



**INSPECTORS**  
BRANCH BOARD



**INSPECTORS**  
BRANCH BOARD

# SILVER BULLETIN

**INSIDE THIS ISSUE:**

<b><i>Pie in the Sky</i></b> <i>General Secretary's view</i>	1
<b><i>Pie in the Sky</i></b>	2
<b><i>Green Paper- Recycled Rubbish</i></b>	2
<b><i>Take the Money</i></b> <i>A look at the new pension commutation figures</i>	3
<b><i>Are you Copping a deaf'un?</i></b> <i>H&amp;S article</i>	4
<b><i>You might not be but the government is !-</i></b> <i>thoughts on the pay dispute</i>	4

**Stop Press**

Attention anyone going onto the 30+ scheme.

Please ensure you notify HMRC which of your separate earnings i.e. Pay or Pension you wish your normal tax coding to be applied to. We have been informed of cases where officers who have failed to make the election have subsequently faced substantial claims for unpaid tax.

Further detail can be found in the MPS SOP or NPJA guidance both of which are on the MPS Intranet

## PIE IN THE SKY

I hope you have been made aware through internal communications of the Met's latest attempt to tackle the issue of stress related illness within the job entitled 'Shrinking Clouds' if not I'm sure you must have read at least some of the sniping comments about it that have crept into recent editions of the national press.

It saddens me to see that so many commentators seem to believe that police officers are, or should be, immune to the causes and effects of stress. There has been backlash in the media of late against what many perceive to be a move towards becoming a risk adverse society and I have a degree of sympathy for their concerns, especially when reading some of the anecdotal evidence they uncover. However, I do object to them singling out police officers as being the personification of our newly discovered 'risk aversion'. Accusing us of being "Namby Pamby" and lacking the resilience society expects from those who choose this career is so far wide of the mark as

to be laughable. On the one hand we are so often accused of being automatons but on the other they now seem to expect us to be emotionless after dealing with, by way of example fatal accidents, serious public order or child victims. We have long argued in a different context that we are a 'special case' but not when it comes to applying HSE standards. We cannot have one set of H&S rules for those 'ruffty-tuffty' people in the police and another for every other worker in the country.

I applaud the MPS for recognising the issue of stress within the police service and taking steps to tackle it. You will all be aware that the Inspectors Federation recently commissioned a 'Well being at work survey' to which every Inspector and Chief Inspector in England and Wales were invited to contribute. Mary Wood, our Vice Chairman wrote an article in the last edition of the 'Bulletin' outlining the Met results and thus I do not intend to repeat that content,

other than to say that they revealed that there are a number of key areas in which the MPS could and should seek to make significant improvements.



He ain't the only one under pressure

But it is a failing not highlighted in the report (which I believe the MPS need to address before anything else can be achieved) that the work of the Occupational Health department in producing 'Shrinking Clouds' and indeed its predecessors 'Triggers' & 'The Camels Back' is being fatally undermined by what I see as a reluctance from the Operational side of ..

(Continued overleaf)

(continued from page 1) ....

policing to embrace the solutions contained within the programmes.

Its all very well preaching how important it is to take time to practice *relaxed breathing, physically removing yourself from the place where stress exists, prioritising, maintaining a healthy work life balance* and *sharing problems* but I see no evidence that the day to day reality of policing affords my members the luxury of indulging in these 'solutions'. In fact quite the contrary.

In my experience there is a reluctance by senior officers to give any guidance on which of the ever growing number of policing priorities are a priority,

sharing problems or asking advice is seen as a sign of weakness and of being unable to cope. The continued acceptance of a long hours culture makes an absolute mockery of achieving a healthy work/life balance.

Planned reductions in Chief Inspectors and Superintendents will only heap more work and hence pressure and stress on those that remain. Especially as additional responsibilities such as being the 'Champion' of whatever is the current initiative seem to be created almost at will.

Is it any surprise therefore that of the 1650 eligible candidates in the Met for the current Chief Inspector promotion process only 333 chose to apply? Now I accept that there may be a variety of reasons why so many opted out but I would wager

that a healthy proportion did so because of concerns over the effect promotion to a rank that is being squeezed at both ends would have on their health and well being.

If the MPS is serious about helping its officers and employees cope with the demands of the job then it really does need to start insisting and monitoring that operational managers accommodate and appreciate those who wish to utilise the theoretical 'solutions' offered by our colleagues in OH.

The MPS needs to start 'walking the walk' when it comes to helping colleagues to deal with their demanding jobs not just 'talking the talk'.

*Mark Crake*

IBB General Secretary

## *Green Paper - Recycled Rubbish*

Its not something I'd recommend especially having done it but the other day I managed to find time to sit and read the governments green paper entitled "*From the Neighbourhood to the National: policing our communities together*". Take my advice - Don't bother - it's not a good read!

It's near 100 pages are completely devoid of either original thought or innovative thinking as to how policing should develop over the next decade or so. It's largely a rehash of Sir Ronnie Flanagan's previous effort and in my opinion adds nothing to the debate. The most significant statement within it is that '*in future there will only be a single top down target for police forces- on improving public confidence*' whatever that means! Given that the MPS recently based their justification for closing police stations on a mere 10 responses to their 'wide ranging' public consultation process, would it be too unkind to suggest that future high levels of public confidence are a shoo in.

But its not the lack of new ideas that alarms me most about this document it's the fact that its whole tone is reactive rather than proactive. It pains me that future government policy for policing seems to rely entirely on the fact that 'Joe Public' will be satisfied with police performance provided they see a visible presence on their streets and that when they call for help someone comes within a few minutes. In other words that we're there if they need us. The Green paper is not just thin it's anorexic when it comes to the notion that if we take and keep the bad guys off the street, the good guys won't have as much cause to need us!

There is no mention for instance of adding resilience to CID capability or indeed any measure to increase conviction rates of those guilty of what I would term common serious offences such as Robbery, Burglary and Assault. Call me old fashioned but I'm ecstatic that my police service prevent my house being broken into in the first place not that they are prompt and sympathetic when attending to complete a report when it is. What will really make a victim of crime satisfied at the service offered by police? The fact that someone records the crime and does little else or that someone actually arrests the person who's committing it?

The paper just about sums up this government - a triumph of style and spin over substance

*Perry Oliver*

IBB Deputy General Secretary

# TAKE THE MONEY!

With effect from 1 October 2007 the age factors associated with the Police Pension Scheme increased meaning that officers' who wish to commute may now, if they wish, take a larger lump sum.

## Main points of note

- Factors have now increased significantly for all ages. Largest factor has gone up from 15 to 19
- Previous inequality removed. Men and women now have the same factors.
- Factors now start to decrease at 50 years of age rather than 51 and on a monthly basis rather than annually.
- The pension left in payment is unchanged (unless the increase is taken as pension rather than extra lump sum.)
- The money used to fund the increase is from the officer's own pension entitlement. This is not a result of the Government being unusually generous.
- Officers' who retire with between 25 and 30 years' service but are not yet 55, will find that the lump sums are unchanged, however, the pensions left in payment are higher.
- Officers' who do not wish to commute will find the pension figures unchanged.

## A couple of illustrations for officers retiring at the end of this month

### Inspector

Average pensionable pay £ 51,834

(£ 37,998 (part year from December 07) + £ 2,106 London Weighting + £1,122 CRTP)

INSP	Gross Pen	Maximum Lump Sum up to 50	Residual Pension up to 50	Maximum Lump Sum 53rd birthday	Residual Pension 53rd birthday	Maximum Lump sum 55th birthday	Maximum Lump Sum 60th birthday	Residual Pension After 55
Yrs								
25	<b>25,917</b>	58,313	22,848	58,313	22,748	116,627	103,668	19,438
26	<b>27,645</b>	62,201	24,371	62,201	24,264	124,402	110,579	20,734
27	<b>29,373</b>	66,089	25,894	66,089	25,781	132,177	117,491	22,030
28	<b>31,100</b>	69,976	27,418	69,976	27,297	139,952	124,402	23,325
29	<b>32,828</b>	73,864	28,941	73,864	28,814	147,727	131,313	24,621
30	<b>34,556</b>	164,141	25,917	158,958	25,917	155,502	138,224	25,917

### Chief Inspector (promoted after April 1994)

Average pensionable pay £ 54,745

(£ 51,831 (part year from December 07) + £ 2,106 London Weighting + £1,122 CRTP)

CI >94	Gross Pen	Maximum Lump Sum up to 50	Residual Pension up to 50	Maximum Lump Sum 53rd birthday	Residual Pension 53rd birthday	Maximum Lump sum 55th birthday	Maximum Lump Sum 60th birthday	Residual Pension After 55
Yrs								
25	<b>27,372</b>	61,588	24,131	61,588	24,025	123,176	109,490	20,529
26	<b>29,197</b>	65,694	25,740	65,694	25,627	131,388	116,789	21,898
27	<b>31,022</b>	69,800	27,348	69,800	27,229	139,600	124,089	23,267
28	<b>32,847</b>	73,906	28,957	73,906	28,830	147,811	131,388	24,635
29	<b>34,672</b>	78,012	30,566	78,012	30,432	156,023	138,687	26,004
30	<b>36,497</b>	173,359	27,372	167,885	27,372	164,235	145,987	27,372

If you require further information or greater detail then please contact your local Inspectors representative

Contact us at

Inspectors Branch Board  
 Met Police Federation  
 York House  
 2 Elmfield Park  
 Bromley BR1 1LU  
 020 8464 2322  
 (Option 3)

**We're on the Web**  
[www.metibb.co.uk](http://www.metibb.co.uk)

# Are you Copping a deaf'un?

By Mike Roulston. Dip NEBOSH Met IBB lead on Health & Safety issues.

A few years ago protesters scaled the chimney of an incinerator plant in London, bringing rubbish disposal to a halt. The workers vacated the site leaving police officers behind to arrest the protesters when they returned to earth.

No-one could work out the source of an irritating beeping noise (close to the serried ranks) which started up a short while later largely because no police officer was 'competent' in the health and safety subtleties of an incineration plant, particularly one that had been switched off.

Fortunately a passing fire fighter quickly advised them that it was a carbon monoxide detector warning of dangerously high levels in the locale.....

A few years later and something equally unpleasant could be in the air near you.....loud noise.

We are all aware that there are hearing conservation arrangements in place for those policing the Notting Hill carnival but I'm not so sure that the same control measures are being applied at the various open air festivals or concerts which now seem so common throughout London.



If you have just such an event on your Borough then you need to be thinking about the possible effects on the hearing of those asked to police it; noise induced hearing loss is permanent but can be easily avoided by applying the appropriate control measures.

To do this you need to track down a 'competent' person in the subject and follow his/her advice.

I hope you don't think I am being 'risk averse' at this point; the job will still get done, just a lot more safely using health and safety guidelines and risk assessment techniques for the purpose.

This is an important point to bear in mind when you hear the strange opinions currently being voiced that Health and Safety legislation somehow constrains operational policing; **nothing** could be further from the truth.

What constrains operational policing is the failure to provide sufficient 'competent' staff to give the advice when needed; resourcing is the responsibility of the same people who are desperately now trying to blame 'elf n safety' for their own failings.

## You might not be but the Government is!

Those of you who have explored our website of late will have noted the addition of a page upon which we have posted some of our readers comments. Not surprisingly the topic of most of the contributions has been the developments or perhaps more accurately the lack of development within the negotiations surrounding police pay. I think its fair to say that the common theme that emerges from all the comments is *'when are the Federation going to act upon the mandate given to it by its members to pursue a change in legislation to introduce full industrial rights'*. There appears to be a growing sense of frustration at what some perceive to be inactivity in the face of the consistent and constant rejection of our case by this government. Despite my closer proximity to the negotiations and with it an opportunity to better understand the machinations of PNB I too have to admit to sharing at least a modicum of that frustration. It is clear to me that this Government has made its mind up and has now put its fingers in its ears and is singing "la la la la la" whenever we speak. The Appeal court judges in delivering their judgement on the judicial review case effectively reinforced the government stance and the recent rebuffs in relation to the 'level playing field' claim and the 2008 pay claim only reinforce to me that the only option now open to us is to pursue that mandate. The latest issue of PF news says that this will occur in the autumn. Well I think the leaves started falling some time ago!



"I'm not listening!"