



**FORCE RESTRUCTURE
TSSA COUNTER
PROPOSAL**

FORCE RESTRUCTURE

TSSA COUNTER PROPOSAL

Introduction

This document represents TSSA's counter-proposal to BTP's initial proposals launched on 15 July 2013 for the Force Restructure Project (FRP).

During the last two months, TSSA representatives have talked to many staff and members regarding the proposals, and their impact on members' jobs and workloads.

We have also had regular meetings with the FRP management team lead by ACC Alan Pacey and HR Manager Kerry McCafferty. During the last month, senior staff or police officers have attended our consultation meetings to explain each workstream Business Case and answer questions on their proposals.

Our document covers what we believe will be the challenge for BTP: to carry out their restructure in order to invest in operational staff, while delivering on its commitment and obligation to minimise compulsory redundancies as far as possible and to support staff through very significant change.

We believe that every job should count.

The meaning of meaningful consultation

There are some employers who will go through trade union consultation over large scale redundancies as a tick box exercise. Fortunately the FRP team have repeatedly assured us that their proposals are not set in stone.

But as a timely reminder for all of us involved "the requirement on the employer is to engage in meaningful consultation: the exploration of all ideas reasonably suggested by the union to avoid redundancies, reduce their number and mitigate their effects. Consultation must be with a view to reaching agreement."

We have set out to produce a reasoned and reasonable case for reducing the number of compulsory redundancies, supporting staff through change while addressing the future workload of members for those who remain.

The aims of the Force Restructure Project

20-20-10

BTP launched their key proposals on 15 July on Intelligence, Operations, Justice and CMU. This was later followed by the delayed proposals on Finance & Corporate Services.

The aim of the Review is create the funding to meet new Force objectives of a 20% reduction in crime, a 20% decrease in police-related disruption and a 10% increase in passenger confidence, known as the 20-20-10 objectives.

The reasoning for the additional deployment is the Force's view that the measures that have been taken so far to reduce crime are now generally exhausted and that new investment in police officer deployment is required to ensure that the 20-20-10 objectives can be met.

New teams of Police Officers are being proposed throughout England, some are already being put in position, others wait for funding.

The overall rationale for the staff Restructure is to reduce existing cost of Police support staff in order to fund these new Police Officer deployments throughout the Force.

The 20-20-10 objectives are not universally accepted as the way forward for the Force. During a time of funding restraints across the public sector including Home Office forces, most public services are trying to maintain their level of service, and against the odds.

Those that principally fund the BTP (the TOCS, Network Rail, LUL) are all experiencing difficulties in their budgets from central government which means that although they fund BTP, they will not be in a position to fund this proposed extension of BTP's targets.

In terms of the aim of a 20% reduction in crime, the potential growth in crime stats through reporting by social media, and the continuing expansion of rail services and large increases in passenger numbers, means that crime, congestion and general passenger dissatisfaction with rail may all increase.

There is also a view that the priorities for some TOCs are very targeted efforts on specific crimes in local areas such as on cycle theft or on non-notifiable crimes such as anti-social behaviour, and that these are higher priorities to TOCs, and possibly more deliverable, than an across-the-board reduction of 20%. While the BTPA agreed the 'ambitious' targets, the overall crime reduction target may not be achievable.

But overwhelmingly it is the problem with funding that undermines the overall aims of 20-20-10. There is none. If the project could be funded by PSAs, or from within BTP reserves, then a significant improvement in police service on the railway would be universally supported.

In order to have the further deployments, staff jobs must be cut and the consequences of widespread cutting of support staff jobs could be a less effective Police Force and more Officers taking on duties that should be undertaken by support staff. In each section on workstreams, we

explain our members' concerns about unrealistic workloads, argue for additional jobs and discuss the potential consequences of cutting jobs too deeply.

Budget considerations

The Force Restructure Project to deliver up to 200 Police Officers to operational roles will cost around £8.6m.

BTP's budget for a number of years has been at a standstill, with no increases or slight reductions. BTP estimates that there has been a 13.4% real terms reduction in the Budget required since 2010. That includes rising costs of inflation, although the significant proportion of BTP budget is its paybill, and in a climate of pay freezes and only EPS increments to pay for, this would not amount to an RPI inflation increase.

One significant increased cost helps explain the 13.4% real terms reduction in required budget: the £5 million payment that BTP needs to pay for the deficit in Police Officers pension scheme. The pension liability of £5 million amounts to 60% of the sum needed for extra Police deployments. With BTP facing a massive liability on pensions, the decision to go ahead with FRP this year is disappointing.

Police Officer – operational roles

Overall, Police officer deployment from office support roles into operational roles accounts for £4.6 million of the £8.6 total requirement for FRP. TSSA continues to support this development to maximise the number of civilian roles being undertaken by staff in need of jobs, and getting the Police Officers back into the operation where they are most needed. Where we believe that there is still insufficient reason to have a Police Officer in a support position, we discuss this within the workstream section.

A new Divisional Structure

Prior to the formal FRP launch, the Force announced that it would be changing its area structure to allow cost efficiencies through reduced staff costs. The BTPA endorsed a position of 3 Areas, Wales and rest of England Division C, London Division B and Scotland Division D.

The most difficult proposed job cuts have fallen on Division C with relocations at distance and large numbers of staff involved. The largest amount of jobs proposed to be lost is in North East Area (Leeds and Newcastle). Leeds has retained F&CS department, with a small out-based team for Operations and 2 roles (FIO/TSO) in Intelligence.

Birmingham is proposed to be the centre for the AJU only, although there may be some work opportunities in the Axis.

Manchester has been allocated the departments for Operations, CMU and Intelligence, but Liverpool is proposed to lose its AJU.

Scotland has been also been affected – though Justice, Operations and CMU are not in scope. There are proposed job losses in F&CS and AIB. The AIB is the greatest proposed loss, and in our AIB

counter proposal we explain the different role that researchers play in supporting Scottish Division police officers.

In a number of workstreams, London employees have also been hard hit – FCS Outer London, the AIBs and CMU. Arguably there are greater redeployment opportunities in London, but clearly BTP needs to have the will to redeploy and retrain staff, otherwise at risk of redundancy in London, as well as in Division C.

TSSA Consultation

In May earlier this year, TSSA representatives met the FRP team alongside the staff associations to receive a presentation on the project. Following that, we had some initial discussions regarding 20-20-10, finances and agreed to appoint only on a fixed term to expire before FRP April 2014 in order to preserve redeployment opportunities for staff put at risk.

Following the formal launches on 15 July, we began a detailed review of the proposals which included our representatives meeting with affected TSSA members and staff. While we have not met with all affected staff, between our officials and representatives, we have discussed the proposals with 150-200 affected employees from all over the country in large and small group meetings, 1-to-1 discussions, emails and phone calls.

At the national FRP meetings, management agreed to have the workstream leaders attend the meetings to be questioned about their proposals. This provided a good opportunity to discuss the basis for the proposals, numbers of job losses and the future workloads and requirements. A number of our questions – particularly regarding workloads – have not been fully answered which has given us the impression and concern that some of the proposals have not addressed this in establishing future staffing levels.

MANAGING THE RISK AND PROTECTING STAFF

Our counter-proposal focuses on

- Improved numbers of jobs where work is proposed to be based
- A two-centre solution for each department in Division C
- Improving opportunities for redeployment, and training and transfer into remaining work; pay protection for changes to grades.
- Relocation and travel support for staff who could commute or move
- Realistic workloads for those who remain

In our counter-proposals, TSSA argues that the low staffing levels in the future proposed in FRP will put support services in jeopardy, leading to a less effective Police Force and inevitably to recruitment of new staff in the future, having wasted the skills and experience of current staff. Each of our counter-proposals argue for either extra staff, or a reallocation to Division of staff resources proposed for centralisation/ FHQ or to senior management grades.

The solution for Division C

As already highlighted in our introduction, staff in the proposed Division C are the hardest hit in terms of potential job losses because the most relevant redeployment opportunities are located at distance in other cities. Apart from the acute difficulties for individual staff in these difficult economic times, the losing of skilled and experienced staff, established teams and structures, poses considerable risk for BTP.

In TSSA's view, the most rational and logical step is for BTP to decide to keep two centres per department in Division C.

This is why:

1. Having two centres is feasible. Whole FHQ teams, small and large, are out-based, operating in London and out-of-London locations.
2. The amount of staff to maintain two centres compared to FRP proposals barely changes. Efficiencies can be made and money will be saved if the loss is limited to one current Area centre per department, rather than two.
3. It is the most effective way of making sure that the skills and experience of some brilliant BTP staff members, who would otherwise be at risk of redundancy, are kept within the Force and within their chosen career.
4. The correct level of supervision and standardisation of processes can be achieved. The key is clear and agreed operating and performance standards, not co-location. The teams will be formed of experienced and skilled professionals, with experienced supervision in place.
5. The proposed 3 Division structure realises very little savings in estates, and in the main over the long term, as long term lease arrangements are in place. Estate savings are normally an important part of restructure savings for businesses but for BTP this is clearly not the case.
6. It would be provide very effective mitigation of compulsory redundancies and BTP has a duty to try to avoid compulsory redundancies
7. Even with first class re-training programmes, there is an inevitability that the Force will have to recruit and train up new staff to fill vacancies in some locations. By maintaining two teams per department, that should not happen or be negligible.
8. It will provide a way to manage the process of achieving a reduction in staff costs without a risk of those support services falling apart in April next year. We explain some of the risks below.

The transition in April

In implementing its proposed programme of staff cuts by end of March 2014, the Force faces a massive task in getting staff trained up to speed for the hand-over in April.

It is clear already that staff are leaving, and those remaining feel under massive pressure to take on more duties, even when they understand that they will be at risk of redundancy.

However many staff are redeployed from other departments or are prepared to commute, there is a massive retraining challenge. For example for the Division C AJU, under FRP proposals , there are 17 staff proposed for the new WACO role. 7 current staff will need to train into that role, including 4 currently at A005. A further 10 will need to be trained as redeployees from scratch. That process will be difficult to achieve by April, as work is handed over from NE and NW as well as continuing WW own workload.

It is not clear how the work will be managed as the NE/NW departments will become diminished as staff start to leave or be trained in other work. The staging of the necessary release of staff to get trained in new work against the need to maintain the services provided will be difficult to achieve. In addition staff who are leaving will need to take their accrued leave etc during the months to April.

The most practical solution is for the Force to maintain two teams in Division C for each department, and benefit from a change programme that does not risk failure.

Proposals for supporting staff

Without the two-centre solution for Division C, a set of provisions need to be agreed per Division including additional staff numbers, training plans and contingency measures for April.

Out-based teams

Without two centres remaining in Division C, we will argue for some teams to be retained in current locations, operating as out-based teams. While FRP business cases have tended to rule out out-based teams, TSSA does not accept this position on a blanket basis. The need for out-based teams is restricted to Division C where the location changes are significant.

Staged reduction

A further contingency measure is to allow a staged reduction in staff numbers – potentially over a year or more – so that the Force is not left at risk. During that period, staff can take voluntary redundancy on an agreed timescale.

Redeployment within FRP departments

This section provides an overview of what BTP should and can do in the first instance on redeployment. TSSA's proposed changes to numbers of jobs are covered in more detail in the counter-proposals for each workstream.

Overall, where jobs are available following job match, but in a different grade or department, we call upon BTP to invest in all current staff and provide first-class support to make redeployment a real possibility for BTP staff through:

- re-training and skill conversion programmes
- relocation and travel support for staff prepared to commute
- enhanced pay protection for those considering jobs more than one grade below their current grade

We ask the FRP team to ask all affected staff whether they wish to consider a role in another location as an expression of interest. We will also be pressing for tailored programmes to help staff move into other roles that are available in their location, or at a commutable distance, or indeed wherever staff are prepared to move to. It is important for staff to say what they need – and our job as a union is to ensure that BTP makes every effort to avoid every compulsory redundancy.

Alternative redeployment opportunities – outside FRP

The Force has already taken steps to ensure that vacant positions are not filled permanently to allow staff at risk of redundancy to be redeployed. TSSA has supported this work.

TSSA asks for information (and discussion) about all potential redeployment opportunities to be made available to staff and the union including, for example:

- all positions that have been filled on a fixed term contract basis through RAP, and information regarding whether the position is to become permanent
- staff roles that will be created as a consequence of extra police officer deployment – such as station administrators. There needs to be a plan to facilitate at risk staff to secure these positions, even if there is a time lag.
- timelines for all Police officer and PCSO recruitment. Review of support available to facilitate staff applications for operational roles.
- recruitment plans for other staff jobs – where business plans are being submitted for future expansion, for example, at Ebury Bridge
- a phase 2 on voluntary severance scheme: the opening up for applications for voluntary severance scheme on a targeted basis where grades and locations in otherwise unaffected departments match staff at risk of redundancy. TSSA will not expect BTP to pay voluntary severance where a job would need to be back-filled by a new recruit into BTP, but for BTP to use the VSS scheme constructively to open up redeployment opportunities where required

Statement takers

In the London Areas, the civilian staff role Statement taker have become an established role to support Police operations and help ensure that Police Officers are fully operational.

As the name of the role suggests, the job is to principally take statements from victims and witnesses. In some Areas, the role also carries out a wider function to back up operations.

TSSA urges BTP to create Statement taker positions in C Division, located mainly in the North East where staff are most at risk. 10 positions would form a credible support to local Police Operations and a significant redeployment opportunity.

Relocation – our claim for employee support

TSSA submitted a claim for an overall improvement to protection on relocation and redundancy as part of our pay claim for 2013. We have discussed the items listed below during pay talks and reiterate our claim below. The current situation is that BTP need to respond with an offer.

Our proposal for employees to be entitled to the following support, as a minimum entitlement for EPS and PSG staff (Red Book staff have enhanced contractual entitlements):

- Financial support to cover the expenses of buying a house, or rental, such as estate agents, removals, legal conveyancing etc up to the value of £15,000 (tax free up to £8000)
- Financial support for renting for a fixed period while looking to secure long term accommodation.
- Reasonable time off to look for accommodation, schools, childcare and other facilities as necessary

- Additional travel costs paid for 2 years, plus any tax liability covered by BTP. This would be the difference in cost between current travel costs and the new fare/fuel/parking costs
- Disruption allowance of £2000 payable following a significant change to work location.
- Reasonable travel time to be included as working time for a transitional period.
- Pay protection for 2 years to be extended to roles more than one grade lower than the current grade.
- Phased withdrawal of London Weighting / shift premia over 2 years.
- Flexible working entitlements enhanced to facilitate working from different (nearer) work locations or from home following relocation

Travel concessions

At every TSSA meeting with members on FRP, the issue of travel passes has been raised by staff. While different entitlements have long been problematic, as staff start to work alongside others from different Areas, there is great potential for further difficulty. The difference in travel concessions, of greater or lower value and the fact that staff will be undertaking new journeys to work, and sometimes at higher cost, must be resolved.

DIVISION C

Below provides a summary position focussing on larger numbers in grades in Division C to start a discussion about some of the support required.

North East

Within the FRP proposals, relatively large groups of staff are affected in different areas. The most acute effect is on NE staff where there is no prospect of other work at relevant grades / types of work at their location.

- 10 staff may be at risk in A003 grade – 8 from AJU
- 3.5 staff in A004 grade (Duty Planners)
- 12 A005 jobs at A005 from AIB, CMU and AJU (4).
- 6 staff jobs at A006 (AIB, AJU)

A mitigation of potential job losses at A003 grade in Leeds is a re-grade of the A002 FCS jobs proposed, and additional numbers for the role, but the jobs will be based in Leeds. The rationale for the re-grade and additional numbers is in the FCS counter proposal.

A mitigation of job losses for the A005/6 grades is our proposal for out-based work in Leeds for AIB and CMU teams to form a smaller unit in Leeds (also with the FIO and TSO roles), and 2-person Duty

10

Management team to work alongside the out-based Event Planners. This would provide 9 further Leeds based jobs. There is a rationale for this in the AIB, CMU and Ops counter-proposals.

A further mitigation of A005/6 job losses would be the introduction of the role of Statement Taker within Division C (currently A005) to enhance the operational effectiveness of Police Officers and provide redeployment opportunities to valuable and skilled staff – up to 10 positions for the Division, with a concentration in the North East.

To make positions viable for staff in locations that might (just) be considered commutable such as Leeds to Manchester, TSSA is arguing for work relocation assistance to staff both for additional travel costs and travel time to help staff through a transitional period of 2 years if their work relocates. We are also asking BTP to provide a home-moving package for staff who could consider moving with their work.

WALES & WESTERN

Under the FRP proposals, the AJU for Division C is centred in Birmingham. Currently the FRP document proposes 8 A003 and 17 A005 jobs. Our counter-proposal presses for an increase to 12 and 22 respectively based on work demands.

Job losses facing staff in WW affects large groups in the following way:

- 4 staff may be at risk in A004 roles in FCS
- 11 staff in A005 roles working in CMU, AIB and AJU, and a further 3 A006 staff in CMU and AIB

To mitigate these redundancies there will need to be a strong commitment to retrain and support staff in FCS, CMU and AIB to be able to work in AJU where the numbers of staff required are increasing. This will involve a tailored training plan to convert the experience and skills for current work into those required for the AJU at both A003 and A006 grades.

TSSA is also pushing for an increase in the numbers of AJU staff at both grades in order to ensure that the workload is acceptable and achievable for staff.

NORTH WEST

While the NW is proposed to be the new location of Division C's AIB, CMU and Operations, there is still a negative impact on a large number of staff in A003 grade particularly from the AJU in Liverpool.

FRP proposes 8 Duty Planning Officers at A004 grade in Operations, which would represent a significant change of role and an increase in 1 grade for AJU staff. As mitigation, we would expect BTP to develop a training plan to develop opportunities for these staff, who would also need to commute from Liverpool.

There are also a significant amount of staff at A006 grade from the AJU who are of an equivalent grade to positions available in Manchester but will also need a training conversion programme to

take up vacant positions in different departments – alternatively there will be A005 roles which may prove an easier entry point along with pay protection.

To make positions viable for staff in locations that might (just) be considered commutable such as Liverpool to Manchester, TSSA is arguing for work relocation assistance to staff both for additional travel costs and travel time to help staff through a transitional period of 2 years if their work relocates. In addition, we are asking BTP to provide a home-moving package for staff who could consider moving with their work.

Employment overview in Division C

The following table shows (approximate) impact of the current FRP proposals. In the last line of the table, we have calculated the jobs required for staff without a matched job in the same department, grade or location. There are approximately 66 staff affected in this Division alone and that figure underlines the effort needed by BTP to support staff in redeployment.

	A001			A002			A003		
	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA
NE	1 AJU				2 FCS	0	1 FCS 8 AJU 1 CMU		4 FCS
WW				1 FCS			1 FCS 1.8 AJU 0.83 OP	8 AJU	12 AJU
NW				1 FCS 1 AJU			2 FCS 6.9 AJU		
JOBS NEEDED	1 NE			1 WW 1 NW NE 2 OVER			10 NE 8.9 NW WW (5.2 OVER)		

	A004			A005			A006		
	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA
NE	3 FCS 3.5 OPS	6 FCS	7 FCS 3 OPS	5 AIB 4 AJU 3 CMU	1 FCS	1 FCS 2 AIB 2 CMU	2 AIB 4 AJU 3 OPS	2 OPS	1 AIB 2 OPS
WW	4 FCS 5 OPS		3 OPs	5 AIB 4 AJU 2 CMU 1 FCS			2 AIB 3 AJU 1 CMU 2 OPS 1 FCS	17 AJU 2 OPS	22 AJU 2 OPS
NW	1 FCS 5 OPS	8 OPS		3 AIB 1 AJU	6 AIB	6 AIB	3 AIB 6 AJU	5 AIB 1 CMU	5 AIB 1 CMU

				4 CMU	8 CMU	8 CMU	2.5 OPS	3 OPS	3 OPS
JOBS NEEDED	9 WW 0.5 NE			12 NE 11 WW 0 NW (6 OVER)			7 NE 2.5 NW 0 WW (11 OVER)		

	B001			B002			B003		
	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA
NE	1 AIB 1 FCS	1 FCS 1 OPS	1 AIB 1 FCS 1 OPS	1 AIB		Either a B001 or B002			
WW	1 AIB 3 AJU	3 AJU 2 OPS	2 OPS			2 AJU		2 AJU	
NW	1 FCS 1 AJU 1 CMU	1 AIB 1 CMU 1 OPS	1 AIB 1 OPS1 CMU	2 AIB 1 AJU	2 AIB	2 AIB			
JOBS NEEDED	1 WW 1/2 NW			1 NE 1 NW					

	B004			C001			C002		
	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA	Current	FRP	TSSA
NE	1	1							
WW	1 FCS							1 AJU	
NW	1							0.5	0
JOBS NEEDED	1 WW 1 NW								

SECTION 2: Criminal Justice Counter Proposal

The main objectives of the AJU business case are as follows:-

- Reduction of staff from 54 to 31.
- Merger of the 2 main job roles of case builder and witness care officer.
- Creation of the WACO role in C Division.
- Elimination of disclosure work from the Justice units and pushing this back out to Police officers.
- Consolidation of AJU offices from Manchester, Newcastle, and Leeds to form a C Division hub based in Birmingham.
- Take on extra duties relating to driver awareness/crossing offences and increased YOT liaison due to recent changes in LASPO.
- Removal of duplication and introduction of consistent working practices and supervision across the Force.

Importance of Criminal Justice to FRP objectives

The target of achieving a 20% reduction in crime is argued as a factor in facilitating the reduction of staff roles that deal with crime. However, as the FRP proposal aims to achieve these objectives through the deployment of additional police officers, the work to support the investigation of crimes will not diminish. Indeed the FRP rationale is that Police have to become more effective in dealing with criminals in order to reduce the crime rate over the period to 2019.

Making the Force less efficient by reducing staff numbers, creating backlogs and delays, will not allow the front line Police officers to deal effectively with criminals. The AJU's play a critical role in getting cases to court, building the cases, updating records, records retention, typing up taped interviews and other back office functions that are *critical to resulting the case files at court*.

Staffing assessment

The main area for job losses for the proposals is located in C Division, currently a reduction of 54 staff to the proposed 31 in the Criminal Justice business case. B division will only be affected by the relocation of the Central Ticket Office of the Justice Directorate to the London based CJU.

There are a number of post-charge JUs throughout BTP and they act as the interface between BTP and the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) and courts, with responsibilities that include the preparation of prosecution files, witness liaison and PNC updating. These Units are situated within Scottish, North Eastern (NE), North Western (NW) and Wales and Western (WW) Areas, while the London CJU serves the three London Areas. Only the London CJU and NW AJU currently operate the Witness and Case Officer (WACO) model of operation which the 2012 review recommended for adoption in all BTP JUs as best practice.

The loss of jobs in the newly proposed C Division is based on the assumption that job roles can be merged and thereby share functions, it is proposed that by creating a new job role of WACO this can be achieved on the numbers that have been proposed. The WACO role merges the current roles of a Case Builder and Witness care Officer Roles into one. The WACO model is the current model that the London CJU is operating with and this has been assessed as successful, the WACO model operates as follows:-

Charge and summons files are dealt with upon their receipt by the London CJU. Essentially, following legal vetting by the legally trained Area Team Manager (ATM), the files are forwarded to the Witness and Case Manager (WACM) who will subsequently allocate to a Witness and Case Officer (WACO). The WACO will carry out the case building and witness care elements which are audited by the ATM to ensure legal compliance and by the WACM to ensure compliance with witness care requirements. The operations team are supported by a performance team which is responsible for PNC updates, records retention, the typing of taped interviews and other administrative tasks.

There will also be a requirement to absorb additional duties relating to driver awareness/level crossing offences and increased YOT liaison following on from changes in the youth justice legislation arising from the legal aid, sentencing and punishment of Offenders act (LASPO).

The Justice Business case also recommends that the relocation of the central ticket office element of the justice directorate x3 resources to the London CJU. The main argument for this is while the administration of Penalty Notices (PNDs) is primarily a pre charge function, it should ideally be co-located with a JU as persons issued with a PND can contest them and elect a court appearance which then becomes a post charge issue dealt with by the JUs. As the current CTO resources are situated within London it is recommended that the posts should be relocated to the London CJU as this would mitigate against loss of staff.

The Scottish AJU is out of scope due to the judicial system in Scotland, the Scottish AJU is excluded from FRP.

TSSA proposals and Rationale

WACO staff – Additional posts required at the hub as there will be an increase in the work load due to the new boundary changes for C Division, these incorporate large stations such as Reading, Luton, Peterborough, Bletchley and Oxford. It has been argued that Reading station will generate the same work load as Birmingham New Street station, and the boundary change alone will generate and extra 500 plus cases. Other arguments that support an increase to the proposed staffing levels are that the extra officers that FRP will move back to frontline duties will also have a substantial increase in case loads for the Criminal Justice units across the BTP Force area.

Considerations regarding staffing numbers also need to be made during the transition and training period as extractions for staff training and file transferral will massively impact on work load and flow and ultimately business continuity.

Considerations also need to be given to the fact that there are no WACOs in either the NE or WW pre restructure. The units currently have Case builders and Witness officers with two separate job descriptions. Each will be expected to learn each other's role and then train the new staff that may

potentially come in from other departments on job match etc. A big concern is whether proposed staffing levels will be able to manage a workload in the new structure that may be up to 4 x more cases per person compared with what they are doing now . At the same time they will be expected to train and mentor new staff.

Any reduction in staff numbers in either role would potentially have a negative impact on this area of business, and to further strengthen the need for more staff there has also been a recent change to Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act will generate more work for the staff in the new C Division hub.

PNC and Records officer staff & ROTI Typists - Additional posts required at the hub as there will be an increase in the work load due to the new boundary changes for C Division plus the additional deployments that FRP aims to deliver.

There a number of issues specific to ASU. A potential risk has been identified that warrants will not be managed as efficiently as they currently are given the projected level of PNC and Records Officer staff in the new set up – the risk that persons are arrested when the warrant is not in existence and the associated litigation costs.

Daily audits are carried out on each outstanding warrant on the court systems LIBRA & Xhibit. The purpose of this is to capture any activity on warrants by HO forces that have not been communicated to BTP via NSPIS. It also captures activity on warrants completed by BTP officers that has not been brought to the attention of the AJU either via NSPIS or CRIME. As it is currently the AJU's responsibility to arrange the adding, update or removal of warrants from PNC, these daily audits are essential in maintaining an effective warrants management process. Over the period March-May 2013 the NW area alone had 76 FTA warrants issued and 83 executed. This is significantly more than NE & WW whose issued figures are 56 & 49, and executed 55 & 32 respectively. This data demonstrates the effectiveness of the stringent checks in place here, and reflects the ability of the 4 ASU clerks to manage a high volume of warrants in and out of the unit. The risk would be that the 4 PNC & Records officers at the centralised and amalgamated C division AJU hub would not be able to effectively manage the combined amount of warrants and that the daily audits would not be completed. The risk associated with this is of false arrest and the ensuing civil litigation would increase against the Force.

The PNC and Records officers also have to complete mandatory checks on PNC Impending data.

To analyse data regarding all impendings on PNC, in accordance to the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) PNC compliance. Investigate the reasons for them and updating where required

Currently an AJU team reviews the impending data that is over 12 months old. The most recent North West impending data had 1090 entries, only 90 of which were over 12 months old. As such, by including the requirement to review ALL impending data this would effectively increase the workload of this element of the role by x 10. With the number of PNC & Records officers JDQ totalling 4, to conduct all PNC impending data reviews for the entirety of C division is not, in our opinion feasible. We estimate that if each entry takes 5 minutes to review and update, the hours

required to complete the full review is 88.33, therefore it would mean that each of the 4 PNC & Records officers would spend 22.08 hours on this task alone each month.

The PNC and Records officers also have to interrogate the court systems to obtain the results for all court hearings. Currently a typical area Justice unit can obtain up to 367 court results per area, these updates will also have a requirement to update CRIME, PNC & JAS. We estimate that amalgamating 3 areas work would effectively triple the volume of court results that need to be obtained by 4 PNC & Records officers in the proposed C Division area.

It is anticipated that C Division is getting an additional 180 personnel from recruiting and as a result of the boundary changes with London North. There is a possibility that the FRP proposal for Admin staff will mean that the staff will be unable to cope with workloads. E.g. ROTI' staff typing up statements, taped interviews working to tight deadlines. Less admin staff to support front line officers will inevitably mean officers spending more time carrying out admin duties rather than visibly on patrol, detecting and arresting criminals etc.

AJU Managers – Additional posts are required as more WACO, PNC and records staff and ROTI Typist's will be required. London CJU has 16 managers – nearly 3 x as many as proposed in the anticipated new 'C' division. This will carry risk due to the sheer volume of work.

The percentage match of work in the Business case report between London CJU and outer London AJU's appears to be flawed. The London CJU deal with considerably more charge files which entails much less work than a summons file. With the number of files and the type of file, the staffing level for the 'C' Division CJU has been under estimated, this is even further reinforced by the additional stations being added from London North into 'C' division with the boundary change. Consideration must then be given to charge/summons/trial files and the workload surrounding each of them.

JANUARY	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	361	135	496	53
Outer London	200	246	446	47

FEBRUARY	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	441	222	663	62
Outer London	160	242	402	38

MARCH	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	376	175	551	54

Outer London	185	280	465	46
--------------	-----	-----	-----	----

APRIL	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	424	174	598	59
Outer London	174	247	421	41

MAY	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	454	151	605	57
Outer London	189	265	454	43

JUNE	Charge	Summons	Total	%
London	352	188	540	53
Outer London	176	310	486	47

Above statistics taken from SEB report January to June 2013

TSSA proposals on staff increases for C Division.

Our proposal is to address the proposal level of staff which we see as inadequate for the expected workload for Division C.

- Waco staff: the FRP proposal is for 17 staff members in this role. TSSA proposes to increase this to 22
- PNC and Records officer –the FRP proposal is for 4 staff members in this role. TSSA proposes to increase this to 8
- TP - the FRP proposal is for 4 staff members in this role. TSSA proposes to increase this to 8
- Manager at B001 – the FRP proposal is for 3 staff members in this role. TSSA proposes to increase this to 4

SECTION 3: Operations Counter Proposal

The business cases for Operations proposes these main objectives:

- Scope - Operations functions including Events Planning, Football Planning and Co-ordination, Duty Management and Resilience Planning. The term resilience planning is an overarching descriptor for what have previously been described as Business Continuity, Contingency Planning and Emergency Planning.
- Centralised duty management function with out based event planning and resilience functions in Division C at at three locations in Leeds, Manchester and Birmingham.
- Overall reduction of staff in C Division from 32.9 to 26.
- DMS hub based in Manchester
- A slight reduction of Division B workforce on balance
- A reduction in Duty Planning in Division B
- The transfer from FHQ of work on Event and Football Planning with a reduction at FHQ
- A reduction in the FHQ team on Resilience Planning

The importance of Operations to FRP objectives

To achieve the 20-20-10 targets, FRP has set to reduce staff roles into to pay for extra police officer deployment. The Operations department plays a critical role in the effective deployment of Police resources on a day today basis as well as for large pre-planned events, football operations, counter terrorist support roles and other major Policing operations. Operations staff are also responsible for resilience and contingency planning for the Force.

Making the Force less efficient by reducing staff, creating backlogs and delays, will not allow the Police to deal effectively with criminals.

Division C

At present, BTP is proposing a reduction of C Division operations staff from 32.9 to 26, representing a significant reduction to the current establishment. The demand analysis provided in the Business Case was subject to debate by TSSA at the FRP meeting which discussed the C Division operations proposals.

The largest reduction in staff posts will be across the DMS teams as the Force propose to centralise this part of the operation at the Manchester hub. A key factor in deciding on this as the location of the hub is the presence of the Divisional Operations Superintendent and Chief Inspector. For valid operational reasons the Force has decided that these two officers will be based in Manchester.

The Force argues that the duty management function will be more resilient and as a result of having more staff in one place than currently exists in the current areas when centralisation is complete. The centralised team will also benefit from the support of the locally based Event Planning Officers where necessary, Leeds, Birmingham and Manchester.

The proposed command structure for C Division will include territorial Superintendents based at Leeds, Birmingham, Cardiff and Reading. The Force acknowledges that there is a gap at Manchester but propose to close this by placing the Superintendent Operations at that location. The distribution

of Senior Officers appears that this is the best operational fit for 'C' Division in the Force's opinion. In addition the current staff at Manchester, who deal with Event Planning, are also trained and experienced Duty Planners.

The current establishment with costing are below:

Rank/Grade Cost (£)

2 Chief Inspectors 150k
3 Inspectors 194k
2 Sergeants 115k
4 Constables (Football Intelligence Officers) 188k
5.5 A006 (Contingency Planning Officers) 174k
2 A006 (Duty Planning Managers) 61k
0.92 A004 (Duty Planner Cable) 20k
12.6 A004 (Duty Planning Officer) 291k
0.88 A003 (Ops Support Officer) 21k

Total posts 32.9

Total £1,214k

The Force proposals are below with anticipated costing:

Rank/Grade Cost (£)

1 Superintendent Nil (existing post)
1 Chief Inspector 75k
3 Inspectors 194k
1 A006 DMS Manager 32k
8 A004 Duty Planners 190k
4 B001 Resilience Planning Officers 141k
6 A006 Event Planning Officers 190k
3 Constables (Football Intelligence Officers) 143k

Total posts 26

Total £965k

TSSA Proposals Operations C Division

TSSA's main proposal is that the future numbers of Operations staff should be based on the workload required using the current model as a bench mark. The TSSA have made representations regarding the proposed staffing levels in the new Operations structure, and in particular raised concerns over the reduction of DMS planners in the proposed centralised hub model.

The Business case submitted by the work stream lead for C Division propose that the duties for C Division staff will be planned by 1 Duty Planning Manager (DPM) and 8 Duty Planners (DPs) based at Manchester. This equates to a reduction of 1 DPM and 5.52 DP's. Also the current DP's in Wales & Western are overseen by a Sergeant. The reduced establishment will also have to deal with an additional 180 personnel as a result of boundary transfers and proposed additional posts.

The proposed business case states that support is to be provided by the locally based Event Planning Officers we feel that this is misleading as the new job descriptions have clearly split the current Duty

Planner role into two distinct functions, with the new Event Planners being responsible only for the events side of the current process. According to their job description they will have no involvement with any of the processes to be undertaken by the revised Duty Planner role. The functions will be entirely separate so no support will be provided to the centralised Duty Planning team in carrying out their responsibilities. We therefore propose that further DP staff posts should be out based at Birmingham and Leeds.

While it is true the new centralised Duty Planning team will have more staff than in any one of the current areas it can be reasonably assumed that at least half of this new team will have no experience of the role and will therefore require substantial training. It is also noted that none of the experienced staff on the new team will have any Area-specific knowledge of the current Wales and Western and North East Areas. The Proposal makes no mention of exactly how these skills and knowledge gaps will be managed, especially considering that this new team is expected to be up and running by April 2014 at the latest, this further strengthens the requirement for out based DMS teams.

The 6 Event Planners (EP's) proposed for 'C' Division will be responsible for considerable more events than what is proposed for 'B' Division, i.e. 1 PS, 3PC's & 4 staff. This imbalance is evident when you look at the number of football teams in the English League. The split is as follows:

	B Division	C Division
Premier League	8	12
Championship League	8	16
League One	6	18
League Two	5	19

Whilst it could be argued that the smaller football clubs don't require such heavy policing it is those clubs which cause problems at Cup Fixtures and local derby's. 'C' Division will also be responsible for numerous other events impinging upon the infrastructure at places such as Millennium Stadium and Manchester Arena.

The TSSA request out based staff throughout the proposal, however, Divisional Event Planners will be based at the 3 locations, and we assume will be responsible for the planning of football and all other such like events but with the duty planning teams allocating resources to the Operational plans being carried out by the DMS staff at the Manchester hub. In theory this is fine but we strongly feel that this function would be more efficient if it were supported by DMS staff at each of the hubs working in close liaison with the Event Planners and local Command. The out based DMS staff would provide resilience in planning in case of a major and or critical incident, work closely with Events Planners who also work with in that operational foot print, thus providing a better more effective service.

TSSA also has to question how the workload for the proposed Reading Sub-Division will be managed for Event and Resilience Planning. It would make sense for additional out based staff for Duty, Event

& Resilience Planning to be based at Birmingham and Leeds to provide an even distribution of the workload.

The additional posts that the TSSA are requesting are 2 x out based Duty planning departments at Leeds 3 x Duty planners & Birmingham 3 x Duty planners.

The additional costs for the above is £138k, reducing the FRP proposed savings from £249k to £111k.

London Division B and FHQ

In the FRP plan for London is the consolidation of LN, LU and LS Areas into new Division B Duty Management team and an Events Unit.

In terms of Duty Planning, there have been operating problems in some areas in recent years –our view is that the workload must be properly staffed. Few economies of scale will be found from combining the teams, and the numbers of Police Officers will increase. The current proposal is for a reduction of four staff in DPO role to 14 (part-time hours rounded up). The risks are very high if day to day management of rostering falls behind as it will lead to operational problems.

The Events unit will take on all the Football and Events planning for London and the South East. The FRP plan is for the London A006 team plus Police Officers to also take on the work of the London Areas and of the event planning work of the current FHQ unit of 8 Planners including Police Officers plus two Sergeants and admin support. It has not been explained how this additional workload will be undertaken, and this needs to be fully worked out.

The Resilience planning section at FHQ has been cut by 50% three members, with an Inspector and B003 manager left in position, along with an A006 Resilience Planning Asst. It is difficult to see how this small team can fulfil a role to set strategic direction and oversee the divisional operation for business continuity, contingency and emergency planning and counter terrorism resilience, working with the new B003 Divisional Planning Officers. In the new structure, both the roles of A005 systems officers have been eliminated, so no systems or administrative support will be available.

TSSA proposal for Operations Division B and FHQ

TSSA’s proposal is to aim to address concerns about workload of the new teams – an increase in staff in Div B Duty Planning A004 team, A006 Contingency Planning Officers to at least match current London operations given an extended workload from FHQ, and at FHQ, systems support reintroduced for Resilience. A new B001 Division role is subtracted, and a FHQ B003 role is replaced with a B002. This is detailed in the table below.

Overview of Division B and FHQ

DIV B	Establishment	Actual	FRP	TSSA
A004 Duty Planning Officers	18 (4 LN, 9 LU, 5*	16 3* (+ 1 FTC) LS, 9	14	16

	LS)	(pts) LU, 4 LN		
A006 DP Manager	2 LN	2	2	2
A006 Contingency Planning officer / Event Planner	4 (2 LN, 2 LU)	5 (2 LN including 1 Ext funded, 2 LU, LS*) *LS is paid at A004	4	5
B001 Resilience Planning Officers	0	0	3	2
TOTAL	24	23	23	25
FHQ				
A004 Admin Support (Football)	1	1	1	1
A004 Duty Planner	6	7 inc FCRL/B	6	6
A005 Systems / Administrator (Res)	2	2	0	1
A006 Event Planner (football)	3	3	0	0
DP Manager	1	1	1	1
A006 Res Planning Asst	0	0	1	1
B001 Force Cont. planning co-ord (Res)	1	1	0	0
B002 Continuity Planning Manager(Res)	2	1	0	1
B003 Resilience Planning Co-ord	0	0	1	0
TOTAL FHQ	16	16	10	11

TOTAL DIV B & FHQ	40	39	33	36
----------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

SECTION 4: Finance & Corporate Service Counter Proposal

The F&CS Business case sets out the following proposals:

- Consolidation of NE, NW and WW Areas into C division centre at Leeds
- Reduction of roles in C Division by 24 (22?) to 11, and in D Division 8 to 6.
- Consolidation of LS, LN, LU Areas into a single centre in London, with two teams operating separately: Inner and Outer London teams
- Reduction of roles in B Division: Inner London from 26 to 23, and Outer London from 17 to 9.
- Significant merging of roles and grade adjustment at Divisions
- Further centralisation at FHQ of procurement, full centralisation of accounts payable) invoice payments and accounts receivable (billing) and improvements to business support.
- An overall increase in FHQ jobs by 4 to 60. Grade increases to jobs within FHQ Finance & Procurement section
- Total savings of £700,000 through an overall reduction from 129 to 108 posts

Staffing assessment

The two main areas for job losses for the proposals are C Division (13) and 8 (B Div Outer London).

The total number of current staff for Division C in the proposal is 24, though the positions reported amount to 22.

The loss of jobs at Divisions are based on the assumption that jobs can be merged and duties shared between staff, with a small number of duties being assumed by FHQ with the creation of a number of new positions.

The main roles of FCS on Area are currently:

- Support and servicing of police officers in terms of uniform, PPE and equipment, PNBs maintaining records and archives for these, travel, hotels, catering, vehicle hire.
- Payroll – queries, time-sheets and expenses
- Buying, cost control, supply of equipment to offices, maintenance and contractors
- Invoicing and billing, captor, banking & cash
- Accounting, reporting, budget preparation & financial management

The key determinant of the workload for the first two items is the number of Police officers working in the Area, or sub Division for the provision of uniforms, PPE and equipment and payroll work.

The numbers of Officers will not decrease in the future Div C or Div B Outer London. Current and future plans are to build new teams around the South which will compensate for a number of teams reducing in the Outer London north sector and Div C will expand with new teams and as boundaries are redrawn.

In terms of efficiencies in work and IT systems, the proposals contain no major advances for the ordering and distribution work on Uniforms, PPE and equipment so the workload for the combined Divisions appears to be remaining the same.

Two Procurement Assts A004 are designated with buying, and overseeing uniform orders, with no dedicated administrative support, for Divs C and B (Inner London).

On Procurement, some changes are being proposed to reduce the workload for Divisional FCS. It is proposed that the buying of items of a value of more than £5000 are to be transferred to FHQ. However the bulk of transactions (in the region of 80% of all transactions) are lower than £5000 so 80% of the transaction work will remain on Division. It has been claimed that the items of higher value are more complex and time-consuming, but those carrying out work, argue that this is not always the case. Two more senior staff are proposed to be employed at FHQ and the value of this partial centralisation is debatable.

In terms of buying, the further use of catalogues is being proposed though it remains unclear when this will come into effect and for what items. Currently stationery and print cartridges are ordered through catalogues. It is also necessary to point out that even while using catalogues allow some greater efficiency at the centre, the checking orders is a part of the standard procurement process to prevent errors, wastage and unnecessary cost.

The proposal also states that it will be possible for operational managers to procure directly on system but clearly it would not be productive for have any operational staff including line management spending time on orders.

In terms of the distribution of workloads on Div C and Div B, most if not all of the basic administrative duties have been put into the Job Descriptions of two Administrative Asst staff proposed at A002 grades. The duties for the two cover:

- Administrative support and mail
- Administration of vehicle fleet including vehicle mileage, fuel cards etc, data on fleet. Organise repairs, maintenance
- Record H&S returns and carry out monthly to six months audits
- Filing and archiving duties, management of storage
- Raise requisitions for, and organise distribution, stationary, uniform and equipment.

- Maintain stationery store, stock control. Faults on equipment. Audit uniform, PPE, passes etc
- Logging of payroll timesheets and expenses

The workload is beyond the capacity of 2 staff members currently in a single Area, let alone an Area doubled or tripled in size.

The under-staffing in service roles risks jeopardising the internal reputation of the administration of the new Divisions, if the basics of uniform, equipment and expenses are not handled promptly and efficiently.

Under the proposals, here is a single A004 Finance Support Asst to deal with payroll queries (assisted by the A002 Admin Asst), replacing three FTE staff. While the Business case says that a number of improvement to standardise the input process, the process remains as is. It is also suggesting a single set of business rules regarding expenses which, depending on their impact and the degree of change for Police Officers and staff, may take time to consult on, and bring into effect. Obviously, this may also bring about a range queries as employees learn about the new approach, and could increase the workload for the Finance Support Asst, and is certainly unlikely to reduce it.

There is a proposed centralisation of accounts payable (invoices) which will reduce some of the Divisional Finance workload, and there is an A005 Finance Officer role proposed for Divs C and Div B (Inner). Extra staff are proposed to be employed at FHQ on accounts payable.

While short-staffed in key areas, it is proposed that there are a number of Facilities Assistants who would have a JD detailing duties regarding building maintenance. This is a new role in most current structures, and the numbers required, compared to reduced teams on Payroll, Procurement and services, needs to be reviewed.

Area Records Administrator has been included in the WW FCS department and as this is a unique role, not all the duties are covered in the proposed A003 JD - only that of input onto CycMOPA. Audits for the months previous to December 2012 showed that this position had less than a hundred files reported missing as opposed to another area which had over a thousand missing. The cost of travel to the current area for audits if carried out by Cardiff staff would be more than the current cost. The current area has a better grasp of the issues in relation to Records Management than any other area within the force.

TSSA proposals

Division C

TSSA is proposing that the administrative, input and distribution work areas of Facilities, Services (uniform, PPE etc) Payroll, Procurement are reviewed. The A002 job is not manageable and needs worked into an A003 position with expanded numbers to support the A004 role. With A003 support, we recommend one extra A004 employee for the core functions on Payroll, procurement, fleet, facilities and maintenance.

We propose that the B001 role is retained to provide hand-on support, given the overall reduction in staff to do the work. It is staff to do the work that is required, not additional layers of senior management and therefore we propose that the C002 role is dropped.

We believe that the WW Area Records Administrator needs to be placed in the correct department, and out of scope for FRP.

Division C	Establishment	Affected staff	FRP	TSSA
Job Title				
A002 Admin Officer	2	2 (1 WW, 1 NW)	2	0
A003 Facilities Asst; A003 Finance Asst; A003 Procurement Asst	4	4 (2 NW, 1 NE)	0	4 to cover: Uniform, PPE, Travel x 2; Asst Payroll; Gen admin support, stationery
A003 Area Records Administrator	1	1 (WW)	0	Out of scope
A004 F&CS Officer Buyer NW ; A004 F&CS Officer NW; A004 Finance Asst (payroll) WW; A004 Finance Asst (Acc Payable) WW ; A004 Corporate Services Asst (uniform) WW; A004 Corporate Services Asst (Procurement) WW; A004 Area F&CS Asst NE ; A004 Area Procurement Asst NE	9	8 (4: WW; 1 NW; 3 NE) 1 FTC (NW)	6 (2 X Procurement Assts, 1 X Finance Support Asst; 3 X Facilities Asst)	7 to cover: Payroll x2; Procurement x3; Facilities / maintenance / fleet x2
A005 Finance Support Officer	1	1	1	1

A006 Finance Manager; A006 Corporate Services Manager WW	1	1 on long term secondment WW	0	0
B001 Asst FCS Manager NW; Finance Support Manager NE	2	2 (Both on secondment-length of term?)	0	1
B004 Area FCS Manager WW, NW, NE	3	3	1	1
C002 Divisional Business Support Partner (covers Div C & D)	0	0	0.5	0
TOTAL	22	20	11	14

Division D (Scotland)

Similarly Division D (Scotland) is proposed to reduce under FRP. As for Division C, TSSA propose not to have a C002 manager shared with Div C but to maintain a B004 manager with a B001 manager in support.

The difference is in the A002 grades where there are staff in the establishment currently graded as A002 and could be retained at that grade. However we would recommend that the job content of these positions are reviewed in line with the grades A002-3 in line with the other Divisions.

Division D (Scotland)	Establishment	Affected staff	FRP	TSSA
Job Title				
A002 Admin Asst	2	2	2	2
A003 Finance Asst A003 Procurement Asst	4	4	0	0 (skills match to A004 roles)

A003 Facilities Asst				
A004 Facilities/ Procurement/ Finance Support Asst	0	0	3	3
A005 Admin Supervisor	1	1	0	0
B001 FCS Support Manager	1	1	0	1
B004 Area FCS Manager	1	1	1	1
C002 Divisional Business Support Partner (covers Div C &D)	0	0	0.5	0
TOTAL	8	8	6.5	7

Division B London

The proposal for Division B creates a central department for F&CS but split into two sections: one dealing with LU FCS and the other dealing with London North and London South. There is little similarity in the proposed organisation of the two sections, and the disparity in employment positions is stark. There has been a marginal reduction in the LU section from 26 to 22 (there are agency staff are covering 2 senior positions and in addition at least 2 vacancies).

The FRP management team have insisted that the difference in proposed staffing levels – not reflected in the number of police officers, police stations, or any other factor – is due to the complexities of the system that TFL requires BTP to use as part of its PSA. TFL pays for the staff to be able to use its system, under which the LU team operate for most areas of work.

Overall, we would propose some cross-training on systems and sharing of workloads between the two teams, otherwise the department is likely to suffer from divisiveness, now that the teams will be working in the same department and the difference in staffing levels will become painfully apparent. Staff will need to be actively supported and consideration given to how it will be possible to build the team.

Inner London

Our proposal for the Inner London dispenses with the A002 grade for which the JD content is disputed elsewhere. It proposes changes to the number of staff in grades in a few areas, and reflects the current staffing level taking into account where vacancies have needed to be covered.

Division B (Inner London) Job Title	Establishment	Affected staff	FRP	TSSA
A002 Admin Asst	0	0	2	0 (minus 2)
A003 Facilities & Logistics Asst	4	4	4	5 Plus a review of duties
A004 PA Team coord	1	agency	0	0
A004 Payroll/ Procurement	6	5 (1 vacancy)	4	5
A005 Audit & compliance	3	3	2	3
Facilities and Log Coordinator	3	3 (incl 1 secondment – length?)	2	2
B001 Finance & Business Systems Officer	3	2 (1 vacancy)	3	2
B002 Accountant	2	2	0	0
B002 Procurement Manager		((Skills matching to B003)
B003 Facilities, Logistics, & Distrib Manager	2	1 (1 agency)	3	3
B003 Finance & Bus Info Manager				
Procurement Manager				
B004 Operations Manager	1	Vacant	1	0 (minus 1)
C002 Divisional Business Support	1	1	1	1

Partner				
TOTAL	26	21	22	21

Outer London

For Division B Outer London, our proposal is for an increase in staff in the work areas as highlighted in the table below. Proposed is the dispensing with the 2 X A002 grade, and the creation of 5 X A003 roles to support the A004 team which we have kept 'as is'.

Our proposal reintroduces the B001 role and keeps the B004 role as the most senior position with the cross London C002 role unnecessary. The two B004 roles for Inner and Outer London will obviously need to work with each other and fulfil the necessary financial management duties for the Division as a whole.

In addition there are C001 and B004 roles based at FHQ responsible for Estates and facilities in London Areas, and for out of London Areas. Other FHQ managers in B001 – 4 roles oversee a range of activities such as Fleet, uniform, financial governance etc.

Division B (outer London) Job Title	Establishment	Affected staff	FRP	TSSA
A002 Admin Officer	0	0	2	0
A003 Admin asst; Facilities Asst; A003 Finance/ Payroll Asst; A003 Procurement Asst	7 FTE	7 (incl 2 pt staff) (1 vacant) (Also includes 1 on career break - length)	0	5 to cover: Uniform, PPE, Travel x 2; Asst Payroll X 1; Gen admin support, stationery, maintenance & fleet support x 2
A004 Procurement Officer; A004 Payroll & Procurement Officer A004 Finance Officer; A004 Facilities Manager & Payroll support Officer; A004 Area Procurement & Facilities Officer	5	5	5 (procurement Asst x 2; Facilities Asst x 2; Finance Support Asst x 1)	5 to cover: Finance Support / Payroll x2; Procurement x2; Facilities Asst x1

A005 Finance Support Officer	0	0	1	1
B001 FCS support Manager; Management Accountant	2	2	0	1
B004 Area FCS Manager	2	2	1	1
C002 Divisional Business Support Partner (covers B Division)	0	0	0.5	0
TOTAL	16	16	9.5	13

FHQ

There is a proposed extension of FHQ in the following areas:

- 1 A A006 buyer and a B003 Procurement Manager
- 2 2 x A004 Finance Support Assistants
- 3 Significant increase in grades in Corporate Finance Accountant / Business Support Accountant / Senior and Management Accountant/ Procurement.

Procurement

It is not necessary to centralise procurement above £5000 and there appears no reason to do this. Therefore the additional personnel at FHQ are unnecessary and the budget for these jobs reallocated to the Divisions, where they have been undertaken at A004 roles.

Accounts Payable

Additional support may be required for the centralisation of Accounts Payable (Invoice payment) with the proposal to fully centralise the activity.

Corporate Finance/ Business Support / Procurement

It is also noted that while a C002 Budget Controller post has been eliminated from the F&P structure, the number of B003 and B004 grades has increased in the area of Corporate Finance Accountant / Business Support Accountant / Senior and Management Accountant/ Procurement.

The current 9 B002-4 posts are proposed to expand to 11 posts, and the seniority of grades to increase. The current 2 X B004, 3 X B003 and 4 X B002 roles are proposed to change to 5 X B004 and 6 X B003 roles (which includes the additional Procurement manager).

In the present climate this would have to be fully justified.

SECTION 5: Intelligence and Performance Analysis

Counter Proposal

The Business case report proposes the following key changes

- Consolidation and significant reduction of AIB teams from NE, NW, WW into a single Manchester location for Division C
- Consolidation and significant reduction of AIB teams from LN, LU, LS into a single London location Division B
- A reduction in analyst and researcher workload and staff in all Divisions, and the removal of separate Briefing Officer and IDO roles at A005 grade
- A doubling of research function at RTI in London and the drawing in of analyst, research and Briefing Officer functions into RTI
- A significant reduction in Division D Scotland of researcher roles
- Overall number of Senior Analysts across Divisions and FHQ reduced and a role of Higher Analysts introduced into Divisional structures
- Overall balance in AIB job losses proposed under FRP is 14 jobs. However the difference in location in Div C could generate 17 losses in that Division.

The intelligence function and FRP

One of three central aims for FRP is to deliver a 20% reduction in crime by 2019. Underlying the aim is Force view that previous methods that have successfully cut crime rates are now exhausted with no more gains expected without a major investment: the Force has decided that a significant increase in Police Officer deployments, up to 200, is the only way forward.

New Police Officer teams are planned across the UK, in new locations and increased numbers in existing locations, many in the South East and along key routes such as Virgin mainline. TSSA has been informed that 20-20-10 will not succeed by improving visibility as a preventative measure but through detecting crime, tracking down and arresting criminals, tackling volume crime in particular.

The intelligence function plays an essential role in targeting of criminal activity: establishing patterns of crime, targeting areas and individuals that make arrests more likely. Criminals are prosecuted and further deterred from reoffending in the same environment.

Intelligence support can be critical in effective police operations. The intelligence requirements of the future need to be integrated into the plans for increasing Police deployment, to ensure effective operations and to deliver reduced crime rates.

TSSA Proposals

RTI provides a 24 hour support for BTP's front line officers. The aim in the FRP proposal is for RTI to continue to provide live time intelligence support and in addition manage the whole organisation's intelligence evaluation and officer safety checks when they are dealing with live time incidents. It is likely that the proposal is based on a view that RTI would deal with live time requests during busier daytime hours and the evaluation of reports during quieter shift times i.e night shift. RTI would become an intelligence support function, taking on the responsibility for the more administrative element of an Intelligence Bureau's work (i.e. officer safety checks and evaluation of intelligence reports).

The Business Case proposes that RTI should take on new functions, with an increase in the number of research posts from 10 to 20.

The clear value of RTI is the 24 hour operation for live incident cover. However, while the Business case states that it has successfully embedded, it has been widely commented that the RTI operation has experienced and continues to experience significant problems with its operating model, restricted staff personal development, with effects on staff turnover and lower morale.

There have been a number of different views put forward on the development of RTI. Our view is that expanding the functions of the unit presents a risk to the Force's intelligence function given that RTI is not fully effective.

Adding further administrative functions into RTI will not assist in developing staff skills and reducing turnover, and potentially will add to the current problems. TSSA asked for clarification on the grades for the proposed unit as both A005 and A006 are included in the document – it was confirmed as costed at A005. It may be the case that running a 24 hr operation, based in London on A005 grades with the limited value shift premia of 15%, will continue to be problematic. The expanded RTI may well not provide the much-needed redeployment opportunities even among researchers because of the type of work, and shift patterns involved.

The movement to centralise functions (and staff), and transfer of budget, means that the capacity on Division will be limited in the future.

The rationale for centralisation is largely for standardisation and dealing with the consequence of job cuts in AIBs. But with three Divisions, compared to 7 Areas, BTP's overall concerns regarding lack of standardisation must be easier to address.

Divisional Intelligence Bureaux (DIB)

The future role of the DIBs has not been fully discussed in the Business Case. The proposal to transfer administrative work to RTI has a rationale, other than cost savings, to refine the intelligence functions on Division. However, the reduction in staffing across Divisions which have tripled in size, will restrict this because of the need to provide support across many more Police officers/ operations. There may well be limited capacity to specialize and develop valued local knowledge within the larger Division. An example of this is the expected reduction in support to volume crime in London, despite this playing such a significant role in crime trends and targets.

An alternative future is that the three new Divisions should be provided with the resources and capabilities to create centres of excellence in intelligence in Division and able to build up their specialist knowledge and capabilities across the new Division. A rationale for the 3 Area structure was the alignment with major routes, to provide a more effective service for the TOCs and in intelligence, where sharing of, and joint work on intelligence, has been successful, this should be maintained and developed. This may help build confidence within the TOCs that the larger Divisions will be responsive to their needs on different routes.

These functions should remain on Division:

- ID soughts
- Evaluation of Intelligence, ensure data standards are met, sanitise and disseminate intelligence
- Responding to intelligence requests and info from other forces and agencies
- Providing intelligence summaries to support key events, protests and demonstrations, football matches
- Daily, weekly and monthly trawls for warrants for regions – outstanding

The focus should be on supporting RTI to perform its core function, not extending its remit into areas where there are already specialist staff.

The list of proposed duties included training in the use of the intelligence system which should sit under Force trainers.

Force Headquarters – Analysis and Performance

The proposed changes to the A&P department are:

- an Automation Unit
- centralising some functions from existing AIBs.

There is an increase in the team of analysts at FHQ. Taking into account at least 2 vacancies (data Developer, Senior Analyst) within the current team, we argue for two analyst positions from the proposed FHQ structure to be reallocated to Division B. The business case indicates that the A&P team would take on reports for submission to the TOCs and independently develop and produce the Strategic Assessment. It is our view that the analyst resources are needed on Division, not only to provide the statistical reports on TOCs but the focused work in support of operations on the rail routes.

With the Division B analyst team in the FRP proposal much reduced, it would be more productive to retain 2 analysts than expand the team at FHQ on Div B rather than unnecessarily centralising this work.

PPU

Lastly, TSSA has raised the future of PPU which is largely externally funded and has a budget for 3 years. A number of Police Staff have the job title of PPU researcher – whether or not these are funded separately - and given that the Business Case does not deal with the future of PPU, TSSA would argue that posts that predominantly work on PPU are considered separately to FRP, so that the future of the project and what the Force needs can be determined in a considered way. We propose that PPU researcher roles should be taken out of scope of FRP. This is not reflected in the employment tables that follow, but needs to be fully discussed.

Out-based teams

In addition to the establishment proposed for the Manchester based intelligence team we are proposing that there is an out-based team in Leeds:

Leeds: 1 analyst 2 Researchers; 1 Higher or Senior Analyst

Birmingham: 1 analyst (Centro funded) 1 researcher

Most of the TSSA proposal on Intelligence is cost-neutral. Our proposals on analyst and researcher positions are cost-neutral as they are essentially the retention of staff resources on Divisions, as opposed to enhancement of the FHQ team and expansion of the RTI.

Indeed, taking into consideration one-off redundancy costs plus on-going London Weighting costs, there may be cost savings.

In addition, we would propose the Force considering an extra Senior or Higher analyst to ensure coordination, supervision and leadership which would facilitate the Leeds team to provide support to a crime sector as well as to operations in the NE sub-division.

This will be in addition to the FIOs and TSOs based in each location, and the Events Planning staff under Operations.

Briefing Officer / IDO

The Briefing Officer role has been eliminated from the proposed structure, along with a number of IDO posts. Unless specific posts are recreated, it means that the researcher role will become a hybrid role and the overall A005 numbers will need to increase, in relation to the number of analysts. The pre-existing ratio was 1:1 which will need to be change as the A005 posts cover the role.

Office Manager – Div B

The London AIBs have not used the role of Office Manager previously and this is not felt to be critical compared to the proposed reduction in analyst capacity. This role should be converted into a Senior Analyst position to provide management and analyst capacity. It will also provide extra SA capacity for day to day leadership of specific teams.

Scotland

Our members in Scotland's AIB argue that their work is more integrated into Police operations than in other Areas and has a wider and more responsive remit. The FRP proposal is for the RTI in London to expand and take on much of the Scottish AIB workload.

However, an alternative view is that Scotland should retain its capacity to provide full intelligence, including real time intelligence for Police operations because of differences in processes, in access to Scottish databases as well as the value of more local knowledge. This is also reinforced by the argument that retaining the current facility provides resilience in the event that RTI becomes unavailable, for whatever reason. It is also unclear whether the future access to the databases for RTI has been established, as it appears that it would not be possible to cover intelligence function for Scotland to any degree without it.

TSSA supports the continuation of an effective intelligence operation in Scotland. BTP's operations and workforce in Scotland are small in proportion to BTP's overall costs, and it would be premature and counter-productive to carry out a major reorganisation, cutting jobs and capacity, when potential and significant change is being discussed with Police Scotland.

Employment Overview

TSSA's alternative proposal is to ensure that the new positions in RTI are allocated to DIBs to retain a significant intelligence capacity, outside the 24 hour support for live incidents.

Analysts & Researchers

TSSA wishes to see the additional analyst posts proposed for A&P at FHQ to be reallocated as analyst roles in Division B.

In addition to these positions covered within the proposed FRP budget, TSSA propose two extra analysts for Div B and for Division C, an analyst A006 plus a Higher or Senior Analyst.

We propose to convert the Div B Office manager position into a Senior Analyst role.

While increasing the Researcher roles in Div D, we propose to reduce the B002 roles by 1, leaving one B002 post (eliminating the currently vacant post).

Instead of an additional 10 posts created for RTI, TSSA is proposing that these jobs allocated into DIBs.

The RTI positions are Researcher roles but in the proposal, the work being transferred to RTI was mainly research work, some analyst work, and including ID soughts. Our proposed re-allocation, in addition to those proposed under FRP, is:

Div B: 4 researchers

Div C: 3 researchers

Div D: 3 researchers

JOBS BY DIVISION

London RTI A005	10	8	20	10 (minus 10)
Div B A005 Researcher, IDO, Briefing Officers	16	16	8 + 1 externally funded	8+1 plus 4 =13
Div B A006 Perf analyst	3 (incl A005)	3	2	2
Div B A006 Analyst	12	11	5 + 2 extern	5 + 2 extern plus 2 plus 2 = 11
Div B B001 Higher Analyst	0	0	2	2
Div B B002 Senior Analyst	5 (3 x LU, 1 x LS, 1 x LN)	4 (2 x LU, 1 x LS, 1 x LN)	2	3
Div B B002 Office Manager	0	0	1	0
Div B other roles: Senior Perf A B001 x 2; Oyster Data A004; Crime stats B001				Senior Perf Analyst job match to HA?
TOTAL DIV B	35	33	23	31
Div C A005 Researchers / IDO/ Briefing Officers	13	12 (4 X NE, 5 X WW, 3X NW)	6	6 in Manchester plus 3 out-based
Div C A006 Perf Analysts	1	1 (NE)	1	1
Div C A006 Analysts	7	5 (1 NE, 2xWW, 2X NW)	4 + 1 externally funded	4 in Manchester + 1 ext. funded role in Birmingham and 1 role out-based in Leeds

Div C B001 Higher Analysts	0	0	1	1 + 1 either Senior or Higher Analyst out-based
Div C B002 Senior A	3	2 (NE, NW)	1	1 or 2 (see HA above)
Div C B002 Office Manager	2	2 FTE	1	1
Div C other roles Perf statistician A006 NW Perf Manager B001 x 2: NE, WW Perf Analyst A005 NE	4	4		
TOTAL DIV C	29	26	15	21
Div D Scotland				
A005 researchers	13.5	7.5 (+ 1 FTC)	3.5 Incl 2 externally funded	6.5
A006 Analyst	1	1	1	1
B002 Senior Analyst; Office Manager	1	1	2	1
TOTAL DIV D	15.5	9.5	6.5	8.5
TOTAL ALL DIVS & FHQ	111.5	107.5	97.5	98.5

SECTION 6: Crime Management Unit Counter Proposal

CMU Business Case proposes these main objectives:

- Consolidation of London Area CMUs into a central location
- Reduction of staff from 36 to 23 including redeployment of two Police Officers and reduction of supervisory costs
- Merge the two main job roles of Victim Care and CM operator into a CMU operative
- Elimination of supporting roles of ICS, CRIS Liaison, Data Quality Supervisor
- Consolidation of NE, NW and WW Area CMUs into a single operation at Manchester
- Reduction of staff from 14 to 11 in Div B.
- Extend operating hours into the weekend.
- Scottish CMU is outside scope, as are CCTV review units.

The importance of CMU to FRP objectives

To achieve the 20-20-10 objectives, BTP is cutting staff jobs to fund Police Officer deployment. However as meeting the targets is dependent on the deployment of additional police officers, the work needed to support the investigation of crimes will not diminish. Indeed the FRP rationale is that Police have to become more effective in dealing with criminals in order to reduce the crime rate over the period to 2019.

The CMUs play a critical role in evaluation, screening and allocation of crimes to investigating officers, as well as reviewing detection opportunities and correcting mistakes. They also play a valuable role in contact with victims, and monitor compliance with the Victim's Code of Practice. Making the Force less efficient by reducing staff, creating backlogs and delays, will not allow the Police to deal effectively with criminals.

Staffing numbers

At present, BTP is proposing a reduction of CMU staff from 50 to 34, representing a third reduction. The demand analysis provided in the Business Case was subject to debate by TSSA at the FRP meeting which discussed the CMU proposals.

The staffing levels and expectations of what staff could manage in an average workload were based on London South staffing levels. It was stated that:

- The average LS workload was 1705 per year
- That was achieved with a significant 25% under-staffing during the year.

Taking into consideration the understaffing, it was proposed that an average number of crimes handled by each multi functional staff member would be 2000. The average used for Div C is 2062.

TSSA queried the LS staffing number of 8, as 4 extra staff members are involved in supporting CMU work outbased in LS as part of CID operations. The four positions are Victim Care Managers and Victim Support officers. The FRP team have now consulted the OICs at the relevant stations and

reported back to TSSA that two staff spend 50% and two spend 25% of their time on contacting victims, adding 1.5 staff.

TSSA also sought information on the under-staffing problems and details were provided for the year 2012, which was clearly significant, although the average number of recordable crimes was taken over a three year period. So it is unclear whether 25% shortfall was for 1 year or for each of the 3.

Taking the additional support of 1.5 staff into account, a more realistic LS average number of crimes handled by the multi-functional team would be 1436. A further review of the numbers of staff in LN and LU found that (now vacant) administrative posts were included in LU's 13 'operators' which if taken out, leaving 11 operators produces an average of 1163 (and that which still includes the cross-London CRIS systems work). For LN, it would seem that the 10 operators was also wrong – it should be 8, giving an average of 1447, similar to the correct LS average.

The average across all current Areas, including NE, NW, WW (excluding the WW Quality of Service supervisor) also equates to just over 1400.

One further issue with the LS benchmarking, the Business case argued that the understaffing problems in LS demonstrated that the team could do more, and on that basis increased the average for the proposal to 2000 plus. Of course if there was a problem with understaffing amounting to 25% (or possibly over three years, so a third of that) the LS establishment by the time of FRP was brought up to full complement, so while staff may well have busted a gut to keep CMU going during those periods, it is not necessarily sustainable, or desirable, or a sufficient basis to increase expectations of a day to day workload.

Non-notifiable crimes

We are awaiting clarification on what processes the Force is proposing as it has been assumed that CMU will not be dealing with NNCs in the future. A large amount of the crime handled, particularly in Division C are NNCs.

TSSA Proposals

TSSA's main proposal is that the future numbers of CMU staff should be based on the workload required. It is logical and necessary to work out how many cases each CMU operative can handle, and the strongest evidence of that workload is the work actually completed across the Areas. The average number of crimes handled across all current Areas is approx 1400.

The London Area total notifiable crime figures is 38001, and divided by an average of 1400, takes the number of CMU operatives needed from 19 to 26.5 (including 1.5 additional support in LS).

For Division C, the total of crimes managed is 16483, and divided by an average of 1400, the number of CMU operatives required is 11.5. This appears to be above the current establishment across the Division – largely due to the small staff in WW.

In terms of the distribution of work within LS which provides the operating model for the proposals, the out-based support actually received in LS indicates that there could be a slight variation on the standard model proposed. While centralisation may prove cost-efficient, there is clearly value to

having some support out-based, and in particular when faced with the potential loss of skills and experience of existing staff.

Elsewhere in our counter-proposal, we argue for the introduction of civilian statement takers who in some Areas currently work alongside police teams, backing up Police Officer work with victims and witnesses as well as a range of support duties which would otherwise take police officers away from their principal duties. It is certainly conceivable that out-based staff working in Victim Care could productively combine their work with the Statement taking role.

We also propose that the WW position of A005 Quality of service supervisor is taken out of scope for CMU as the position covers a much wider remit than Crime management.

Division B

Job title	ESTABLISHMENT	ACTUAL STAFF	FRP	TSSA
A003 Admin support	3	1	1	1
A004 Incident & Crime support	4 (plus FTC mat cover)	4	A005 CMU Operative 19	25 in line with LS operating model Position to cover <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17.5 current CMU/ VCM • Job match opps for A005/6 • roles with training plan for A004 ICS staff • Including outbased roles
A005 CMU Officer	14.5 (LN 3, LS 8 Inc a PC & FTC, LU 3.5)	12.5		
A005 Victim Care Manager	5	5		
A005 CRIS LIAISON	2	2		
A005 CMU Supervisor	1	1 (ON HGD)		
A006 Data Quality Manager	1	1		
B001 CMU Manager	3	3		
TOTAL	33.5	29.5	22	28

Division C

Job title	ESTABLISHMENT	ACTUAL STAFF	FRP	TSSA
-----------	---------------	--------------	-----	------

A003 Admin support	1 NE pt	1	1	1
A005 CMU Officer	6 (NW 3, NE 2, WW 1)	6	8	8 in Manchester plus 2-3 out-based staff Total 10
A005 Victim Care Manager	3 (1 per Area)	3		
A005 quality of service supervisor	1	1	0	Take out of scope – not CMU
A006 Data Quality Manager	0	0	1	0
B001 CMU Manager	3 includes a A006 in WW	3	1	1
TOTAL	14	14	11	12