

# **Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB)**

## **Frequently Asked Questions**

### **Who are the PRRB?**

The Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB) was established by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, and became operational in September 2014. It covers England, Wales and Northern Ireland. It provides independent advice to the government on pay and conditions for police officers at or below the rank of chief superintendent. This includes allowances, hours of duty, leave, and related matters.

The PRRB has a remit to take into account a number of issues when considering pay. These include the unique frontline role of policing; the fact officers aren't allowed to be members of a union or to strike; and the Government's wider public sector pay policy. Although the PRRB doesn't set pensions, it is required to take into account changes in pensions, so that it considers the whole "lifetime" remuneration package.

### **Members of PRRB**

The Body is chaired by David Lebrecht, an Employee Relations Consultant and former Head of Employee Relations at British Airways. It has five other members, these being Heather Bailey; QPM; Professor Brian Bell, an economics professor; Elizabeth Bell, Group Talent Manager at Kingfisher; Christopher Pilgrim, HR Director at RWE Npower; and Patrick Stayt QPM, former National Secretary of the Superintendents' Association.

### **What is the process?**

Each year the Home Secretary delivers a remit letter to the PRRB. This is usually in November. The remit letter sets out those aspects of pay and conditions that the Home Secretary wants to be considered in that round.

All parties with an interest in pay and conditions must then provide a written submission to the PRRB, outlining their position. This has to be achieved within approximately 7-8 weeks. For example, this round the remit letter was received on 10<sup>th</sup> November, and submission date was 11<sup>th</sup> January.

Those likely to provide full submissions are: the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW) and Police Superintendents' Association of England and Wales (PSAEW) (usually joint); the National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC); the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC), the Home Office. Each publishes their submission on their own website.

Each party can then make comment on the others' submissions, by 8<sup>th</sup> February.

The parties are then invited to give oral evidence to the PRRB in March. The General Secretary leads on this. This is an opportunity for the PRRB to ask questions and seek clarity: it is not a negotiation.

## **What is the purpose of the submission?**

This year, the PRRB have asked PFEW to submit recommendations in relation to the following key points:

- 1) How to apply the pay award for 2016-17. All parties are asked to have regard to Government policy on public sector pay as outlined in the Chief Secretary to the Treasury's letter, which states that pay awards will be funded up to an average of 1% per year;
- 2) the consideration of targeting of particular groups;
- 3) whether any adjustments should be made to London and South East allowances in light of further evidence put forward by employers;
- 4) and, as part of the rolling review of payments and allowances:
  - a. Overtime rates for bank holiday working;
  - b. Motor vehicle allowance rates; and
  - c. The Away from Home Overnight Allowance.

The PFEW is asked to provide a written, evidence based statement of its position, and justification for that position. This is not a negotiation. The PRRB collect different perspectives from relevant parties, and consider them. They do not invite the parties to negotiation to reach a position agreeable to all.

## **How much are PFEW are asking for on our behalf?**

The PFEW are asking for an uplift to basic pay and most allowances of 2.8%.

## **Why 2.8% and not more?**

We asked for 2.8% because this figure reflects private sector pay increases in the three months to September 2015.

Our analysis of economic data suggests that officers – like many in the public sector – have seen their pay decrease in value by about 13.6% since 2010.

At the same time, private sector employees have seen their pay devalued. But this situation is starting to change, with the private sector gaining.

We want to see officers fairly rewarded for what they do. And we want to see pay that is sufficient to attract officers capable of delivering high standards of public service.

## **How did the PFEW come to this decision/figure?**

The figure was derived after analysis of all the key indicators that pay review bodies normally take into account, these being:

- Economic data regarding inflation and pay increases in all sectors
- Data on the numbers of officers recruited and retained (as pay bodies are keen that pay is set to maintain recruiting and retention)

- Data on morale: 70% of officers in our survey said morale is low
- Information about changes to the nature of the role: this included information about increased workloads due to cuts and restructures; changes in crime, including a need for sophisticated investigative skills; and expansion in roles due to reduction in partner agency capacity.

The information was made available to the Interim National Board, who, led by the General Secretary, debated what figure should be recommended in our submission to the PRRB.

## **Why were rank and file officers not consulted with this decision, as it affects them directly?**

We canvass members' overall views on pay and related matters via a pay survey run each year in April – May. All officers have an opportunity then to voice their overall viewpoint.

During the year, the Interim National Board (INB) and Interim National Council (INC) feed member concerns back to the HQ.

With regard to consulting on the detail of the PRRB submission, there are a number of reasons why members are not directly involved.

Firstly, the information that is needed to arrive at a recommendation is complex, and must be up to date and timely. For example, key economic indicators are emailed to all Interim National Board and Interim National Council members routinely each month, so that they have an opportunity in year to give consideration to the uplift in pay that the organisation wants to ask for.

Secondly, the detailed remit letter from the Pay Review Body is only sent to the PFEW a few weeks before the submission date. This year, we received it in mid-November, with a due date for submission of 11<sup>th</sup> January. Given the number of issues raised, these timescales are challenging. The INB and the INC, as the key elected representatives, act on behalf of all members during this time.

Logistically, attempting to involve every single member in the detailed consideration at this time would be impossible.

## **If public sector pay is at 1% why are we bothering to submit anything at all?**

The PFEW needs to engage with the PRRB on wider issues than just the pay uplift, and for the longer term. We need to build a relationship, to be seen as a credible voice, and have influence.

The wider issues include whether and how pay should be targeted. This will be a long piece of work, and the PFEW needs to be involved to provide a check and balance to those who would simply reform pay in ways that may not be in the best interests of the public, or fair to all officers.

And over the longer term, the public sector pay restraint will not last forever. We need to be involved now, building an evidence base for the future, so that, at such time as the cap is removed, we have our already started to establish our case.

## **Does the PFEW think that those officers who are in specialist roles should be paid more?**

The PFEW believes the pay system should support the service that is representative of the public served, with a system that attracts and retains officers of differing genders, ethnicity, and age groups; pay should be fair, and be felt by officers to be fair; it should be designed based on need, and on what works to attract and retain capable officers. Any differentiation should be based on an objective evaluation. Pay should reflect responsibilities and workload, but it should also facilitate the need for officers to be deployed across a spectrum of activities.

## **Why does the PFEW support the London and SE Allowance?**

The London and SE Allowances have been in place for several years. The rationale for them being created still exists, and they seem to have been helpful in recruiting and retaining officers in the forces where they apply. The PFEW is opposed to withdrawing any allowance, without sound evidence demonstrating that its removal would not be problematic.

## **Why are PFEW not asking for more of an increase around the London and SE Allowances?**

Neither the employers, nor the staff associations, have yet demonstrated evidence that the current London and SE Allowances are inadequate as they are.

## **Why are overtime rates for Bank Holiday working being considered?**

The PRRB has a rolling programme to consider all allowances, over a three year period. In this year, the PRRB is considering overtime rates for Bank Holidays, Motor Vehicle Allowance, and Away from Home and Overnight Allowance.

We are concerned, however, that the focus on Bank Holiday working is, at least in part, because of the need to police large events on Bank Holidays – e.g. the Notting Hill carnival. The PFEW has argued that forces and Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) can and should recover costs for policing from the organisers of large scale events. This is especially the case where organisers have not made adequate stewarding provision. It would be demoralising for officers, and could have a negative effect on policing events, if officers were penalised financially, when other options to recover costs are available.

## **What is your view on the current Motor Vehicle Allowance (MVA) that is paid to officers?**

We are concerned on two points: the mechanism for setting MVAs, and the ways in which forces interpret the categories of MVAs.

Currently MVA rates are set by local government employers. We believe it unfair that rates are set by a body that has no input from officers' representative bodies.

We are concerned that some forces are classing officers as casual users, when they should be classed as essential. We are lobbying chief officers to have the rates applied consistently.

### **Does the PFEW support the Away from Home Overnight allowance?**

Yes, the PFEW supports the consistent application of this allowance. This allowance is intended to provide fair compensation to officers unable to return home, for the difficulties that may arise (e.g. additional costs, childcare, services paid for that cannot be utilised in their absence).

However, there have been difficulties with the implementation of the allowance. Poor drafting of the Determinations has resulted in differing interpretations across forces.

### **Why are some colleagues being paid this allowance, and others not?**

The Police Arbitration Tribunal in 2011 made it clear that this allowance should be paid. However, when the Determinations were drafted by the Home Office in March 2012, it contained new restrictions, reflecting ACPO's desire to limit payment. This has caused inconsistencies across forces. A revised Determination in 2015 has only made matters worse. The PFEW and PSAEW have raised this many times with the NPCC, and at the Police Consultative Forum. There have also been successful legal challenges taken.

### **Why has the PFEW included evidence of the annual allowance in their submission?**

The PFEW has included this because we believe it is fundamentally unfair that officers in their final years of service, who are promoted, can incur tax liabilities that largely cancel out the financial benefit of promotion. This is having an impact on officers' willingness to be promoted. It is not in the public interest for there to be a disincentive for the best officers to be promoted.