very effectively in resourcing against a roster which is decreed managerially.

MR RENNIE: Absolutely. It is in two parts to support Richard there and what David has said.

Self-rostering is flexible working by any other name, whether it is fixed shifts or just flexibility within the roster. I am sorry, I don't wish to be disparaging but if we don't know our business by now, there is something wrong with the police. We know when we are busy. Everybody knows when we are busy. So what you do is you roster how many people you need at that particular time and say, "Slot into those hours", and that would give people the flexibility to slot into the hours that they want. At the peak times and the busy times we have additional people.

MR CREW: But the HMI's report earlier this year said that that wasn't actually what happened. That the highest demand time was when there was the lowest

proportion of police officers. All the officers were on duty at 9 o'clock on a Monday morning.

MR RENNIE: If all the police officers are on duty at 9 o'clock in the morning somebody has to take responsibility why they are rostered at 9 o'clock in the morning. And they should be putting the roster down to Friday and Saturday night whenever the peaks are. That is what this is about.

MR CREW: And that is not what is happening.

MR RENNIE: That is not what is happening. It is about providing the flexibility.

Can I just give you one example? I went to about 32 forces over several years delivering seminars, maternity in the morning, flexible working in the afternoon to try and get people on board with where we need to go with this. I went to one force and I was given an example where a woman who had seven years service, operational police officer on response, loved doing her job, became estranged from her husband, had a seven year old son, went to the bosses there and said, "I want to work permanent nights for a period of time which will allow me some stability in my life. My husband's left me. It means I can take my son to my mother's

at night. Come to work. Pick him up in the morning. Take him to school. Sleep. Get him home in the afternoon. Spend some quality time with him and come back to work in the evening. I will keep the same rest day pattern as my shift and I will work the same hours on the days that my shift works and I will have that bit of overlap. Why can't I do that?" "You can't. You'll set a precedent over everyone."

This is just ridiculous. This is the intransigence within management in the police service that I have experienced going round the country. This is about opening up and thinking outside the box about giving people the flexibility to work when we need them. Balancing the needs of the service with needs of individuals. And we don't do that.

The number of times I have walked into a room and said: flexible working in the police service is not half past nine to half past 3 Monday to Friday and I am really sorry, this is a 24/7 service and everybody needs to engage with it: the management, the people in it, everybody. And some of them didn't like it.

MS NAYLOR: Can I just say, my concern about the shifts and self-rostering has nothing to do with matching

demand. I think we are quite capable of identifying the demands and matching it. My concerns are actually people issues that are will come out as a result of it. If you have actually particular strong characters in a particular group, then there is propensity for workplace bullying. There is propensity for lots of grievances, lots of debate and discussion about who has managed to get on to the computer first. There is the general race to the day that the book opens and everybody can put their shifts in.

What you tend to get from this and my experience is in anecdotally again, I would want to be convinced on this, is that you get a bureaucracy dealing with grievances and unfairness and claims around that that actually is really hard to administer and ends up with you having the administrative burden. It is not about matching to demand. It is about how people actually work it, how good a team they are.

MR WILLIAMS: Can I just support a slight aside of what Ian has just said. Crime in West Midlands was 15 years ago a male reserve in the main. When you look at the way that workforce composition has changed it is very appropriate for flexible working

and the preponderance of women as detective constables working in crime in the West Midlands has increased considerably, enormously because it does have these sort of patterns of work.

You set an example. I agree with Ian, as long as you have the management discipline, and I agree with all that there has to be management discipline and control and oversight, but I think we are at the exciting stage of how we deploy people and resources in perhaps different ways than we did a decade ago or even five years ago. And I think that is part of what the review is about.

MR CREW: But the evidence is that women are still underrepresented.

MR WILLIAMS: Not in West Midlands crime.

MR CREW: Sorry, I wasn't talking specifically about West Midlands.

MR WILLIAMS: But the generational thing will flow through anyway with intake levels of now 40 per cent women coming into the service. Over time the preponderance and proportions are going to increase and they will drive into the specialist areas over time.

MR CREW: Can I come back to you, Chris?

MR HANRAHAN: It is going to be very difficult to be prescriptive with regard to flexible working.

I think the best you can achieve is to get forces to explore the possibilities and lay down some guidance and some benchmarking, to say the least, to consider. It should be for each employer to make up its own mind as to how best to achieve that.

Going back to how we seek remuneration for people on shifts, I take you back to the police staff terms and conditions which have different levels of compensation for different types of work. That has worked quite well for us and when we have had shift changes on occasion people may go up or down a scale depending on the span of hours and the work it is required for them to undertake. However, it is a fair way of compensating people for different degrees of unsocial work.

MR RENNIE: Just in support of David, it is the second time this morning I have agreed. Part of what I have been saying for the last number of years is that the police service has changed, for the better I may add, and is no longer male dominated with the recruitment of high numbers of women. Some forces

over the last five years have recruited between 40 and 50 per cent.

With that comes a different management issue.

Unfortunately the service is slow to change from old management practices. We find ourselves now during the last seven years, probably having recruited about 35 per cent of our front line resources who are women, average age 27 to 29, who will require some flexibility within their working hours because they are the primary carers. If we don't start to get a grip of this and manage this properly we are going to have some serious operational resilience problems in the future. We are storing up a problem.

And, with David, I think this is an exciting opportunity for this review to give that clear steer as to move that forward to deal with that difficult challenge the service has yet to address.

MR CASSIDY: I think what occurred to me is that we need some examples of good practice and there are some examples out there. Some of them are historical, Merseyside perhaps. Others perhaps more recent, in the West Mids. We need to capture those examples of best practice and this team

perhaps to say to chief constables, "Look at that, do something with it", and then hold them to account through police authorities and HMIC to ensure that they are putting best practice in.

MR CORKERTON: Just a couple of points. I can't let it pass that we understand demand well in the police service yet. I think we understand better demand than we did five years ago but I wouldn't say it is anywhere near well, and all my understanding is that demand does vary from force to force and BCU to BCU and it is actually the devil is in the detail. It is always busy on Friday night and that is the busiest point in every force but actually when it starts and how high the work peaks in relation to other nights is different. So actually we have a long way to go for understanding demand.

I am then happy if we are working to that that we have debate with staff around work/life balance within the needs of the business but that needs to be simple, which is Ali's point.

And lastly for me, there needs to be a device at the end for when agreement can't be reached. Kind of actually is it incentive or is it compulsion? But

if everyone does end up wanting to do permanent nights, how are you going to even out after you have had the debate? It might be that the mix of the team, if it is big enough, will all fall into place and perfectly match the shift pattern but what's the incentive or penalty at the end or device that will drive through to a conclusion?

For me, if we are going to run an efficient organisation moving forward and really say that we are totally efficient, there is a lot to do on understanding demand yet.

MR RENNIE: Can I just give you the examples. In 2006 as part of the gender duty that came in, the Ministerial Women in Police Steering Group developed flexible working guidance for the police service and it included the management perspective, officers, staff and that was published and was available on the Home Office website. I will be really surprised if many people in this room have actually seen it. It contains good examples including the Merseyside one because I was instrumental in writing that, together with a number of others. I don't know whether it is still in existence because I am aware that the NPIA

were trying to rewrite it and the last draft I saw I said we wouldn't sign up to it because it wasn't improving the guidance. It was making it worse. So.

That guidance was available and published as part of the gender unit and has the examples that you might need.

MR CREW: Thank you for that.

Overtime

MR CREW: Let us move on to the overtime issue again. Overtime. £358 million. So peanuts? A large amount of money. It is a small amount of money relative to the total police budget but still a very large amount of money.

MR PUGH: 387 million in 08/09.

MR CREW: Thank you, Richard. That was top of the head so I will excuse myself if you have a note.

MR PUGH: For officers.

MR CREW: So it is a large amount of money. Are we content or do we want to make changes to the way that overtime is dealt with in the police service? Is that the sort of figure we should be paying? If it is not, how do we deal with that? How do we

approach that?

MR SMITH: I just want to make one point with 387 million. Let us remember that some of that overtime is to do with the policing of commercial events or football for which there is a chunk of money which is, in effect, self-funding. So let us start with the tip --

MR CREW: Have you any idea what we are talking about there, Derek?

MR SMITH: No, off the top of my head I don't.

MR CREW: What would it be for the West Midlands as a total of your proportion?

MR SMITH: We probably spend 1.5 million on football in an overtime bill excluding public holiday overtime, just about 9 to 10 million.

Remember the number of commercial events are rising across the country, particularly the festival industry has grown in the last five years so special police service, which is generally funded out of overtime, is a component.

Secondly, initiative money. There has been in the past five years a fair amount of initiative money which is effectively put by partners or frankly, the Home Office for the Government who want to encourage

particular events or initiatives to take place. The funding of police overtime to deliver short-term deliverables is actually part and parcel of the culture. So it is recognised that those two parts are in there, in the landscape as well as general overtime running.

I come back to a clear point now. The regulations around overtime are complicated and complex and when you have to refer to people who have specialist knowledge about regulations I think then you have lost the transparency of the arrangement. I see Ian shaking his head. Clearly we are going to have a difference here. From my point of view it needs to be clear and transparent and frankly the rates need to change and that is true both of general overtime and short notice overtime and secondly, mutual aid overtime, and I will talk about that later.

MR WILLIAMS: If you ran a payroll enquiry to ask for the 250 top police officer earners I would be surprised if many front line officers figured in that: the 24/7 officers, the neighbourhood officers. It would be specialists.

I think in any debate there has to be a need to look at

this, about whether the work pattern is right, whether the processes are right. Because at the end of the day the public will probably relate to police being the front line, neighbourhood and 24/7 officers. The overtime, I don't know whether it is true for the Met but certainly when we looked at the West Midlands, it was populated most by detectives and intelligence officers, surveillance officers and counter terrorist officers.

MR CREW: Does anybody have an observation about that, experience in other forces?

MR HAYS: Night and day pay, this is from my experience in the National Crime Squad. I will talk about that first. It applies to my experience in Sussex police as well in terms of how we actually resourced your investigation capability because actually often overtime was used as part of the incentive to do that.

MR CREW: Sorry, was it an incentive or was a necessity in the sense that, you get a murder, it has to be resourced straightaway. As the regulations are currently structured less than five days notice, almost inevitably you are going to catch large numbers of officers in that to. So was it a

by-product of that or was it, if you like, Spanish practices around it?

MR HAYS: You could use that phrase potentially to describe it. But the fact is that certainly within the crime squad the start of the working day was set at 6 am. There was no shift pattern but we recognised that we had people working across the 24 hours and that was used as an attraction method to get officers in. It was surveillance work, investigation work. It was something we had a constant battle with with the SOI detectives because they didn't want to introduce any kind of structure to this which might reduce it because it is part of the reason why people stay here. Certainly when I was in Sussex, at Brighton, it was going back a few years now at a time when it was very male dominated and this was when it was really focussing on -- you had your murders, you would have serious crimes occur of course, but for the normal run-of-the-mill work I think the office covered maybe a 16-hour span but it was operating over 24 hours. And that 24 hours operated on overtime. It was a way of getting people in and retaining them.

That is when it was notoriously difficult to get people into CID and that was the trade off. So there was a cultural issue there certainly and it was very acute in the crime squad and in my work with forces now that doesn't seem to have changed.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR DRYSDALE: I mean the notion of having overtime I think is an important one to just address because based against risk, threat, all of those uncertainty things that we have, I think chief constables, individual chief constables in the same way as they set levels of reserve that they are comfortable with against the risk that they face should set what overtime budget they want because they can easily convert it now. It is not the early 1990s but we had to ask the Home Office if we could have more officers or whether it was overtime. That is within the gift of chief constables and police authorities to say, "I am comfortable with this amount of overtime and I want to convert a chunk into officers" as to which they feel is the best economic means to an end. So I think the notion of having overtime is important. The rates and the notice periods is where I think

this review should perhaps turn its attention and allow chief constables to set the levels at which they want overtime budgets to exist. Because I think it is the rates and notice periods that are perhaps lagging behind time not favouring officers in some instances and certainly not favouring the organisations and the end users.

MR CREW: Tell us a bit more about that then.

MR DRYSDALE: Well, I think it is right and proper to reward people if we disrupt them but if I was running a business and there is a cheaper way of getting people to give me labour I would do it. So therefore I might offer overtime at late notice because I am busy to people who are prepared to do it rather than those who are on a different notice period.

So if at the end of a shift we are really busy and I want to get people to work on because I have lots of prisoners to be processed, I want to do it in the most economical way possible. Not necessarily according to who is on what notice. Observing issues around health and safety and working time, I would like to have some freedoms and flexibilities to be able to meet the demand as

economically as possible bearing in mind that there is a health and safety issue.

It is the notice periods that bother me greatly.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR PUGH: Returning to the research that I mentioned earlier, the two key bits from that were, and we spoke to neighbourhood, response and investigation officers, and certainly reflected in what Richard [Morris] said earlier, neighbourhood and response officers were really not very interested in working overtime beyond their shift because they felt very overworked anyhow. Certainly the investigative officers were much keener to work overtime, and in fact in many instances the anecdotal evidence said to us that was the reason why they had moved there in the first place.

Much of that is because in neighbourhood and response functions there has been a lot more work on demand analysis of where the peaks and troughs are. There hasn't been in the investigative functions and that seems to me quite a dimly lit area for this type of work.

Also the issue around complexity, people in the support areas in the forces were saying that it is quite

difficult sometimes to ensure that people get paid the correct rates because the regulations were overly complex and issues around half an hour at the start were hard to administer and costly because of the time it took to go back to officers to check.

MR CREW: Steve, have the inspectorate done any work about how overtime gets divided to specialist, to specialisms or to officers on 24/7 shifts?

MR CORKERTON: No, not any detailed work. I would certainly bear out from the observations that I have made in visiting forces that overtime is disproportionately towards investigators and people in specialist functions rather than what would notionally be called front line response and neighbourhood. I very much echo the points about it being part of the management culture that there are. They weren't all bad reasons. That is the thing that I am sort of grappling with. It was a different economic cycle and a different climate five to ten years ago and managers were trying to retain and motivate staff when it was a buoyant market in policing and doing the best they could with the tools available. The market has changed

and of course people are slightly less willing to recognise that if it is not in their direct interest. We are now in a far more resource constrained, resource efficiency world where we need to look at very hard how we are using our resources and try and extract maximum value.

So I would say some of the overtime perhaps and the controversial - I will get a reaction - should be at flat rate, standard time where people do clearly need to stay on to finish tasks and we wouldn't want to stop that and they certainly should be paid for it, but whether they could be pay paid a premium is open to a debate, whether there should be a difference in premium for planned and unplanned is also a debate.

MR CREW: What about the concept of paying a premium without any overtime at all to officers who are in specialist departments, so when they are in a specialist department they know that is their salary and they will work whatever hours are required, as would happen in many other professions?

MR CORKERTON: Personally and professionally I wouldn't say that was great in policing because of the

unpredictability of the job. I think we can do more at an organisational level to plan and understand our business but for individuals crimes will occur at strange times and are we going to rely on their goodwill to service them or are we actually going to recompense them at the time? I guess the trick, as has been said all the way through this, is not to create a total bureaucracy out of the process behind it but I don't see anything to apologise for having in overtime in policing because we are an emergency service and things do crop up that no one was expecting at strange times.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR CASSIDY: I think again we should retain overtime and I think we should retain it at current rates. We have to talk about possibly changing the stuff like that so it is a debate that has to be had, but I think it is worth remembering around this table, and Ian will tell me if I have it wrong, out there in the workplace at the coalface the vast majority of changes in shifts from day-to-day ad hoc are done voluntarily by teams who are committed to doing the job and who are not looking to cash in by

current arrangements. There is a tremendous amount of goodwill and team work. The danger for me in attacking current levels of remuneration around structured payments around overtime is that you will lose that goodwill and you might pay a lesser amount per hour but you'll have to pay more hours in the future because that would blow over. I just flag that up.

MR WILLIAMS: Just come away from officers and the police staff for a moment and think about managerial responsibilities. I think it is beholden on senior management and command management to be monitoring where officers police staff are working beyond 48 hours a week. It is in PNB guidance. It is very clear. I could put a proposition that the rate of remuneration should actually taper away if people are working excessive hours beyond that. So I would approach it in a quite different way. I might keep the premium rates up to 48 hours but say actually we have European law which is pretty clear about this and if people go above it you might -- I steel your point, Steve -- say beyond that on an average basis you come down to plain rates.

So with the greatest respect to Ian and my colleagues there is a disincentivisation the more the accumulator of overtime working. It also is legislatively strong. Its duty of care is strong to the individual and also it will require senior management to look at their rosters, to look at their deployment patterns and say, "Why is this person averaging 60 hours a week at work?" Because I have to say if somebody is 60 hours at work their productivity is probably not as great as in the first hour. I am sorry if that is slightly radical but ...

MR CREW: Not at all.

MR GIBBONS: You know, picking up on Steve's point about the lumpiness of the workloads and policing. Well, we don't necessarily see that okay, in some areas of the job, probably more unpredictable than other areas, maybe the response functions and so on, but other occupations have lumpy workloads as well and so if the service wants to pitch itself as a professional outcomes orientated entity, then the question of whether paying by the hour at all as part of the overall package is appropriate needs to be reviewed.

That is not to suggest that you would diminish the likelihood or probability of overtime activity in certain roles and certainly you have to remunerate for them. But the complexities and the bureaucracy and the cost involved in managing an overtime system, just aside from the manipulation of overtime, needs to be seriously considered in terms of totalistic packages that are paid for different roles.

So all this is heading toward obviously, if you like, fixed rates of pay or salary depending on the role you are working on.

MS DESHPANDE: Tara Deshpande from the Home Office.

Just to pick up from the point that Anthony was making.

I think something that has been running through the discussions today is this big question about what is recognised by basic salary and what needs to be rewarded separately. I don't think we are in a position of any great clarity on that and there are a range of views on that, but I just wanted to point out that there seems today to be quite central to a lot of these discussions.

The other observation I had was that returning to this question of the different rates for the different

kinds of overtime. For both police officers and staff it seems to me that is linked to the way that time off is managed so Ian and Ali were both talking about bank holiday rates for officers and the situation we have now is that officers have an amount of annual leave and it is expected they won't work on bank holidays and they get paid the rate they do if they are required to work on bank holidays to recognise that. So we have to look at that in the round.

And for police staff I think the PSC agreement for overtime differentiates between extra work done on Monday to Saturday and then extra work done on Sundays and bank holidays. So there are wider questions around when people are expected to work, the reasonableness perhaps of being expected to do extra work at different times and whether that is working well and whether that is an effective and appropriate pattern.

MS NAYLOR: Just to comment on that. I think if we are looking to make something sustainable in the future we have to recognise that as a society we have changed. Sundays aren't days where people trot down to church and don't do anything any more.

Shops are open. We live in a different environment and people's expectations of service are very different and demand is different.

And my challenge around the payments are not that people should not be remunerated for working on days when they would normally be on annual leave or on a rest days but whether Sundays and public holidays still should have a premium attached to them because I am not sure that that is the way we live our lives as a society any more.

In fact within our force we moved some of our public holidays to reflect other people's religions and desires to take, particularly Diwali and that kind of thing.

So there is a just a question of whether we attach premiums to those days off actually reflect the diversity of the society we are in and actually the world we live in today and whether or not we would be better off with some different form of remuneration that is based on antisocial hours or the impact it has on your personal life as opposed to some arbitrary date which says: these are protected days that people don't really view in the same way as they used to.

MR CREW: Thank you for that.

MR RENNIE: If I may. You won't be surprised to hear me say that obviously the Police Federation of England and Wales believe that the current rates for overtime compensate officers appropriately and also give chief constables something to think about before they interfere with people's off duty time. It is their off duty time. It is not their working time, they are directed to work.

I was interested with David's comment in respect of reducing the premium beyond 48 hours. Obviously that is constables and sergeants, not inspectors. It would be really useful if you could get inspectors down to 48 hours a week because you usually find they are working in excess of that as well.

But for the constables, at the end of the day this is a management issue. Managers should be ensuring without any financial disincentive to direct individuals to work to make sure that officers are not working beyond that time.

I was interested in relation to why the public should foot the bill for public events. That is the question I put in. If we are using a large

amount of the overtime for policing public events, then really we should be making inroads into recovering more of those costs. Why should the public in general pay for that?

Again, a couple of examples where people have made sweeping statements about regulations they don't understand and they don't work yet. We have had very few examples. With the exception of, I think it was the loss of the half-hour that was mentioned when overtime is worked on the first four occasions in a week, which was something which came in 2002 at the behest of senior management, and if you want to reinstate that loss of half hour for the first four times in a week to get back to payment of it all, you will have no objections from the Police Federation because I do get a great deal of criticism from my members who feel we sold them down the river on that one.

So we can make it simpler if you like, but basically I have still heard no examples of why regulations are not understood. I have heard no examples of what the problem is in relation to notification. Again, notice periods have been mentioned, planned and unplanned overtime. That only applies in

respect of rest days with less than 15 days notice whether planned or unplanned. Overtime isn't always planned or unplanned. If it is at the end of the shift it is time and a third and it should be paid at that.

A lot of it is management deployment and people not understanding the terms of reference of employment for police officers which is regs and determinations, and it doesn't get any simpler than at the end of the shift you lose the first half-hour four times in a week and after that you are paid time and a third for the hours that you work. On a rest day, less than 15 days notice it is time and a half. On a rest day, less than five days notice it is double time.

That is how easy it is and you can plan to avoid those instead of trying to take money away from people who are directed to work on many occasions. And I really do support -- Graham's absolutely right. If you want to keep the highly motivated workforce who give an enormous amount of their own time as well who don't actually claim overtime, if you want to keep that good feeling and not create ill will, then you really need to seriously not touch the

overtime premia because we are all historic. In 1993 and 2002 that was the one thing that upset every member of the Police Federation, the attack on the overtime. And I just raise it. As you know, it is a management issue and it can be managed down and it is about management and not upsetting people too much.

MR WILLIAMS: I agree with Ian about inspectors. We did look at that and we took that very seriously and the evidence is there.

MR CREW: About the hours they are working?

MR WILLIAMS: Yes, and it is a good point and the two reports probably speak for themselves but where forces had difficulty with that for the rank of inspector. But I would also acknowledge the point that a lot of time is given freely of goodwill as well and I think in this review there has to be at least some acknowledgment to that. I don't know whether it has ever been measured or assessed but it does exist. There was a lot of goodwill across. And in some ways it is back to team rostering and mutual swaps of shifts.

MR CREW: Thank you.

MR HANRAHAN: I just want to add a couple of points if

I may. The first one I would raise is that police staff get very few opportunities for overtime so I wouldn't anticipate that our overtime is anything like the figures that have been mentioned today. The issue about differences in the days or Sundays still, whether you go to church or not, is a day for families and until we start having 24 hour schools et cetera it is still going to be a day when people have together with their families. How many people round this table go for Sunday lunch with parents and children et cetera? You do. It is a family day. So with regards to religious considerations. And services have changed slightly over the years whereby you can go shopping et cetera on Sundays. You take your family. Your children are off school so therefore it is still seen to be, if working an unsocial event. So I think that is an important message to take away. I think the issue of goodwill is a very important one. The service runs on goodwill and those of us who deal with people with these sort of problems see that on a daily basis and very often we are saving vast amounts of money based on that goodwill. I think the point the superintendents and

the Federation make about if we threaten the current arrangements in any way then you will see that goodwill disappear and if that disappears that will be a detriment not only to the force but to the people we serve.

MR CREW: Thank you. I shall let Liz from the Treasury have the last word.

MS DAVIDSON: I just wondered if I could cite the weight of this folder as an example of a complexity of the system. It is the regulations.

Mutual Aid

MR CREW: Thank you. We are going to look at mutual aid now, or go back to looking at mutual aid, and try and see if people feel there are different ways of handling mutual aid, particularly in this world of collaboration which is going to get much greater than less and whether the levels of payment are now appropriate and if they are not appropriate how they should be changed. Are there different ways of dealing with this issue altogether? It is around those sorts of issues we have a few issues to talk about.

MR SMITH: Let me start on mutual aid. As Ian pointed

out quite rightly, there are different ways and issues around mutual aid. Most people see it as the reactive incident or short notice event, and to a certain extent they still form a significant component of mutual aid. There are national doctrines around operational policing and mobilisation requirements that sit underneath significant public order events and requirement to police them. The result of which in those areas is that it is still possible for an individual force to not have the capacity to deal with that event and, therefore, call mutual aid. Some of this is purely short notice. Some of it again of course has different time spans. We can know of an event which will be potentially a policing event some time in the future. Sometimes it is quite considerably in the future. But other times it can be an event like the G20 for which an individual force probably doesn't have the capacity. It can be an EDL march that starts next Tuesday or next Saturday and then changes its venue at short notice and becomes a policing requirement.

To the extent, therefore, that the chief constable asks for aid from another force, then that is the

trigger for mutual aid and mutual aid payments. For the most part where they can be managed in a working day there isn't a significant impact in terms of either the providing force or the receiving force. The history and experience is where that is either prolonged or where there is a significant event that needs policing that keeps people away from home for more than a single night, then the difficulty around mutual aid and its payments start to show. And that is the rate for officers and we have talked about the Hertfordshire agreement. There are criteria around the Hertfordshire agreement. You have to remember that it was set in the context of its time which is the early 1980s when there was significant events across the country which required policing largely away from forces and those officers were held away in not very good accommodation and were required to be available for long periods of time. So the background to the criteria for Hertfordshire agreement is based on history, but had some fact on the basis of the conditions that officers were held in.

Nearly 30 years later conditions have changed and the

arrangements for organising policing has changed but the mutual aid Hertfordshire agreement still exists and exists for the point where as a trigger point officers move away from their force area overnight.

There is a consequence that has happened over the last couple of years which is that collaboration around planned events have been largely about cross-fertilisation and synergy of operational policing, so that forces in a region can share some capacity and their deployment.

What it achieves is a better overall set of tactics, a better and more coherent approach by forces in the region to a particular issue. It is also fair to say that by doing that forces have entered particularly into sort of informal arrangements where officers cross boundaries and don't receive, as it were, the formal mutual aid arrangements. Why is that? The experience is this: is that the receiving forces now fully recognise it is a very expensive business. The consequence of that is that informal arrangements have been grown up around collaborative approaches.

It is clear there are some prolonged incidents and

clearly the case in point that was pointed out by Ian is the Suffolk murders for which the initial reaction then went into a prolonged period of time. Some work has been done to create a basis for that to happen in the future. I don't think there is a difficulty with that. I think there is this small issue which is about officers being taken away, asked to leave the force area for periods of time for which the rates need to be addressed.

Now, there has been some ongoing work in PNB, and I don't want to cut across PNB, but it seems to me that we ought to find a way for delivering a payment towards the inconvenience of being away from the force overnight and disassociating that then with the hours worked with the arrangement which is mutual aid. So I think there is a route to this by which again we can get some transparency which is about an inconvenience payment, for a better word, for the act of taking officers out of a force into a different environment but thereafter paying them for the work that is undertaken in those arrangements.

MR CREW: Does anybody have anything to add to what Derek has said?

MR CORKERTON: Just to build on that. I am not an on expert on the Hertfordshire agreement at all. But there must be a difference between things that are planned with some notice for individuals. The events may be planned but it is actually the individuals you have to look at this from, and if they are getting notice that they are going to be called away to go and support policing at a G20 summit and they are given three weeks notice, that must be very different to: there has been a flood in Cumbria and we are turning out surrounding forces and they're being pulled away today.

Therefore, I would have thought there is a kind of crisis component with no notice and the police have to respond to that and do respond to it and deserve different remuneration to something that is, dare I say it, more akin to overtime but kind of an extension of duties in a different part of the country.

MR CASSIDY: Just to reiterate the point I made earlier. The PNB working group on this was I think not far away from.

MR CREW: Not lost on me.

MR CASSIDY: And with efforts redoubled a solution

could be made.

MR CREW: Thinking aloud really, how much of the planned mutual aid, where people go away and stay away, is volunteers rather than pressed?

MR MORRIS: An observation I would make is on the whole mutual aid tends to be specialist officers. If I can extend the specialist to mean public order trained. It tends to be all generalisations about public order trained officers, G20 et cetera.

Where the Olympics will be different is in actual fact the majority of aid won't be those level 2 officers. So there is, I think, a greater scope for again, going back to this theme from earlier, trying to find volunteers. I think there should be greater scope. Although I do immediately say although those are greater numbers, where the tensions will be greater in terms of the requirement is all around specialists, particularly by firearms officers.

MR RENNIE: As a person who actually experienced this first hand in the 80s let me tell you that the emergency type of mutual aid situation remains unchanged. In fact the only thing that has changed is that we have improved the sleeping accommodation

of police officers these days. Actually being dragged away to do a job still exists exactly the same as it did then.

Our view is that it compensates adequately. That the issue is, and you touched on it, is it voluntary or are they being directed? And if you are going to direct and take a police officer away from their family, be it with notice or whatever to another part of the country and they are unable to return home for a period of time, they require adequately compensating and we believe that the current arrangements are such.

MR CREW: Okay.

MS NAYLOR: Just an observation, because I do accept that at no point do I want people not to be remunerated for what they do. But I would point out that police have been very well remunerated for many years. Like you, I did a job in the private sector. I got sent to Germany for two years. I only got paid for the hours I was at work when I was in Germany and that was normal. So I am not sure I buy the argument around people have to be paid to be away from their family as if it is a mandated right. It is accepted practice in other

industries for people to be paid for the hours that they work if it is part of the general job that they do.

It is just an observation, but I would not want people not to be remunerated. I would just like to reflect I don't think it is quite the right that we seem to be saying it is here in this room.

MR GIBBONS: The APA supports that view actually. One of our fundamental positions on mutual aid is that officers should be paid for the work they do. The minimum 16 hour rule for the mutual aid we struggle to really get our heads around. There are some issues around that in terms of fairness just with the logic of it anyway. In terms of the additional aid hours, provides a sliding case of remuneration, then there is some logical faults with that.

The other thing is I can't remember from where but there was a little bit of research done by us or others on some of the types of mutual aid activity that was actually undertaken which was a formal mutual aid opportunity. In terms of incentives for officers to actually do some of that work, and picking up on the specialist unit thing, I remember one example was a specialist diver was more than

happy to travel out of a district elsewhere to assist another force because they saw it as a good training opportunity and thought it was useful. So I think there are career development options in there. So I don't think it should be entirely predicated on how much are we going to get paid to go out of district overnight, and I think the same thing in terms of expectation as well. If you go on to a specialist unit, there is an expectation that because you are in a specialist unit and therefore resource to do the sort of work is limited, you may be pulled into additional work in another force or another area. These sort of things. Why can it not be built into your base salary attached to that specialist role?

There must be other ways rather than just a seemingly sort of crude blunt instrument of paying a minimum of 60 hours duty.

MR CASSIDY: Both points are well made but the only points I would put as counterpoints and a difference perhaps to the secondment to Germany is that police officers can be ordered to go out of their force for considerable periods of time to somewhere else. They can't say no.

MS NAYLOR: I know you can technically be ordered but I have to say in the practical world of work, and I am sure Unison will back me up on this, if somebody asks you to go and do something whilst they can't order you do it, if you don't go you frustrate your contract and you are without a job potentially.

I think there is an immaterial difference in there.

Just throwing a challenge in around whether these things are all as appropriate today as they were when you look at the way other industries pay people. That is the only point I make.

MR CREW: I think it is an important issue to expose for us anyway. It was valuable in that sense.

MR WINSOR: It strikes me that this discussion, which may be illustrative of other aspects of the review, regards whether policing is still a blue collar job as it was in the 1970s or whether it is much more of a profession? Because in professions, certainly in the private sector, as Ali says, there are expectations as to where you will work and how intensively you will work, and this blue collar mentality seems to me to be a throw back to the past. I realise that is a controversial statement.

But I make it in those controversial terms deliberately to provoke a reaction.

MR WILLIAMS: I don't know whether my response is controversial. I have listened to the debate about whether the police service is professional. I think the only thing I am pretty confident about is that the public, society expects police officers and police staff to act professionally at all times. So I think the debate should run about whether it is a profession but the public expectation is to expect the highest standards of our police service. So it is professional and always will be in that context.

MR WINSOR: Yes, I understand that. The point I was making was slightly different which is: yes, of course they will be professional when they are working but it is a profession in the sense that actually you have a great deal more flexibility as to where and when and how intensively you are required to work. As I have seen, and others round this table know far better than I do, when there is a particular urgent demand, a murder has taken place and so on resources are thrown into it and you can't just clock off at the end of a certain

period or indeed in some respects expect to be paid a premium rate. Indeed, it seems to me from the officers that I have met, they wouldn't want to because the loss of continuity in something as critical, particularly in the earlier stages after a very serious crime has been committed is something that professionally they would be committed to anyway.

MR WILLIAMS: Sir, if I could just follow up. I think the public would expect all of that. If I could use your term, they would not expect a blue collar perspective in response.

MR CREW: I want to move us on because we are running out of time.

MR WINSOR: Before we do, just one moment. Ian, do you want to say anything about this blue collar point?

MR RENNIE: No, I am fine. I am intrigued by your view.

MR WINSOR: It is not my view. It is a view which has been expressed to me which I am putting out to others for comment. As you know, I have done a great deal of going round the country and meeting police officers and police staff on their own patches and I have heard a variety of very strongly

expressed views, more strongly than have been expressed round this table today. In these sessions it is of advantage for me to repeat some of the things that have been put to me to provoke a reaction from those who wish to say something.

MR HANRAHAN: I would like to respond on that. I think the answer to your question making it simple is it is a hybrid in essence, isn't it? We used to talk about the police service as a uniformed disciplined service. We don't seem to talk about it in those terms. It is a little old fashioned and maybe things have moved on. But if you look at the things from the point of practicality, then I think your analogy of blue collar work, there is an element of that but there is also a massive element of professionalism. Policing has changed vastly over the last 20 to 30 years and the expectation put on the service has also changed by members of the public and that has been driven by politics, by internal issues and also by society itself. So we have to acknowledge that.

When we come down to the core skills of what policing actually is it is about nicking and locking up bad guys. That is what it is about and maintaining

order. So surely that has to count for something. It is not just about a profession doing a particular role. If we were to use the analogy of white collar workers, that wouldn't be sufficient because of the things that officers are called to do on a daily basis.

MR MORRIS: The only response I was going to give as a professional one, and maybe this will do as a response to the Feds. I don't know. We will see what Ian and Raj make of, it but I think quite a lot of it does come down to the general pay issue. I am taking it back, Tom, to your comment about people like vets, lawyers, doctors being woken up in the middle of the night having to come in without any thought of compensation which would be exactly the same as, in my opinion, someone in my position should be in exactly that position as well, such that I wouldn't expect to have to get paid to get any kind of shift allowance or any kind of thing like that or compensation for that kind of thing and frankly, not if the commissioner ordered me to go off to Belfast for a fortnight. I think I should pack my bags and go and I probably wouldn't even claim overnight allowance, though don't quote

me on that.

The point I am coming to is simply this, because I know time is quite tight: I think there is a connection between what you pay people and then what you require them to do and I suspect that all police officers would be perfectly happy to say, "Yes, I am a professional. If you pay me in accordance with other people you are making comparisons with, then absolutely fine." So there is, I think, a really clear connection there. I like to think of all police officers as professional people but then maybe building a little bit on what Chris said, I don't think we should take all current remuneration arrangements or rearrange that to the disadvantage of current officers in lower ranks and say: there you are, you are now professionals.

MR WINSOR: Ian, do you agree with Richard's point about paid as a professional?

MR RENNIE: I can understand it certainly at the senior ranks because I think it is a slightly different situation. We have had a move for a long, long time and the term has been, and I hate it, "professionalising" the police service. I do actually find it quite distasteful because I like

to think, certainly myself and my colleagues are professional in the way that they deliver a policing service on a daily basis.

But I can understand them wanting to raise the professional status of policing so it is at a level, it is not dissimilar to others that have bodies that support them et cetera.

So I can understand the issue with it because it has for a long time been seen as the working man's profession. I use that term loosely, if I may. So I have to say that there is still a need to recognise that there is a difference between the management structure and the management responsibilities and the senior responsibilities in certain organisations and that of the workers, and the work that those individuals have to do which is totally different and is demand led in delivering a service to the public.

I go back to, and I am sure you may well have been informed of this, many people do actually work without claiming and put a tremendous amount of time in to do what they need to do. That doesn't mean to say that everybody should be in that position, and that's a choice for certain

individuals.

But for me, there still needs to be a structure that incentivises to attract the right calibre of person and to retain the right calibre of person to deliver a quality service to the public and there still needs to be a structure of payment to incentivise that. I don't think there is too much wrong with what we have but I understand that that is currently under review.

MR CREW: I am going to stop it there. We just have these two issues of mutual aid and on-call to very quickly talk about. It didn't generate a great deal of debate earlier on. I do just want to get a feel about standardised arrangements for on-call. That seemed to be what was being said and what was emerging from the discussion early on. Is that the feel, that we should be looking for some national arrangement that is formalised and standardised? Nodding heads. Okay.

Specials

MR CREW: And lastly, specials and I suppose the issue is: do we need to incentivise specials? We talk about money. Do we need to incentivise specials

without losing the very unique nature of them as volunteers, particularly as we have, with this change of government, we have a government that is committed to this big society with things being local and reflecting local delivery and so forth.

Can we reconcile those two things?

Should we incentivise by payment or in some other way and if we are going to do that how do we avoid losing the unique nature of the special constabulary?

MR WILLIAMS: Going back to the point I perhaps laboured earlier about concordats. The Revenue probably wouldn't thank me for this, but there are facilities around of things like salary sacrifices, things on expenses, national insurance maybe, savings, tax rebates, we talked about council tax rebates which in a sense are indirect incentivisations back. And I think if the service could look at that to see if there could be a much more uniformity of coverage about how we treat specials with really good guidance coming out, so that we do, and I think the big society has to work because at the end of the day policing is with the community or the community involved in the

community. So I would like to know how they got to 55,000 back in the 1960s and if anybody can remember that and what the sort of magic touchstone was to achieve that because maybe that is, with greatest respect to society, some of the things we are trying to get back to.

MR WINSOR: How many specials do we have now?

MR GIBBS: 16,000. London has a target I think for 10,000 by the Olympics which I don't think it will meet but there has been this increase.

I would say on specials, I think if we do want to increase their numbers and I think that's right, we need to look at three areas. We need to look at the responsibilities that they have. We need to look at whether the jobs they do when they are actually turning up for these shifts as volunteers, whether they get enough back in terms of the responsibilities they are given. That will go to issues of whether they are being properly integrated into the policing teams or whether they are just seen as frankly not well respected enough as volunteers who just rock up and then are just given something to do. So I think we perhaps need to consider issues of a separate command structure

for the special constabulary.

The next issue would be regularity: to what extent do we need to make them more regular in terms of their commitment so they can be depended upon and, therefore, used as a deployable resource more often. And then lastly on reward, I think we do need to look at some more imaginative ways of incentivising them. It is not to go down the remuneration route. It is to go down the route of looking at indirect incentives which should be about partnerships with local authorities as well, stumping up some of the money to provide other incentives, travel incentives, indirect council tax incentives, and we should be very wary of loading on additional costs. So, for example, Police Federation membership. I know it is not a huge amount but there is no benefit that I can see in requiring that specials become Police Federation members. They should be allowed to become them if they choose to but they shouldn't be required to.

MR CREW: Police constables aren't required to become Police Federation members. They choose to do it.

MR RENNIE: Actually every police officer is a member. They subscribe to it voluntarily.

MR CREW: That is more accurate. Absolutely. Okay, anything else anybody wants to say on specials?

MR CORKERTON: Just to correct the number because I saw Tom raise his eyes when he heard 55,000 down to 16,000. Actually it went to a low point of about 12,000 and we are actually on the ascendancy at the moment. Part of that was to Derek's point really, that it became clearer over the last ten years of what forces were going to do with specials and specials collectively are very proud that they do have the full set of police powers and wear the same uniform and it is very hard to distinguish when they are out and about between them and a regular officer. Whereas an earlier model was we would take lots of different volunteers who would fill a much wider gamut of polices roles and perhaps do things which regular police officers had chosen not to do in attend school liaison meetings and car parking at village fetes and so on, but you wouldn't say those people were really discharging full powers and training that they had been given. So that there is a conundrum between actually just involving a large section of the community and actually having people who are trained

professionals who can work alongside their regular colleagues.

I say that because I sit on the Specials National Coordinating Committee. I'm aware of at least two reviews with specials over the last ten years about whether they should be incentivised or not and the response both times has come back extremely evenly balanced. About half of them say yes, they would welcome some incentive, some bounty, some recognition in financial or other terms. The other half say, "No, that's not at all why I joined." So there's a very very mixed message. We have asked it twice. We got the same mixed message back twice.

Personally I do think there is more that we should be doing to recognise the value of the people who contribute and that possibly the length of service awards and the stature of those awards could be increased and reduced.

MR CREW: The periods of time?

MR CORKERTON: Yes. So perhaps people who worked three or five years should be recognised for a steady input. It is not 21 years in terms of a regular cop but actually in the scheme of what they are

doing, balancing a daily life in the community, we could look at actually their recognition as well as other incentives.

MR WILLIAMS: I agree with what Steve has just said but I just wonder, as well as looking outside whether we should be looking at our own occupational groups. I realise this is going to cause some real conflict and real ambiguity. We have 16,000 police community support officers. It would be quite interesting if the service started to encourage some of those to think about special constabulary for maybe part of their working week or in addition to their working week. People will then come back and say that with the community support officers you will get role drift, you will get ambiguity of role. But I just feel, given that they are discharging a very important role, there is some crossover between occupational groups within the police service.

MR CREW: I am going to stop it there because I am conscious of people's time and you have all worked particularly hard this morning. I am grateful to you. Tom, before I wrap it up is there anything you want to say?

MR WINSOR: No, just to thank everyone for your contributions. Thank you very much indeed for coming today. We have other sessions arranged that won't necessarily be this with this cast list but it will be with Ted and me.

MR CREW: Can I just add my thanks. I am very grateful and grateful to you for all for participating in the way you have. Can I just give you an email address in case you want to follow things up, if you have further ideas you want to submit or thoughts you had after today. It is contact@policereview.gsi.gov.uk. Please don't feel inhibited. Anything that comes to you we really want to hear about. It has been really good to see old friends again today and it has been good to meet new people we haven't met before and we look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you very much indeed.