



## SPECIAL NOC(S) MEETING (OPERATIONS REVIEW) BIRNAM 26-10-04

<b>Present:</b>	Malcolm Crosby	Chair, PCS
	Brain Duff	PCS
	Jim Lauder	PCS
	Jim Seaton	PCS
	Graham Coupar	T&G
	Phil Whitfield	Prospect
	Roddy Macleod	PCS
	Edward Shephard	PCS
	Alastair Gillies	GMB
	Gordon Kennedy	PCS
	Kenny Hay	PCS
	Chris Grice	PCS
	Alan MacKenzie	PCS
	Fiona Barnett	PCS
	Andy Chadwick	PCS
<b>Minute Secretary:</b>	Peter Fullarton	Secretary, PCS
<b>Apologies:</b>	Gordon Donaldson	PCS
	Iain MacNicol	PCS

### 1. Introduction

**Malcolm Crosby** welcomed everyone to the special NOC(S) meeting to discuss the Scotland Operations Review.

### 2. Operation Review

**Malcolm** outlined the options for taking forward the review with management. They were either to negotiate with management on their proposals for numbers and locations of Operational staff or to come up with counter-proposals.

The unions' survey of staff showed very strong feeling against the proposals but it was felt that most members needed to see a way forward.

**Edward** explained that progress had been made on non-ops staffing at PB 5/6a. However, there was no real resolution on workloads at PB 3/4 after staff reductions in districts since OM/AOM not felt to be enough to cover the staff left in the district.

**Phil** asked what the risk was if the union walked away from the negotiations. He felt that there was very little: there were no problems with non-ops PB 5/6 and if ops PB5/6 had problems, they were more likely to get more help. Members just wanted resolution.

**Malcolm** replied that some points had to be discussed with management whilst **Edward** said that we could walk away but the unions would still have to do something afterwards. Tactically, he felt that that it would be better if we negotiated until management got bored and they walked away rather than the unions leave the table. Much better to complain to Ministers later...

**Malcolm** suggested breaking the proposals down and identifying the main problems.

The most contentious points to emerge were:

- Operational managers: better to stay with the existing structure and re-organise within the district if necessary.
- Reporting lines: fundamental to review but no consensus as to whether/how they would work.
- Lack of support for those not in the same district as their manager (Kincardine being cited as an example).
- No consideration given to the status quo.

**Malcolm** said that he had had only one request for additional posts to support the ops structure (in Lothian/Borders). Discussion followed on lack of requests from former N(S) area- may either be no need, pragmatism on part of FDM's or still unsure of what is ahead.

Further discussions followed on the way forward. A number of reps (BD, PW, JS) thought it best for the unions' credibility to walk away from talks. **Malcolm** and **Edward** said that PB 5/6 changes had already been agreed with FDM's but an alternative might be to go with those changes but to keep reporting lines within districts, then fight over PB 3/4 changes.

**Edward** was happy to go back to management to agree to the PB5/6a post changes but to maintain a position of being unconvinced as to the soundness of the rest of the proposals. To walk away from the table could bring the imposition of a worse solution i.e. a WHAM-type set up.

It was **agreed** that the unions would not object to the implementation of management's PB5/6a proposals.

It was also **agreed** that **Edward** would write to ask management to present a case which could convince the unions that the proposal to take operations out of districts is either better than present, or is indeed even necessary. Unless a case can be demonstrated, the unions will not agree to the proposals.

**Malcolm** would write to members explaining this course of action.

### **3. Date of Next Meeting**

10.00am, February 21<sup>st</sup> at MES, Stirling.