



SILVER BULLETIN



INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

<i>A Necessary Extraction</i>	1
<i>A Necessary Extraction</i>	2
<i>Cost of Everything—Value of Nothing</i>	2
<i>Cost of Everything—Value of Nothing</i>	3
<i>Pick and Mix anyone</i>	4

New IBB reps

In recent weeks a number of new Inspectors reps have joined our Branch Board

Croydon - Ray Whiting

Hackney - John Lester

Harrow - Philip Burke

Lambeth - Allen Davis

Newham - Fraser Neilson

TOCU— David Nesling

CO18 - Anthony Ward

SCD 1 - David Willis

SCD 6 - Paul Whatmore

SCD20 - Roger Milburn

Welcome Gentlemen. We hope your time as an Inspectors Fed rep is both fruitful and rewarding.

A NECESSARY EXTRACTION

Early next year I hope we will finally be able to take another significant step along the road to consigning the rotten concept of 'On-Call' to the dustbin of history. An appointment had been booked on the 4th January 2010 for the TP BOCU's to have the 'On-Call bad tooth' that has been causing so much pain and discomfort to our detective colleagues for a great many years extracted at long last.

Whilst it is true that I have never been a Detective; you don't need to be Sherlock Holmes to deduce from the case papers that come across my desk, that the 'On-Call' system is a significant factor in why so many DI's and DCI's hit tilt and seek early ill health retirement. This view has over the years been reinforced through many conversations with those in the Detective Inspecting ranks. I firmly believe that the 'On-Call' system creates slaves to the MPS of my Detective colleagues and furthermore had there been in the past a more enlightened approach to offering them a reasonable work / life balance which would have allowed them to properly relax when not on duty, then many of those who have been cast because of stress related illnesses would still be at work today.

I have been striving for the removal of 'On-Call' for at least 5 years and throughout that time we have published articles both on our website and via this newsletter updating the wider membership on our progress. Those

elected Fed reps who attend our Branch Board meetings will also tell you that the topic of 'On-Call' is constantly raised as the circulated minutes of those meetings will attest.

Earlier this year the MPS itself sent out via TP HR managers an invite for every DI and DCI to attend a number of workshops for the purpose of identifying a workable alternative.

Having personally attended these workshops I can confirm that those in attendance and who came up with the new policy were 'frontline' TP Detectives.



This new 'On-duty' TP DI's policy which we have been working with the Service to refine since those workshops provides the dentist with his pliers in this case. The specific details regarding resourcing levels, shift patterns and responsibilities of the role are still being finalised and that's why

the appointment with the dentist's drill has been delayed for a few weeks- but make no mistake -much sooner rather than later- that tooth is coming out!

In essence the new system will mean that instead of the current inflamed situation whereby we have 32 TP DI's 'On-call' for 365 days a year which let's not forget equates to over 11,500 **UNPAID** working days in excess of the 'day job' there will be a considerably soothed position of less than 3000 **PAID** 'officer days'.

(Continued on next page)

The reason I think of 'On Call' as a bad tooth or other such similar infection is that for many it starts as a dull ache that they can live with before it develops into a nagging irritant and then unchecked it continues to fester away and eventually begins to cause so much pain to those suffering its effects that far more drastic remedial action needs to be undertaken.



Sadly in too many cases the only remedy has a terminal effect on the officer's career. I think I can safely say that promotion aside, no other subject exercises the Inspecting ranks more than 'On-Call'.

What has now been agreed is that all TP DI's including those who work within TPHQ and Support, will take part in a Rota where instead of being 'On Call' they will be part of a cadre of 6 DI's (2 in the North East cluster; 2 in the North West cluster and 2 in the South) who each night including week-ends, will provide the on duty cover for

the whole of the MPS. The figure of six is based on an assumption of 12 hour nights.

On that basis this works out as approximately 9 shifts per DI per year.

However the significant upside is that on their 'non cadre' days they will no longer have the restrictions placed upon their off duty time which the current 'On-Call' system dictates must exist and the rotten 'On-Call' tooth will have been removed I believe forever.

Part of the detail that needs to be finally decided upon is the length of the duty as this will clearly impact on the number of officers required each day and hence the amount of days each TP DI will need to do each year. As a Staff Association our key responsibility is the welfare of our members and for that reason I personally would rather the DI's were on duty for 8 rather than 12 hours because I can envisage a situation whereby 12 may creep into becoming 13 or 14.



Eight hour days will of course mean each DI having to do more cadre duty

days per year because whilst the number of night duties over the year will be the same there will be a lot more late turns to cover. I believe it is only right therefore that those involved in making the new policy work are allowed to directly impact upon that decision. So please anyone wishing to express a view – please do so via your elected IBB Fed rep.

I appreciate that there will be some teething problems- there always is with new policies, issues like proper 'day job' cover, that will need to be overcome. Indeed a review process has been built into the plans; but the simple fact is the Superintendents have jumped at the opportunity to have an on duty Rota and from the feedback received to date they wouldn't go back to an 'On-Call' system. I can see no reason why their experience should not be replicated by the Inspecting ranks.

Together we need to make sure the TP business group keeps its rendezvous with the dentist's chair and rids itself of the infection that is 'On-Call' because if we don't it will continue to spread its decay and in doing so destroy people's lives and careers.

Mark Crake
General Secretary
Met IBB

Cost of Everything– Value of Nothing

Many of you will be aware that the hot topic for discussion within Federation circles in recent weeks has been the issue of a proposed rise in subscription costs. I won't bore you with the minutia of the Federation constitution—it is suffice to say that much of our current difficulty is as a result of the longstanding funding structure of our organisation and not financial mismanagement.

Way back in the 50's when we were first allowed to raise funds through our membership a bottom up funding system was implemented that survives to this day. In simple terms that means that you pay your monthly sub to us here in the IBB office at York House, we deduct a set amount (30%) - which covers the costs of

running our board, looking after the needs of the Metropolitan Inspecting ranks and also to contribute to the operating costs of the Metropolitan Joint Committee.



We pass the residual 70% to the National Inspectors Central Committee (ICC) at Leatherhead who in turn deduct 18% of that amount before passing the remainder onto the

National Joint Central Committee (JCC) The effect of this is that for every pound paid to the 'Federation' by a member - less than 60p arrives in the National Joint Treasurers coffers. That may seem like plenty but before we go any further ask yourself- why do most people join the Federation?

I reckon most of you will have answered because it's a good 'insurance policy' to have should you be unfortunate enough to fall into 'trouble' and indeed it is! But that insurance policy or as it's more correctly known the "Voluntary fund" is financed out of the JCC's portion. Last year the voluntary fund paid out nearly £13 million in legal costs arising

from representing the membership and impending Government changes to the way in which the legal aid system is funded mean that amount is only going to increase.

So why did the JCC propose such a large increase in subscription? Well in part it was to correct a problem caused by our existing funding structure that means that every ten years or so the value of the income actually received at the top of the organisation is sufficiently eroded by inflation such that it no longer meets expenditure and partly to build a contingency in anticipation of the increased legal costs

That all seems reasonable enough, so why has there been so much heated debate within the Federation over the validity of the proposed rise? Well the need for an increase is widely recognised especially in relation to the anticipated increase in legal costs. However what we and many other Branch Boards around the country remain to be convinced about is what that increase will actually be! Out of the proposed rise of £4.03p per month - the JCC have allowed for £2.83 to cover the increased legal costs. But this is only a best guesstimate and we have asked that a more scientific method is adopted rather than what appears at present to be, very much a 'finger in the air' approach.

We were also one of the Branch Boards who advocated from the outset of the financial review process that the issues caused by the way in which we are funded needed to be resolved once and for all in order to prevent the ten yearly deficit reappearing.- a root and branch review of the way the Federation is funded.

Finally at a time when so many of our members were feeling the economic pinch and having to tighten their belts we said it was only right that the Federation should examine its proposed

expenditure and find savings to offset the extent of any proposed rise in subscriptions.



We maintained that the membership should never be viewed as the easy default option in order to raise additional revenue and as such we would not support any attempt to pass costs onto the members without first putting the organisations finances in order.

I am pleased report and acknowledge that significant steps have been taken to cut expenditure and absorb some of



the anticipated increased costs from within existing resources but we are not yet convinced that the fundamental 'nettle' of how the organisation is funded has been grasped. Our, not insignificant challenge, along with those colleagues from around the country who hold similar views, is to convince the whole of the Federation that core constitutional reform is essential.

Members are I'm sure asking themselves questions such as 'Does the Federation represent good value for money?' and 'What do we get for our money?' Comparisons have been made to the lesser amounts paid by Nurses and Teachers to belong to their respective Unions but I'm really not

sure that such a comparison is either fair or valid.

True we are all public servants operating in what is an increasing litigious society but those working in education or the health service, even in the most difficult communities are not subjected to the barrage of malicious, vexatious or frivolous complaints that police officers seem to be.

And whilst I don't know I'd hazard a guess that neither the Royal College of Nursing nor the National Union of Teachers have to set aside nearly 50% of its income to cover the cost of legal representation of its members often as a result of those unfounded allegations.

So does membership of the Police Federation represent good value for money? Well that's a question each individual member has to answer for themselves.

Those of you who have been unfortunate enough to have needed to make a claim on the 'insurance policy' will I'm sure agree that it does and if you haven't yet needed to call upon the 'voluntary fund' - please ask a colleague who has, before leaping

to judgement.

It's only when you find yourself in that lonely position that you realise what 'good value' actually means!

Finally whilst we will continue to do our very best to ensure that it remains good value please understand that because of the changes the government have made to the legal aid system in order to maintain our gold standard service it is likely that some increase in subs will be required.

Perry Oliver
Deputy General Secretary
Met IBB

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



We would like to take this opportunity to wish all our members and their families a peaceful and safe holiday period.

The Branch Board office will be closed after 4pm on Thursday 24th December until 9am on Tuesday 29th December. However if you are in need of urgent advice during that period the office phone will be on divert to the mobile phone of one of the Branch Board officers



Pick & Mix Anyone?



Some of you may have seen the press coverage a few weeks ago about another force which had a truly negligent discharge during the classroom demonstration of a firearm loaded with ammunition stored in a Quality Street tin containing both live and blank rounds; at least one live round found its way into the weapon.

There is an unreported possibility that simultaneously elsewhere in that force another officer was loading his/her weapon for operational use from another sweet tin of (possibly a rival brand!), again loaded with mixed blank and lives rounds.



Needless to say this basic failure to provide a 'safe system of work', a fundamental requirement of health and safety legislation attracted considerable flak from the public as shown in the following link:

http://www.shponline.co.uk/article.asp?pagename=incourt&article_id=9305

The incident also attracted the full weight of the law as both the individual and police force received substantial fines on conviction and presumably further costs will be incurred when the personal injury claim for the injured person is settled.

In the Met our public order tactics are currently under scrutiny but nibbling away at the edges are some ex senior officers who just don't seem to get the fact that health and safety legislation does in fact apply to the police service. Whilst one of them does have intimate knowledge of the subject having been involved in some high profile prosecutions I'm not sure whether he has actually read the recently published document (produced by the HSE and ACPO) entitled 'Striking the Balance'

This was the HSE's view on the issue:
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/speeches/transcripts/hackitt071009.htm>

This statement dispels the myth that health and safety is not for the police service and hopefully incidents involving tins of

confectionary will become increasingly rare (although the sometimes confrontational question of who keeps putting the wrappers back in the tin will remain a residual liability for many years to come!)

However as I browse through the results from our ongoing survey of inspecting ranks hours I have some concerns that the police service still has to address the chronic rather than acute health, safety and welfare issues; before the survey we knew that officers were working excessive hours and it is accepted that there are occasions when this will be necessary because of the task in hand.

However I find it hard to accept that an officer can be expected to work successive 18 and 16 hours shifts at a major public order event with only two hours rest in the intervening period; especially as in most cases the operation order is written well in advance of such events. A recent 'Despatches' program included a suggestion that wearing PPE was somehow contributing to officers' behaviour at public order events but I believe a greater contribution may arise from fatigue which is widely known to have physical and psychological effects.



I am also embarrassed to be in an organisation that allows officers to have accrued over 60 outstanding weekly leaves (with some having over 100 owed). The bare minimum under the Working Time Regulations is at the rate of one a week and any failure to maintain that level suggests another absence of a safe system of work.

As the firearms instructor found out cutting corners had serious implications for his wealth and ignoring working time provisions may similarly affect your health.

**Mike Roulston MSc Dip NEBOSH MIIRSM
CMIOSH
Met IBB H&S lead**