

Revenue & Customs Group

Annual Delegate Group Conference 2018

**Standing Orders Committee (SOC)
Report No. 1
Conference Agenda**

**Auditorium 2 (ex-Hewison Hall)
Brighton Conference Centre
Monday 21 and Tuesday 22 May 2018**



Introduction to Standing Orders Committee (SOC) report no.1

This is the first report of the Standing Orders Committee for 2018 with our recommendations for debate.

The chance for all members to have their say on these motions is at your branch's mandating meeting, where you will provide instructions to your branch delegates so they will be able to speak for you at conference. Your branch officers will have the information on when and where your mandating meeting will be held – please take the opportunity to attend.

This year a total of 117 motions were received from branches and the Group Executive by the deadline; 14 fewer than last year. These have been considered and assigned to appropriate categories, in line as far as possible with the Annual Report section headings. We have one general debate this year (motions 15, 16 and 17) but there are no fellings and no composite motions.

When it comes to selecting the moving branch for syndicated motions, we have endeavoured to give every branch at least one chance to speak, and for the first time we have chosen seconding branches for these motions using the same principle.

Category A contains 78 motions at present, divided into 17 sections. We expect almost all of these to be heard in the given time, provided conference is as disciplined as usual.

Concerning references back, I would like to echo my predecessor's request from last year and ask that branches only move reference back on motions they have submitted themselves. If you identify a problem in another branch's motion, please make the effort to contact them directly and invite them to move their own reference back. As always, all emergency motions and references back submitted on time will be published in SOC report 2 which will be

available for delegates before conference opens.

Delegates moving motions and seconders wishing to speak should move adjacent to the podium in anticipation of being called by the conference chair. This will save conference time and allow more motions to be debated.

The SOC would like to thank all staff for their assistance and support, and wish all delegates the best for conference.

Dave McNeely – Chair
Andrew Forster
Dominic McFadden
Niall McInnes
Paul Donlan
Laura Lloyd – SOC Secretary

Report of Standing Orders Committee group delegate conference

1. The agenda and timetable have been prepared in accordance with the Standing Orders of Conference, as set out in the Revenue & Customs Group Constitution.
2. Conference sessions will be as detailed below, unless otherwise decided by the Group President. The full timetable of Conference is contained in this report.

Monday, 21 May 2018 – 09.00 – 17.30
Tuesday, 22 May 2018 – 09.00 – 12.15

3. In accordance with Standing Orders A17 and A18, branches must give the SOC written notice of their intention to move reference back of this SOC report with details of proposed alterations, and with reasons for it, by 3.00pm noon, Friday 18 May 2018. This written notice should be sent to Laura Lloyd, SOC Secretary, at PCS Group Office in Liverpool, by email to RCconf@pcs.org.uk or submitted through motions online explained in R&C/BB/008/18. The branch delegations will be able to meet the SOC between 14.00 and 16.30 on Sunday 20 May 2018 in Bar 2, Auditorium 2 (ex-Hewison Hall) Bar. Only branches which have complied with the Standing Orders may seek to move reference back to an SOC report. There is no prescriptive right to move reference back: whether a reference back is heard shall depend on the time allocation acceptable to Conference. If a branch delegation is not due to be in Brighton on Sunday 21 May, they may wish to ensure that one delegation member travels in advance to ensure that they are available to meet the SOC.

4. Adoption of the agenda – SOC 1 (2018) and subsequent SOC reports and timetable will be proposed at the opening of Conference.
5. The SOC has separated motions into the following categories:

Category A: Motions for debate, grouped as far as practicable under the main subject headings appearing in the annual report.

Category B: Motions which confirm existing policy.

Category C: Motions which seek to reverse policy as determined at conference within the last 2 years.

Category D: Motions capable of being dealt with by correspondence with the GEC

Category E: Motions covered by motions in category A.

Category X: Motions which are out of order.

6. Card votes

Voting shall be by show of hands except when a card vote is either called by the Conference Chairperson or demanded by at least 25 delegates.

7. Emergency motions

Emergency motions must have been passed in accordance with Standing Order A7(a) and must be submitted in writing to Laura Lloyd, SOC Secretary, at PCS Group Office in Liverpool, by email to RCconf@pcs.org.uk or submitted through motions online as explained in R&C/BB/008/18, by 3.00pm Friday, 18 May 2018.

8. Requests to Withdraw/Second Motions

In line with advice given by the SOC in previous

years, branches who wish to withdraw/second a motion, must use Group SOC A form and are advised to contact the moving branch to agree arrangements with them.

9. Guillotine Motions

SOC request that Branches wishing to have their unheard Motion in this section are to use Group SOC B form & pass to the SOC table.

10. Rule Amendments

All rule amendments require a 2/3rds majority.

11. Speech limits

We recommend the following time limits for speeches:

- a) Movers of motions – four minutes
- b) Seconders, GEC and other speakers and those replying - three minutes.
- c) Moving Conference Paper – six minutes.

12. All general debates

Each motion to be moved and seconded in turn. Delegates may then speak to any or all of the motions. When the debate has finished the mover of each motion has a right to reply to criticisms of their own motion and the motions are then voted on.

13. Log of Branch Sub Motions

An appendix at the back of this book contains for easy reference details for Branches to look up their motions submitted

Timetable 2018

Monday

	Section	Motions
09:00–09:10	Opening of Conference, President's Address, Conference Appointments	
09:10–09:25	Adoption of SOC Reports	
09:25–09:40	Presentation of 2017 Annual Report	
09:40–10:00	Estates and Environmental	1–4
10:00–10:20	Guest Speaker: Janice Godrich, National President	
10:20–10:55	Attendance Management	5–9
10:55–11:15	Tax Justice	10–12
11:15–11:30	Brexit	13–14
11:30–11:50	Guest Speaker: Meg Hillier MP, Chair, Public Accounts Committee	
11:50–12:15	Health & Safety	15–18
12:15–12:20	ESA	19–24
12:20–12:30	Rules	25
12:30–13:30	Lunch	
13:30–14:00	Pay, terms & conditions	26–31
14:00–14:20	Guest Speaker: Mark Serwotka, General Secretary	
14:20–15:20	Building Our Future	32–38
15:20–15:35	Presentation of ESA	
15:35–15:55	Break	
15:55–16:25	HR	39–44
16:25–16:40	VOA	45–47
16:40–16:50	Financial Report	
16:50–17:20	Equalities	48–54
17:20–17:30	Guillotined Motions	
17:30	Conference Adjourns	

Tuesday

	Section	Motions
09:00–09:30	Business Streams	55–59
09:30–09:40	Organising Report	
09:40–09:50	Organising	60–63
09:50–10:20	Jobs	64–68
10:20–10:35	Guest Speaker: Chris Baugh, Assistant General Secretary	
10:35–10:55	Outsourcing	69–71
10:55–11:25	Training & Continuous Improvement	72–76
11:25–11:35	Guest Speaker: Credit Union/ARMs	
11:35–11:50	PMR	77–78
11:50–12:05	Guillotined Motions	
12:05–12:15	Close of conference	

CATEGORY “A” MOTIONS 1 – 78

Section 1 – Estates and Environment

Motion 1

That this conference notes the continuing announcements by HMRC of its Regional Centre & other future locations. PCS remains committed to opposing the disastrous & misnamed Building our Future programme, recognising however that the accommodation & facilities at many locations occupied by HMRC staff have been allowed to deteriorate over the course of the contract with Mapeley.

This meeting agrees that all HMRC workers deserve & require quality accommodation & equipment, along with building services delivered to a standard that meets the needs & demands of PCS members. This meeting is clear that the control of building services must remain in-house to enable the appropriate scrutiny & application of appropriate standards. This meeting also reaffirms the PCS policy that the preferred method of service delivery is via an in-house workforce.

The GEC is instructed to ensure that:

- Appropriate structures for consultation & negotiation with DTUS on the future building service standards are in place
- Members & branches are directly consulted over proposed changes to the provision of building services
- Commitments are sought from the employer for in-house control & delivery of building services to be the preferred option for all HMRC occupied premises.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(Covers motions 79–80)
(Seconded by R&C East Midlands)

Motion 2

Conference notes that there are a number of issues that have arisen following HMRC's premature move to push staff into the Croydon and Canary Wharf sites. Canary Wharf has been plagued by heating problems. It has not had a canteen or restaurant since staff moved there in 2017 and the earliest promised date was April 2018. The front entrance remains a building site and staff have to use an alternate entrance to access the building, including cyclists having to come out of the building to re-enter it.

It has already been stated policy that none of the Regional Centres would have a gym. This makes it impossible to train Customs staff in restraint techniques and other areas for which a certificated qualification is required. Both Croydon and Canary Wharf lack adequate disability access for drop-off or pick-up points. There is a shortage of DSE assessors, First Aiders and Fire Wardens on both sites.

'New ways of working' means desk ratios are at 7:10. We are still awaiting the full meaning of 'new ways of working'. Additionally, the policy appears to be not to have paper noticeboards, just electronic ones, thus furthering the draconian censorship of the union's ability to communicate with members. If the electrics were to fail on a site then

no information on evacuation site-maps, first aider and fire warden lists would be readily available.

Conference instructs the GEC to call on the Department to halt any moves until these and other basic health and safety issues are addressed and arrangements put in place before any staff move to a site. Conference further calls upon the Department to publish all Service Level Agreements and contractual obligations that are signed with landlords of any Regional site. Until such assurances are received to call on all moves to be halted.

200145 – R&C HQ London

Motion 3

PCS has always been at the fore front of environmental campaigning amongst the unions. PCS needs to continue to promote this fight. To continue to pressure the government into taking the action that is necessary to clean up our planet not just our atmosphere, our land and our seas they have all been negatively impacted up on by human consumerism.

You may have seen recently the televised Blue Planet II series where Sir David Attenborough filmed the devastating effects of the tons of plastic waste that has been dumped in the world's oceans. Many people were shocked and horrified at the extent of the problem. Since then the Scottish government took action and more recently the BBC and other organisations have reviewed their policies and have started to take action on wasteful use of plastics.

This GDC instructs the incoming GEC to negotiate:

1. That HMRC withdrawals from any purchase activity on items made from non-recycled plastics.
2. That HMRC is encouraged to take a lead role, leading the government by example, in the fight against the use of non-recyclable disposable plastics.
3. To encourage HMRC to follow the lead of the Scottish government and implement measures to cut the amount of plastics being disposed of in a non-recycled manner.
4. That HMRC reinvigorates and asserts its recycling policy. Encouraging all HMRC sites to have specific recycling points, that these are taken seriously and to enforce that the waste disposed of in this way is actually recycled and not just given lip service.
5. PCS green reps are given official time to determine and assess the final destination of HMRC waste, with a clear route to challenge the contract under which the recycling waste is managed.
6. HMRC to arrange with their waste contractors for PCS Green Reps to be invited to visit HMRC contracted waste management sites.

This GDC expects the incoming GEC to reports back to membership by the end of November 2018, reporting both activity taken and progress made in pursuit of these aims

200149 – R&C West Mercia
(Covers motion 81)

Motion 4

This conference notes that HMRC does not support the provision of gyms in the new regional offices given the exclusion to date of any gym provision in those centres already announced/opened. This conference finds this disappointing and confusing especially given the Depts. stated aims of seeking to support and improve the health of its workforce and the Depts. own policy on well-being.

It is doubly nonsensical as in some existing locations, already due to close; there are gyms in place with valuable

equipment that could be moved to the new Regional Centre, and any new gym therein; thereby saving additional costs in setting up the gym provision.

This ADC therefore instructs the GEC to urgently seek discussions with the Dept. on revisiting the provision of Gyms in the new Regional Centres.

200026 – R&C London South Thames

Section 2 – Attendance Management

Motion 5

That this conference, both with some reluctance and some appreciation, accepts that progress is being sought and gradually achieved by the GEC on tackling the issues faced by our most vulnerable Members following HMRC's adoption of the CSEP (Civil Service Employee Policy) Attendance Management procedures in early 2017.

That being said we instruct the GEC to widen their stated bargaining aims (R&C/BB/132/17) to specifically include the recognition of, and proportionate action against, the perpetual breach of the only emboldened text in the entire policy that "the decision on the action to be taken remains the responsibility of the line manager and must not be escalated to, assumed by or attributed to the person giving the advice".

Whilst line managers absolutely should seek appropriate advice and support where necessary, the manifest pattern of pressure being placed upon them by their subsequent line managers and/or HR case workers to change decisions not 'to move' is unacceptable, in equal measure, to the both staff awaiting the decisions and our line manager members being constantly placed in this position. Frequently this pressure is being applied, not as a means of support to managers or from a wider perspective as promoting a healthier workforce, but as simply as a means of achieving statistical aspiration.

The GEC is therefore instructed to:

- Specifically include this point in all related negotiations with the employer
- Prepare a briefing for line manager members highlighting this guidance with a view to their empowerment
- Include this aspect in all by future training information or correspondence issued by the GEC Attendance Management Working Group (such as identifying Branches with particular issues)
- Obtain expert advice regarding what evidence we need of contravention of the guidance in order to give us the best chance of success in tribunal. Where possible this should be by reference to actual cases

These instructions are to be regarded as implementable with immediate effect.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(Covers motions 82 – 84)
(Seconded by Glasgow & Clyde)

Motion 6

This R&C Annual General meeting recognises that the current sick absence policy does not provide enough support to members afforded protection by the Equality Act 2010.

The policy at HR27008 states "Managers should not take

a mechanistic approach to setting a Disability Trigger Point; there is no set formula to follow. However, it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be an increase in the region of 25% or 50% on the standard trigger point (based on a jobholder's working pattern). Managers considering increasing a jobholder's trigger point by more than 100% may want to obtain advice from Civil Service HR Casework. The decision to make an increase which is greater than 100% must be signed off by a senior manager in the business chain, at least Grade 7 or above. This is to ensure consistency in approach."

As Conference can see, to state that there is no set formula then state "it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be the region of 25%-50%" is contradictory. Managers have only looked at what is "expected for the vast majority" and not given due consideration to other possibilities, such as 75% or 100% automatically as it is not mentioned, any consideration over 100% requires a senior manager at Grade 7 or above to sign off the increase so again is actively discouraged.

Conference does not need reminding that the trigger is to hold a formal meeting so even if the outcome of the meeting is no action at this time disabled members, and especially members with mental health concerns are put through a stressful process.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to remove percentages and days from disability trigger point guidance and introduce a policy based on reasonable adjustment that reflects the size of the employer and the resources including staff at its disposal.

The GEC with the assistance of the Disabled Members Advisory Committee and FTO support is to investigate how other Civil Service Departments and large private sector employers approach this issue and use any areas of best practice in its negotiations.

The GEC is to report back progress to the membership at 6 months and at 9 months from the date of the first full GEC called after end of conference 2018.

200200 – R&C Five Shires
(Covers motions 85 – 86)
(Seconded by R&C Portsmouth)

Motion 7

This Conference notes that we have now gone a further year with the current attendance management system and the effects have become more abhorrent.

It is reassuring to note that GEC has commissioned feedback from Branches on issues and details of specific cases in order to strengthen our argument for a change of the HMRC guidance. In November 2017 a briefing quoted that, "the GEC feels that in order to progress these aims further, consideration should now be given to industrial action, per resolution 19."

Unless there has been sufficient and robust progress before this Conference is held the GEC are instructed to:

1. Formally remind official side of our demands on attendance management which are:
 - Removal of automatic trigger points (relating to both formal action & formal meetings)
 - DRSA to be discounted from formal proceedings
 - Separate reasonable adjustments for each condition covered by the EA2010
 - Right of members to be represented at case conferences
 - Removal of downgrading/ dismissal (aside in cases of sick absence exploitation)
 - Removal of the Attendance Management Officer/ Champion role
 - The following to be discounted from formal proceedings:

- a. Absences related to accidents (either in or out of work)
 - b. Absences relating to sectioning under the Mental Health Act
 - c. Absences related to mental health issues where the member is receiving new or altered treatment
2. From the case details supplied by Branches identify the most suitable cases to pursue through the legal system without unnecessary delays.
 3. Provide template grievances and legal arguments for Branches to use in personal cases.
 4. Issue full instructions on how to deal with Attendance Management and update members.

If there is still no acceptable response and significant movement by HMRC within 2 months of notification of these demands, take immediate steps to ballot for industrial action.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 8

This conference is concerned that the introduction of the new Sick Absence Policy, with Trigger Points for mandatory Formal Meetings after only 8 days absence (Pro Rata for Part Timers), or 4 separate occasions, will see an increase in stress, an increase in Dismissal, an increase in Bullying & Harassment and Discrimination.

HMRC's results in the People Survey for 2015/16 show the following: As the survey is based upon 45,259 Returns (a response rate of 69%) this suggests the following:

- 6788 Staff have experienced discrimination & 5431 Staff have experienced Bullying or Harassment in the 12 months prior to the survey.

This conference believes this is in no small part a result of detrimental policy changes to our Terms & Conditions.

This conference instructs the GEC to immediately request the following information be provided, on an ongoing monthly basis, to monitor the introduction and impact of this policy:

- Number of Formal Meetings held
- Outcome of Formal Meetings
- Number of Appeals submitted
- Outcome of Appeals
- Number of Dismissals
- Numbers of staff likely to be covered under The Equality Act 2010.

The above information is to be supplied broken down into business area, location etc. to allow for a meaningful comparison to be undertaken on the consistent implementation across HMRC.

This can also be used to identify if this is fairly implemented in relation to offices marked for closure under HMRC's Building Our Future Program.

The GEC are to feedback this information to members quarterly, sooner if any discriminatory findings are found, to allow the impact to be understood.

If results indicate that discrimination, or inconsistent implementation are an issues then all legal steps should be taken to counteract this policy.

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Motion 9

This is a censure motion to revisit a motion supported at R&C Group Conference 2016. The instruction was for the GEC to approach HMRC and negotiate a Bereavement Policy

as recommended by ACAS. This still has not happened and we press on the current GEC to act upon the instruction within the motion.

ACAS Managing Bereavement in the Workplace tells us that employers should prepare themselves to support its employees by having a Bereavement Policy.

It is with great regret that HMRC have no policy in place to support our members through what is a sensitive & traumatic period of their lives, leaving them open to a wide range of differing interpretations from managers who have no official guidelines on how to effectively support them following their loss.

As it is, at the current time most employees will trigger the Attendance Management Policy when suffering from Bereavement.

At a time when compassion is needed the most, employees are having to suffer the extra stress and anxiety of possibly attending a Formal Meeting, and furthermore being subject to a Formal Stage Sickness Absence warning.

As a bereavement policy is the recommendation of ACAS we should strive to achieve a policy with HMRC that not only supports our members at work at a time of need but also sends a message out that the business & the union will actively work to ensure they are valued and not alone whilst coming to terms with their loss.

Any agreement reached should focus on a supportive rather than punitive process taking ALL circumstances into account and avoid any mechanistic approach as a 'one size fits all' criteria would be detrimental to our membership

This motion calls upon the current GEC to negotiate and discuss a Bereavement Policy with HMRC and report back to branches by January 2019.

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire

Section 3 – Tax Justice

Motion 10

That this conference notes that the Paradise Papers again demonstrate that the PCS / Tax Justice Campaign estimates of the tax gap are far more likely to be accurate than the government / HMRC figures.

Conference notes that PCS, and in particular the R&C group, was the driving force behind the setting up of the Tax Justice Campaign, and that the facts and arguments from this campaign are now commonly accepted and have reached millions of people in the UK and even more abroad.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue pressing our Tax Justice demands, in doing so reminding members of the role that PCS has played and continues to play. Conference further instructs the GEC to pursue the following bargaining objectives.

- Further input into tax policy, including Parliamentary submissions when requested, and directly to the opposition parties when requested, through the PCS Parliamentary Group
- Continued campaigning on the need for adequate compliance staffing to tackle evasion and avoidance
- A locations programme that would enable non-compliance to be tackled wherever it arose.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covers motions 87 – 88)
(Seconded by R&C Liverpool)

Motion 11

This Group Conference notes the main focus of the VOA's

work is property valuation. Property tax is the most stable, cheap and reliable form of taxation; property does not move whereas people do. This work relies on local knowledge, market trends and the ability to inspect quickly and efficiently.

The proposed rationalisation of the VO estate and the TOM strategy will result in vast swathes of the country having no local Valuation office, resulting in a loss of local knowledge and experience. This will result in a worsening of the service provided by the VOA to Local Authorities and the potential risk of loss of revenue for the country. As a result of the work currently undertaken the Treasury is able to collect in excess of £200 billion pounds per annum in revenue.

It will also mean that those undertaking the work will have to drive significant distances to cover the work putting them at increased risk of accidents etc.

The GEC are instructed to arrange a meeting with the parliamentary group to seek support to obtain a full review of the estates & TOM strategy. The GEC is also instructed to include the VO in both its BOF campaign and tax justice campaign and to make representation at the highest level that like HMRC the VO needs to expand so that the correct tax is paid by all.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 12

This Group Conference notes that following the recent large scale reorganisation of the VOA many lower grade members have been allocated into roles which could become surplus in the next 2 years due to the ongoing restructuring of the organisation and the Estate Strategy. Members are facing a real threat of redundancy which is unacceptable. The GEC is instructed to include the VOA in the tax justice campaign. The GEC is further instructed and to raise awareness of plight of VOA members with the parliamentary group with a view to questions been asked in the House.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Section 4 – Brexit

Motion 13

This conference notes with concern that HMRC continue to pursue its deeply flawed office closure programme with absolutely no regard for the potential impact of Brexit particularly in Northern Ireland with the land border.

HMRC have closed all the Revenue & Customs offices near the border in Northern Ireland except for Foyle House in L/Derry which is due to close on 2021.

This conference believes this is extremely short sighted and wrong.

The Northern Ireland Civil Service are building a new building in Ballykelly which will hold 600 staff Colin Lewis the Department secretary of DAERA has stated that the Northern Ireland Civil Service will look to other government departments to fill the building.

This conference instructs the GEC to enter negotiations with HMRC to maintain a presence near the border and to seek to rehouse the workers in Foyle House to Ballykelly to ensure our members can continue to provide a service and to keep their jobs.

200082 – HMRC Northern Ireland Branch

Motion 14

That this conference notes Jon Thompson's comments to the PAC committee last year, in which he called into question the credibility of the department being able to continue to undertake its current organisational activities, before going on to state that in a no-deal Brexit scenario, the department will need to recruit up to 5,000 additional staff to cope with the fall-out.

Conference agrees that prior to Brexit, BoF was already an ill-conceived and dangerous proposition and with Brexit looming ever-closer, BoF is now so obviously unrealistic that even HMRC's Chief Executive has been forced to admit that it lacks credibility.

As such, conference instructs the GEC to reiterate our demand that BoF be paused until after the full impact of Brexit has been ascertained, pointing out the inconsistency with a department closing offices and shedding jobs whilst its Chief Executive simultaneously talks of the necessity to recruit thousands of additional staff.

Give that the department has thus far rejected this demand, conference, in anticipating a continuation of this position, furthermore instructs to GEC to campaign for the following (taking into account the additional jobs cited by Thompson).

- Adequate trained staff to administer the huge increase in work, particularly on Customs and International Trade, that will arise from Brexit
- A re-evaluation of the numbers and locations of compliance officers who will have to respond to requests to attend at ports and airports
- A locations and compliance strategy that is driven by what the work of the department needs, rather than trying to fit the work needs around the estates programme.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Covers motions 89 – 90
Seconded by Glasgow and Clyde

Section 5 – Health and Safety

Motion 15

(In General Debate with motions 16 & 17)

Conference notes the carrying of Motion 22 of R&C Conference 2016 to 'undertake a stress management survey'. Conference also notes that Regulation 4 of the Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulations 1977 gives PCS Safety Reps a legal right 'to investigate potential hazards - and to examine the causes - ' and under Regulation 4A, that 'every employer shall provide such facilities and assistance as safety representatives may reasonably require for the purpose of carrying out their functions'.

Work Related Stress is well known as a major hazard in HMRC and is the greatest cause of mental and physical ill health and resultant sick absence. The Health and Safety Executive recommends employers tackle Work Related Stress by use of their Management Standards Indicator Tool - a 35-item questionnaire relating to the six primary stressors identified in the Management Standards. However HMRC has refused to conduct a department wide survey based on the HSE Management Standards Indicator Tool and have also refused 'to provide - facilities' - email - for PCS to carry out an independent survey.

As a result R&C PCS have conducted a survey using a very limited number of members private email addresses in February. However Motion 22 2016 also stated that the

survey should 'Ensure that the results are identifiable by business stream' Unfortunately the February PCS survey did not include questions on business streams, nor other useful demographics such as location or protected characteristics previously agreed by the Regional H&S Chairs and the TUS of the Joint Consultative Committee (JCC).

Importantly the agreement between PCS and HMRC states that PCS safety reps represent employees who are not union members for health and safety matters only. From a trade union point of view this is important because any hazard to a non-member is also a hazard to a PCS member and it is also a useful recruitment tool.

Therefore the use of departmental email addresses for a stress survey is particularly important, but restricting the survey to a limited number of members who have signed up to providing their email addresses to PCS will not provide comprehensive results nor possibly a representative sample regarding work related stress.

We also note that the TUS of London Regional H&S committee reached an agreement with the London Official Side to conduct a stress survey using departmental email addresses, and the official side agreed to provide an admin resource. However this agreement has now been vetoed by HMRC.

This Conference therefore calls upon the GEC to:

- Robustly challenge the legality of HMRC's refusal to allow PCS safety reps to use departmental facilities to conduct a stress survey as per regulation 4 & 4A of the Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulations 1977
- In the event of continued refusal, take legal advice to present a test case to an Employment Tribunal to assert Safety reps right to conduct a stress survey using departmental facilities as per Regulation 4 and 4A of the Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulations 1977.

200026 – R&C London South Thames

Motion 16

(In General Debate with motions 15 & 17)

This Conference recognises that stress is understood to be one of the main ill-health concerns in the workplace. A TUC survey identified a number of factors linked to stress which included workloads, cuts in staff, change, bullying, harassment and redundancies. The Health & Safety Executive have guidance available to help organisations to tackle this issue. This motion is for the VOAC and GEC to encourage VOA management to implement HSE Management Standards for Work Related Stress as part of the TOM restructuring process.

200036 – R&C VOA Eastern Counties Valuation

Motion 17

(In General Debate with motions 15 & 16)

That this Conference notes that the ongoing trial of a stress reporting form does not appear in the standard guidance.

Conference notes that for this, and other reasons, the trial of this form has not been applied in a consistent way and that therefore any data gathered from the trial cannot produce a valid result.

Conference instructs the Group Executive Committee to withdraw support from the invalidated trial and to seek agreement to rerun the trial across HMRC in a transparent and consistent manner so that valid data can be gathered.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride

Motion 18

One of the new roles following the TOM reorganisation of the VO is Property Inspector. This new role differs as it is not restricted to an offices local area but countrywide. These people will be allowed to work from home but it is expected that people will be visiting properties for the majority of the week.

Staff will now cover much wider areas which will see an increase in Health and Safety issues.

This ADC calls for full Risk Assessments to be carried out to ensure the safety of our members

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Section 6 – ESA

Motion 19

This conference agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Mike Black.

Mike was the lynchpin of the Cambridge Branch for many years, and he has been a familiar face at IRSF, PTC and PCS conferences. In addition to his Branch work, Mike worked for members across the Eastern Region and took a leading role in representing staff working on National Minimum Wage work across HMRC. As a PCS rep he fought to end the exploitation of workers and provided expert advice to support PCS's national work on gangmaster regulation and National Minimum Wage.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 20

This conference agrees to posthumously award an Exceptional Service Award to Nigel Buller.

Nigel's organisational and interpersonal skills, not to mention his remarkable attention to detail, were pivotal for the union and its predecessors in HM Customs and Excise, the Revenue and Customs Group, and later as Group President of the Home Office Group. In his last two departments, he was instrumental in bringing together organisations with considerably different ways of working. He is sorely missed.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 21

This conference agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Steve Ferrier.

Conference recognises Steve's many years of service to members as a rep in IRSF, PTC and PCS. In addition to organising for many years the Scotland v England football match at Conference, and playing a significant role in the development of a generation of Reps that have gone on to occupy senior FTO positions in TSSA, EIS, GMB and NASUWT, he has helped hundreds of PCS members facing difficulties at work, making a real difference to members who have needed union support, and that the commitment and dedication that Steve has shown in his years of fighting for members in Dundee and Glasgow deserves to be recognised as exceptional.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 22

This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Carol Gerrard.

Carol has represented the interests of members in Cambridge Branch for many years, and as a GEC member she was a powerful voice for members in Personal Tax, and a real champion of the members working in the Face to Face Enquiry Centres and latterly delivering a service to Need Enhances Support Customers. In making this award, conference particularly commends Carol's dedicated defence of these members through a period of immense change.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 23

This conference agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Bernard 'Barney' Lawn.

Barney was a powerful voice for members in HMCE and HMRC for many years, where he took a leading role in promoting and protecting the interests of members working in Northern Ireland. He worked hard to build understanding of the specific risks and protections that were relevant to members in Northern Ireland with both management other reps, as in recent years he provided support to hundreds of staff going through the office closure process. He served the Group as both a GEC member and as AGS lead for Compliance.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 24

This conference agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on David Owen.

David retired last year after 35 years' service to IR/ HMRC and 35 years PCS membership (joined in 1983) across various Branches. He had been active as a Rep since 1986 at Office level. Became a Branch rep from 2001 and continued until his retirement late last year.

David has been involved in personal cases over the last 10 years in particular and has held a variety of Branch Roles in his time being a long term Branch Chair as well as having been Branch Learning Rep, Branch Executive Committee Member, Branch Auditor, Delegate to Conference etc. He served 2 or 3 times on the London Regional Executive Committee too. David has also been involved with the PCS Credit Union from its beginnings and is an accredited rep in that area. He continues to be a lay tutor providing pension talks to members which continue to be oversubscribed. David is now a member of the London & South East ARMS Branch following his retirement.

David has been an active and valued member of PCS and its predecessor unions for many years and we would suggest an Exceptional Service Award would be more than warranted for his service over the years.

Group Executive Committee

Section 7 – Rules

Motion 25

This Conference agrees the following Rule Amendment which has the effect of reducing the SOC from 5 to 3 people.

Replace existing rule 7.20 with the following:

- 7.20 There shall be a group standing orders committee (SOC) consisting of 3 members. Each member will serve for 3 years. Each year the Chairperson shall be elected by the SOC.

Where the chairperson is absent, the SOC shall elect a temporary substitute. The quorum shall be 2 out of 3 of the elected members together with a deputed member of the Secretariat.

Replace existing Appendix c: Transitional Arrangements with the following:

- Appendix C: Transitional arrangements

In 2019, elections will be held for all 3 places on the group standing orders committee (SOC) and candidates will be advised that the highest polling candidate will serve for 3 years (retiring in 2022), the second highest polling candidate will serve for 2 years (retiring in 2021), the third highest polling candidate for 1 years (retiring in 2020). In 2020 a new SOC member will be elected for 3 years and the cycle of yearly elections for 1 SOC member to serve for 3 years will be repeated annually thereafter.

200033 – R&C East Midlands
(Covers motions 91 – 92)
(Seconded by Glasgow & Clyde)

Section 8 – Pay, Terms & Conditions

Motion 26

This Group conference is concerned about the continued impact of the 1% pay cap on PCS members in HMRC. This is hitting members' pockets hard, and we are now seeing the worst effects of it in that the AA grade recently required an uplift in order to meet the statutory minimum wage whilst the majority of those on the AO grade remain substantively below the real Living Wage.

This is being further compounded by the retention of a link between performance and pay and the further inequalities that this creates.

Conference is aware that HMRC have been working to find efficiencies in budgets to try and increase the pitiful amount of pay that we have. However this would potentially be in exchange for changes to terms and conditions and potentially further cuts to jobs. This is clearly unacceptable.

This Group Conference believes that we need a focused and sustained Group-wide campaign for the following demands:

- A pay rise of at least 5% or £1,200 which is centrally funded rather than coming from cuts or changes to terms and conditions.
- An end to performance related pay and transference of all non-consolidated monies into the consolidated, pensionable pay pot.
- For HMRC to be a Living Wage employer, and for this to cover contractors as well as staff at the lowest grades.
- For the Living Wage to be the base rate on which the pay differentials of all grades are based.

- No acceptance of any pay deal that includes detrimental changes to terms and conditions.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to campaign for these demands by any means necessary, up to and including industrial action.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 27

This Conference notes the proposal from the Employer Side published as 'Proposed Principles'.

This Conference rejects the notion that the Employer can move members down allowance tiers or move them to a post with lower or no attendance allowances against their will.

This Conference notes in particular the following extracts from the Collective Agreement members agreed in a ballot in 2012:

- Para 11, "Where staff are allowed or required by CI (or CHISOPS) Management to move to posts which attract lower (or no) additional payments, those staff in post and in receipt of an allowance on 1st July 2012 will retain that tier of payment (and will be expected to deliver attendance in line with the expectations within the payment they receive)."
- Para 16. "No compulsion to exist for any member of staff to be moved to a higher payment and associated attendance level than they would wish for"
- Para 18. "...Any subsequent change to payments will be undertaken only following full consultation with LTUS, ballot as required, with the agreement of DTUS and in line with Departmental Period of Adjustment provisions."

PCS have an extant agreement with the OS regarding moves between different rates that is fair, equitable and transparent. Effectively this is an orderly bus queue where those who wish to opt for the higher allowance levels can do so and that members can't be forced into reducing or losing their allowance.

This Conference rejects the notion that because FIS have restructured into 'semi-autonomous' LOB's, we should give up our Collective Agreement and enable the business to force move members to accept a financial detriment and move to a lower level of allowance, for promises that, "...FIS has no current plans to move people down the CIDAA tiers now or in the near future".

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate for the Bargaining Objectives below:

Using as a basis the "Proposed Principles Final Draft".

1. Split the potential agreement in two. Draw a line under "Any uplifts to base, intermediate and upper tier will be voluntary"
2. All above the line (i.e. movements up the rates) to be priorities in negotiations. Our concerns about moving up the tiers in a location is that some would be offered upward movement and others not, depending which FIS business stream they were in. This was the cause of the dispute in the first place. One solution could be that if management wanted to offer higher rates in a business stream they could offer a move to that business stream within the location using transparent criteria in the proposed agreement.
3. Replace the old 2012 Collective agreement with a new updated agreement that still prevents management moving members down the tiers against their will.

Any potential agreement (or agreements) should be put to affected members in a ballot.

Should the employer refuse to meaningfully negotiate

or attempt to impose an unacceptable system the GEC are instructed to ballot affected members for action short of strike.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Motion 28

Conference notes that RCDTS has instituted a grading structure that is not fit for purpose; it is unfair, causes division and confusion, and hinders career progression.

The initial grading structure proposed by RCDTS comprised 7 grades and was similar to that in operation in HMRC, with relatively sensible pay spans which did not overlap. However, that proposal was superseded by a new grading structure that reduces the grades to 5, includes huge pay spans within the grade, and allows grade minimums to overlap considerably. This structure was imposed despite concerns raised by PCS. For example, on its introduction Grade D has a span of £22k to £55k, and the next Grade (E) had a span of £35.4k to £65k.

This results in people being paid vastly different rates for the same job, means some people can be paid considerably less than colleagues despite operating in a higher grade with greater responsibilities and skills.

The problem is further exacerbated by the use of spot rates within grades or smaller unofficial sub-spans for recruitment, which results in new recruits being brought in at significantly higher rates than colleagues already in situ.

Because the grade spans are so large and encompass a wider range of job role, this also results in staff being unable to be rewarded for taking on additional responsibilities or team leader roles, as there is no documented process for progression within roles. This is demoralising for staff and can mean staff have no option than to apply outside their team structure to progress.

Conference instructs the GEC to engage with RCDTS management to negotiate a fairer grading and progression structure with more appropriate pay spans that enables staff to be rewarded fairly and encourages genuine progression up the pay range and development opportunities.

This negotiation is to be pursued in line with existing PCS policy on performance related pay and pay progression.

As part of a strategy to deliver a fairer system, the GEC is also instructed to consider bringing equal pay claims under the EA2010, as there is a strong likelihood of finding members who are in a protected group being paid substantially less than direct comparators.

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 29

Conference Delegates, my branch in BPV are concerned at the attempt to impose changes to the agreed Flexible Working pattern of our members on Traditional Contracts.

Our concerns are that a significant number of members on 'Traditional Contracts' have been subject to an enforced moves from AO Caseworker roles under the 'Pacesetter Agreement' where the majority of their duties involve written Customer Correspondence to Telephony Advisor roles, with the majority of their job role, working hours and practices now being in a Contact Centre environment.

The introduction of Contact Centres was negotiated with PCS on the assurances that staff on standard contracts would not have their terms and conditions restricted by the introduction of telephony advisor roles. The resources required was supplied by specific recruitment of PN103 contracts. This is why traditionally staff only move to permanent telephony advisor roles on either promotion or on a voluntary basis and there is no previous precedent for

enforced moves of this type.

The current mutual flexibility agreement in place within these telephony roles, has significant differences in terms of the agreements in place around working conditions, flexible working arrangements, breaks and monitoring etc. this would therefore equate to a substantial change to the working conditions and duties of the members in question as things stand currently.

We would always want the terms and conditions of staff on PN103 or 5/7 contracts to improve but not at the detriment to staff on traditional contracts. We do not want a race to the bottom and instead want a race to the top as regards this.

Agreements such as the annual leave allocations in PT Ops are eroding Flexible Working agreements as negotiated allocations apply to annual leave and flexi leave half and full day flexi. Some sites actually have better local agreements with e.g. no core time. Sites have successfully fought off planning tools such as 'predicted hours' and 'staff availability' for a number of years. The GEC needs to be careful about eroding existing agreements when negotiating new terms and conditions.

Members with traditional contracts have had their terms and conditions in place for many years. Any flexing, blending of work, or planning should not affect their Flexible Working Agreements.

We wish to instruct the GEC to obtain guarantees that staff with traditional contracts will suffer no detriment to their Flexible Working Agreements as a result of flexing, blending or planning of work.

We would like the guarantees to be in place by September 2018.

200126 – R&C Benton Park View

Motion 30

This conference recalls the unilateral changes made by HMRC to the banked leave policy, announced by the then Chief People Officer William Hague on 15 April 2014. These changes meant that further banked leave could not be accrued and that staff were expected to use all of their banked leave by 31 March 2019 or face the accrued banked leave being lost. Conference notes that the PCS response, given in R&C/BB/97/14, was for the union to register a formal disagreement and to seek legal advice. Members were advised not to agree to any action taken by their line manager.

The deadline of 31 March 2019 is now looming and many members that followed the PCS advice in R&C/BB/97/14 now find themselves being put under pressure by their line manager to use their banked leave and being threatened with the prospect of that banked leave being lost forever.

Conference calls on the GEC to urgently produce and release a briefing to branches and members giving updated PCS advice on what action members with banked leave should take before 31 March 2019.

If the PCS position remains that banked leave cannot be unilaterally removed by HMRC, PCS should consider any avenues available to resist this unnecessary and detrimental change to member's terms and conditions. This could include compiling a list by branch of the members affected to identify cases to take to Tribunal.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 31

This Conference recognises that many Caseworker and Caseworker Support staff are currently in roles that are

being renamed as Customer Service Centre roles. The recent UK Average Salary Figures survey by the Office of National Statistics, shows that the average pay of Customer Service Operations staff is significantly lower than other office based professions. For example, roles such as Local Government Administration, Housing Officers, Welfare & Housing Association professionals, Personal Assistants and Secretaries and Bank/Post Office Clerks all have higher average salaries. This motion is to ask VOAC and GEC to work together to protect pay for staff in renamed Customer Service Centre roles, and to make sure the pay reflects the complexity of work that is actually being done. To be acted on as soon as possible.

200036 – R&C VOA Eastern Counties Valuation

Section 9 – Building Our Future

Motion 32

This Group Conference condemns HMRC for pressing on with the office closure programme, in the face of all the evidence that this will be a mistake for the Department and the country.

- Experienced staff are being made redundant when Brexit may require up to 5,000 more staff.
- Making Tax Digital for Individuals has been wound down, and this was the basis for the reductions in Customer Service staff.
- Compliance Lines of Business are having to lower their targets due to lack of staff.
- HMRC is already failing to provide national coverage for Compliance work and will be even less able to do so from just 13 locations.
- It is clear that Customs cover and border control will be impossible from just 13 Regional Centres.
- A number of Regional Centres have now been delayed, with costs issues, and there are increasing doubts about the projected cost savings.

Conference welcomes the continuing campaigning work of the GEC and Branches, which has included local and national political lobbying, arguing the PCS case at a House of Commons Bill Committee, and briefing leading opposition spokespeople.

Conference instructs the GEC to maintain and increase this work, encouraging Branches to campaign locally amongst members, with local authorities, MPs, MSPs and Assembly members, arguing for a national network for HMRC that can deliver what the country needs, and in particular:

- That the department postpones further roll-out of Building Our Future until its full impact can be ascertained
- Extending the number of locations that remain open permanently, which would save jobs in those locations and defend national coverage by HMRC;
- Getting the best deal possible for members who want to remain in HMRC, members who want to leave, and members who are being forced to leave;
- Organising Branches through the PCS Regional Centre Hubs to obtain the best possible working environment and terms and conditions for members who do move to a Regional Centre, including resisting unwelcome changes to working patterns and supporting and encouraging branches who wish to take industrial action;
- To carry out data analysis using KAI wastage models, to work out the number of jobs lost as a result of BOF

- after attrition;
- Ensuring that even if HMRC get away with driving through the BOF plan, PCS exists as a strong force in all the Regional Centres and the other remaining offices.

Group Executive Committee

Motion 33

This Group Conference notes that the Building our Future Location announcements stated that there are no regional centres planned across the South Coast. There is no planned HMRC presence south of Bristol to Land's End and from Bristol in the west to Worthing in the east. It is noted that the capacity of Lynx House in Portsmouth is about 1000 members of staff when full and conference recognises that not all staff are ever in all at once. This Conference is aware that as with other branches there is local fight back and this campaign has started with an invited drop in for South Coast MPs in Parliament on the 14 March 2018.

This conference calls on the GEC to continue to provide support and secure PCS organising resources for the South Coast Campaign including funding. This conference agrees that a presence with reasonable daily travel of existing staff should be kept. To keep the pressure on ExCom and the government using PCS resources, identifying areas where a judicial review on the lack of both Equality and Economic impact assessments could be used to PCS' political advantage, to use the Brexit argument to explain why our members are needed to protect borders and tax revenues from smugglers and cheats.

This conference further agrees that the campaign should fight for the provision of sustainable good quality jobs in each location and upgrading accommodation to match that being offered at the Regional Centres & Specialist Sites.

This conference instructs the GEC to appoint a South Coast Campaign GEC Liaison Officer as a lead and point of contact, with a remit of working with local branches, their GECLOs, ARMS members in the south, and PCS FTOs to forward the campaign and report back to members in due course.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(Covers motions 93 – 94)
(Seconded by Cornwall Devon & Somerset)

Motion 34

This Group Conference notes the HMRC announcement on a proposed closure of the Cumbernauld site and relocation to a Glasgow Regional Centre.

PCS nationally and locally have serious concerns for all members of staff for employment and future working terms and conditions arising from this decision. Despite figures showing that the space in the proposed new build does not add up to the current numbers employed by HMRC in the catchment area, management still insist that there is a job there for everyone even whilst they continue to conduct recruitment programmes for the Glasgow site. Indeed PCS are aware that under 'Building our Future' plans HMRC intends to shed more than 9,000 jobs nationally by 2021.

HMRC management is continuing its campaign of office closures and job cuts whilst it is engaged in a review of the feasibility of delivering its own transformation plans. This review authorised by HMRC CEO John Thompson was instituted as a result of pressure PCS placed on MP's and questions asked by the Westminster Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee. Despite this they have announced the signing of a long-term lease for a centralised location in the centre of Glasgow in the middle of a review and carry on regardless.

PCS nationally have requested to see the business case for the 'Building our Future' transformation but these requests have been ignored. This Conference believes the employer must justify its business case for the closure of sites such as Cumbernauld and the damage it will cost to our members' jobs, pay and working terms and conditions and as the largest employer in the town our community first.

This Group Conference opposes the closure of the Cumbernauld Tax Office site. We call on the Revenue & Customs Group Executive Committee to campaign to retain a presence in Cumbernauld and to work with the PCS Cumbernauld Revenue & Customs Branch, local politicians and community groups.

This Revenue & Customs Group Conference instructs the Group Executive to use every option available to it to protect jobs and members working terms and conditions as part of the 'Save Cumbernauld Tax Office-Keep Jobs in the Local Area' campaign.

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Motion 35

This Conference is horrified by the recent announcement on Stratford, and the essential breaking of its promise of "a post there for everyone who wants it" and the potential redundancy situation for the majority of Southend staff. While the news of a potential "stay of execution" for Brexit-facing staff is welcomed, there are serious concerns over the length of their employment, and over the apparent likelihood that they will be retained for the crucial period, and then be sacked because Stratford will have long been at capacity.

This Conference condemns the way HMRC has handled the announcement, and instructs the GEC to:

- Pursue the business areas with staff in Southend to provide clear indications of how many posts are guaranteed to be going to Stratford.
- Pursue HMRC to guarantee that those staff whose posts are not going to Stratford will be provided a job there if desired, and to be clear as to which business areas/teams those roles are likely to be in.
- Pursue HMRC to provide specific details of all other options available to staff, whether those be posts in OGDs, severance packages, or otherwise.

200144 – R&C South East Essex

Motion 36

BOF office closures will not save money. The Government will not publish assessments of closing local offices. Parliament slates office closure plans. HMRC costs for replacing 170 offices with Regional Centres has risen by £594 M, these are the headlines behind the human casualties of BOF.

We want to fight to save our workplace

Ealing is the last office location in West London. In the last 12 month offices that have closed are:

- Finchley
- Winchmoor Hill
- Wembley
- Staines
- Uxbridge

Office closures in West London have led to the displacement and disruption of the workforce through voluntary redundancy. We have lost colleagues and expertise along the way. We have been moved to temporary locations for the next 2 years in Ealing and

Euston. Both of these locations are closing in 2020. If we still have, a job will be expected to migrate to either Stratford or Croydon.

The BOF locations of Stratford and Croydon for the majority in West London is outside of reasonable daily travel. As a direct result of 2017 closures Ealing has a high population of staff who fall under the heading 'particular needs', many are considered to be covered under the Equality Act 2010. Relocation to regional centres under current HMRC plans would end their careers and jobs in HMRC. This is only one of the group of workers that BOF discriminates against, other groups are Carers, Part timers and anyone who wants a healthy work / life balance.

Withdrawing from West London will have a significant impact on our ability to provide a professional service to taxpayers. A common feature is a concentration of trader groups heavily involved in the Heathrow based economy in close proximity to the airport. This group will be particularly effected by Brexit.

There are 250 HMRC staff located in Ealing. Help us save our jobs.

Our Campaign has the support of local MP's

- Dawn Butler, MP Brent Central, Labour
- Rupar Huq, MP Ealing Central, Labour
- John McDonnell, MP Hayes & Harlington, Labour
- Steve Pound, MP Ealing North, Labour
- Virendra Sharma, MP Ealing Southall, Labour
- Gareth Thomas, MP Harrow West, Labour
- Tanmanjeet Singh Dhesi, Labour

1. We ask conference to support our campaign to Keep Work in West London.
2. We ask that the GEC request that HMRC commission a full impact assessment report covering the closure of Ealing and Euston.

200070 – R&C London North

Motion 37

Like most Government departments, the VOA is closing the majority of its offices mainly in market town and small cities, leaving vast area of the country without local presence.

This will leave many staff forced to leave as their closest office is outside of daily travel.

This Group conference therefore requests VOAC and the GEC to press VOA management to see whether co-locating several of the closing VOA offices into the new HMRC hubs is a viable alternative

200141 - R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 38

That this conference acknowledges that, in our fourth year of debate on HMRC's manifestly ridiculous & ideological BoF restructuring plan, an absurdly galvanising sequence of events has taken place. Conference is aware of the critical juncture we find ourselves at, with the reality of BoF Phase one a mere two years away. Conference agrees our campaign must be stepped up now.

Conference agrees:

- Local individual campaigns, from Dundee to Ipswich to Porthmadog, have successfully delivered - without strike action - retention of jobs in those locations from entirely different platforms
- Public outrage has been provoked by worldwide press publication of tax pornography such as the 'Panama Papers' and 'Paradise Papers' - the same public is now

aware of the fundamental lack of funding for the tax collection that our department is obligated to undertake

- Millions of voters in the 2017 General Election rejected Tory austerity policies in favour of others; Labour, SNP, PC; indicating support for investment in public services & an end to job cuts
- HMRC Chief Executive Jon Thompson stated in September 2017 that 'Brexit' could require an extra 5,000 departmental jobs.

We instruct the GEC to concentrate on the latter comment on all future negotiations with HMRC and furthermore instruct the GEC to campaign against BoF within the changing political context to:

- Identify Branches, equally, which can activate their Members to campaign for job retention and those who are unable to do so

Where branches are well organised, offer support. Where branches need help, the GEC should actively assist.

- Allocate resource to the compilation of data to strengthen the case for job retention in vulnerable areas. Hub leads can produce information based on SIP figures, BoF migration plans and KAI wastage rates to identify likely redundancies in each directorate per location post attrition. This data will give branches information required to motivate members into action
- Seek support from all Parliamentary Groups to support those comrades in their valued work on our behalf to actively lobby council taskforces and parliamentary groups in all Parliaments for a new, alternative vision for HMRC modernisation based on the Tax Justice documents created by Scottish and UK-wide PCS campaigners over the past two years, based around tax justice, good customer service, higher local compliance presence and adequate IT & skills investment.
- Survey members in all HMRC locations, obtaining data about increased travel & childcare costs, caring responsibilities and reasonable adjustments.
- Work with Advisory Committees and Health & Safety teams to highlight inadequacies of existing Regional Centre plans, highlighting inadequacy for disabled members as an example of Government bias against all PCS members.
- Ramp up our National Press Campaign. Our hard work in localised campaigns has been published in local newspapers, which has been picked up by senior management in HMRC. Our collective BoF voice has the potential to force a change of opinion if the National Press Campaign is utilised properly. HMRC fears bad press above all!

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation

(Covers motion 95)
(Seconded by Telford Branch)

Section 10 – HR

Motion 39

Conference notes that the recent cross-Civil Service People Survey highlighted that a significant number of colleagues are experiencing bullying and harassment.

By way of example, in HMRC, 12% - that is about 7,000 people, experienced bullying or harassment : of these, 37% reported it, but less than 10% of those reporting it felt it had been resolved. These are damning statistics.

The TUC notes that over 25% of those experiencing

bullying or harassment report detrimental effects on their physical health, whilst the CIPD reports that the groups most likely to be affected are BAME, women, or those with disability. Disabled people are more than twice as likely to have reported bullying.

The ACAS guidelines describe the characteristics of bullying or harassing behaviour : but HMRC & RCDTS make a significant departure from these guidelines in only recognising bullying or harassment if it is 'repeated'.

In addition, our Conference notes that HMRC and RCDTS adherence to their own guidance is poor, and serves members and colleagues poorly. Cases of bullying are often unreported, while those that are get investigated by people who are poorly trained or, even worse, untrained, and not given the time to carry out the job properly.

The fact that the People Survey highlights that so few who go through the process feel that the issue is resolved speaks volumes.

This conference instructs the GEC to negotiate an improved anti-bullying and anti-harassment policy more closely aligned to the ACAS guidelines, that gives confidence to those who report cases and ensure that the investigation of cases is carried out by properly trained and properly resourced people.

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 40

This Conference recognises that as we continue with the BOF programme more of our members are being moved across lines of business and Directorates to balance the figures in the various Regional Centres.

Whilst this in general protects jobs, we have to ensure that it is not used as a vehicle to alter our members' terms and conditions. We have seen instances where local flexi arrangements, opening hours and expected telephony periods have changed bringing detrimental situations for many.

We have also seen a worrying trend towards coercing members who cannot do telephony work back to that through managers checklists and flimsy Occupational Health reports. There has to be a real concern that as we move towards Regional Centres those who cannot do telephony work will be pressurised beyond all reasonable expectation.

A further concern is the lack of consultation between Workforce Management Programme, Senior Managers and PCS. Many of these large scale moves are happening with absolutely minimal discussion with PCS and the timescales for them leave insufficient scope to raise legitimate concerns.

This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate the following points within a separate agreement or as part of a wider overall BOF agreement. Agreement to be reached by 31st October 2018.

1. Agreed reasonable timescale for moves allowing for discussion, negotiation and escalation if necessary.
2. No changes to our members' terms and conditions including local agreements. If the receiving line of business or Directorate wish to alter any aspects it must be considered by members and PCS at all levels.
3. Full recognition of reasonable adjustments per HMRC guidance and EA2010.
4. An agreed documented process taking into account HMRC guidance and EA2010 when looking at any possible attempt to move non-telephony staff to telephony or any similar type of change of work or tasks for individuals.
5. Guarantees that suitable and sustainable work will be found for individuals who may not be able to carry out every task in the receiving line of business or Directorate and there will be no threats of pre-surplus status.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 41

That this Conference acknowledges that due to the adverse weather experienced at the start of 2018, many members found themselves having to call the Emergency Information Line (EIL) on a number of occasions, for a long duration of time to enquire as to whether their offices were open.

The EIL is currently a 0845 (premium rate) number. The guidance on Gov.UK states that this is at a current cost of 7p per minute plus your carrier's access charge – between 25p and 44p (from landlines and mobiles). With multiple calls made to the helpline over a number of days where offices were closed, this has had an impact on our members.

The EIL was also slow to update, forcing members to call frequently and they have since noticed the charges for doing so, deeming this unacceptable.

This Conference instructs the GEC to approach HMRC to consult on this matter with the aim of achieving a change to a free phone number.

This should be done within 6 months following close of Conference 2018.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 42

This ADC instructs the GEC to raise concerns with HMRC regarding the use of lack of properly trained Officers to deal with grievances.

It is becoming more and more the norm to appoint inexperienced staff who do not have adequate training to either recognise a proper Grievance or deal appropriately with Fact Finding. The use of Trainees is also a concern as they should be allowed to complete their training without undue pressure that assisting on a Grievance can bring. There is inadequate assistance along the way together with a lack of evaluation as to how the inexperienced Officer and/or Trainee have performed.

This ADC instructs the GEC to:

- Notify Branches to be alert to this situation
- Incorporate in training Personal case workers to challenge any inappropriate handling of Grievance cases
- Appoint a point of contact to collate details of such cases.

Whilst this ADC appreciates that everyone has to start somewhere there needs to be a more robust system in place. A HR 'buddy' is not enough as there is evidence that without experience a 'volunteer' may not even realise that they need help.

This is causing unnecessary stress on both the member taking out the grievance, the member who is on the receiving end of a grievance and also the PCS Rep who is trying to sort it all out.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 43

This Group Delegate Conference notes with the move to regional centres staff will in general have to endure longer travelling time and distance to the new office from their home address.

There is a need now to look at more flexible ways of working and for the department to offer as many staff as possible the option of working from home.

The GEC are instructed to negotiate with HMRC that staff with access to Surface Pro tablets are given the increased flexibility of being able to work from home either in cases

of emergency or for longer periods where it meets the need of the business and the individual.

The GEC are instructed to negotiate with HMRC for an increase in the roll out of both Surface Pro tablets and Smart phones, this would enable more staff to have the flexibility of working from home either in emergency or for longer periods.

The GEC are requested to revisit the policy on remote and mobile working, with a view to make it an option for more staff within HMRC and to report back to the membership by 1ST February 2019.

200070 – R&C London North

Motion 44

This Branch instructs PCS nationally to withdraw support and co-operation from the annual HMRC staff survey.

Since the creation of HMRC in 2005, the survey has been manipulated to disadvantage front line staff and managers (Eg PMR) and since 2010/11 staff have regularly voiced how much we need a strengthening of our pay and terms and conditions and how these are THE most important things to us. Instead excom ignore these concerns and are complicit with government by pushing through an agenda which is detriment to us all (Eg BoF). Instead we are subjected to a tirade of pink, fluffy gimmicks prefaced with a hashtag to divert our attention away from the very real issues people are facing on a day-to-day basis (Tell us what you think but we'll ignore it!)

To this end, PCS are instructed to withdraw accordingly.

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Section 11 – VOA

Motion 45

This Revenue & Customs Group Conference is appalled at the Valuation Office Agency's handling of its Target Operational Model and the detrimental impact this has had on PCS members in the VOA. Throughout the negotiations PCS strived to protect the rights of those members who opted out of the new grading structure, ensure there were no job losses as a direct result of the implementation of TOM and to make any application process as straightforward as possible.

The TOM process is a catalogue of mis-management, ineptness and unbelievably bad organisation.

The errors encountered through the process include:

- Job descriptions changing and evolving during the application process
- Job descriptions not agreed prior to advertising post
- Ineligible members offered interviews and jobs
- Previously agreed protections withdrawn by the employer
- The wrong job offer letters being sent to the wrong members
- Members placed in the redeployment pool

The new organisational model was due to be introduced on 1st April 2018. The VOA postponed this until 8th May 2018 due to complications with the implementation. It is clear that the VOA was unprepared for the amount of change required.

Decisions taken by directors caused untold problems with the distribution of jobs and letters. PCS is aware that these late decisions corrupted the VOA spreadsheet used to allocate jobs. This late interference was not a VOA Board or

ExCom decision.

1. Given the level of incompetence exhibited by the VOA with the TOM process, this conference believes there should be some accountability for the errors that have taken place, VOAC is instructed to pursue any outcome it sees fit.
2. VOAC is further instructed to ensure that the VOA takes action to make sure those members adversely affected by the many errors are addressed.
3. The VOAC is instructed to escalate this as necessary including a meeting with HMRC's Chief Executive if approaches within VOA fail to achieve results.
4. Where possible VOAC should pursue legal challenges to ensure VOA members receive fair treatment.

Group Executive Committee

(Covers motion 96)

(Seconded by VOA Central)

Motion 46

With the introduction of TOM, the availability of homeworking has been severely curtailed. This was an option for staff in closing offices so that they were not forced to leave the VO.

Now that this option has been removed and the VO has stated that they want as many people as possible to be located into the remaining offices, current homeworkers are becoming increasingly concerned that they may be forced to move back into offices however impractical this may be. Their only other option is to leave.

This Group conference therefore wants the VOAC to make it clear to VOA management that no one currently a homeworker will be forced back into a remaining office

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 47

Following the roll out through out the network of the CI boards, it has become clear that it is now being used as a Time and Motion exercise to monitor poor performance despite assurances from VOA management that it would not be.

VOAC are therefore requested to inform VOA management that this must stop immediately. If they do not give assurances this ADC calls for a boycott of the process

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Section 12 – Equalities

Motion 48

Conference recognises how Motion A34 in ADC2016 proposed the establishment of a network of Neurodiversity champions across PCS Groups and proposed the adoption of the Social Model of disability. The social model of disability says that disability is caused by the way society is organised, rather than by a person's impairment or difference. It looks at ways of removing barriers that restrict life choices for disabled people.

Conference also notes that the way that HMRC is organised, from its buildings, interiors and policies and procedures, does not support members with neuro-diverse conditions, and that HMRC is not a neurodiversity friendly employer. This can be illustrated by the new BOF office

layouts with its overpowering whiteness, tightly packed desks and seating, and lack of areas for members to remove themselves from this assault on the senses. Another example is how HMRC's insistence on a one-size fits all behaviours framework discriminates against members such as those on the autistic spectrum, who will not always easily conform to these supposed 'norms'

This results in those with neuro-diverse conditions continually having to fight for adjustments, acceptance of their differences and general equal treatment.

The GEC is therefore instructed to negotiate with HMRC to develop a neurodiversity policy to cover the way HMRC operates: how it organises its work processes, work areas, HR policies and procedures (including recruitment) to demonstrate that HMRC truly values neuro-divergence.

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 49

This Conference recognises the changed situations caused by BoF and 'New ways of Working'; Conference particularly notes the risk that these might have a disproportionately detrimental impact on disabled colleagues.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC an agreement that no new IT systems, Applications or working practices will be introduced unless they are compatible, accessible and usable for the department's assistive technology (specialist software) users who use the following assistive software products:

- Dragon
- Jaws
- Supernova
- Zoomtext
- Magic
- Read & Write Gold

The Department will carry out a full Equality Assessment to establish and analyse the impact of the new system on disabled staff, and states clearly either how the system can be adjusted to ensure compliance with or else is clear that the system can NOT support staff with those disabilities and produces a clear strategy as to how the any Staff displaced as a result of implementation are to be found meaningful and worthwhile work of equal value.

The GEC is instructed to produce an update on progress in achieving these aims by conference 2019 at the latest.

200147 – R&C Anglia
(Covers motions 97 – 99)
(Seconded by South East Essex)

Motion 50

That this Group Conference is concerned that there seems to be a trend emerging within PT Operations where the AWP (Alternative Working Pattern) process and the reasonable adjustment process appear to be being conflated incorrectly, and this is leading to requests for reasonable adjustments being refused purely on 'Business Need'.

- When a member is asking for a change in working hours to manage an underlying medical condition as a reasonable adjustment, the member is being told that any request for a change in working pattern must go through the AWP process.
- The problem with this is an AWP request can be refused purely on 'business need', whereas a request for a reasonable adjustment has a higher threshold for being refused.
- This advice has apparently come from HR, but we are unable locally to get a name of who this advice has come from.

A recent Employment Tribunal case (4104645/2016) noted in parts of its ruling that 'there should not be a requirement for a claimant to make an application in order to be afforded a reasonable adjustment. If an adjustment is considered to be reasonable, it should not be dependent on the claimant making an application for the adjustment to be considered'. It went on to say 'the difficulty for the respondent in relying on the fact that the claimant should have applied for an AWP, is that the AWP policy is not designed as a reasonable adjustment at all'.

This GDC instructs the GEC to;

- Enter into discussions with HMRC and HR to resolve the issue of requests for reasonable adjustments not being treated as such.
- Discuss with HMRC ways of ensuring consistent treatment of members who are requesting changes of working pattern as a reasonable adjustment.
- Reporting back to the membership of progress made on these discussions by the end of the calendar year.

200133 – R&C Salford Revenue

Motion 51

This conference notes with concern the removal by HMRC of the policy which allowed paid time off for IVF /IUI treatment.

We believe that the removal of the policy disproportionately affects women and LGBT members.

The conference instructs the GEC to negotiate paid time off for fertility treatment'

200082 – HMRC Northern Ireland Branch

Motion 52

HMRC makes great claims and statements about being a diverse and equitable workplace. To the public on the outside and members on the inside this is often not visible and does not promote an atmosphere of a diverse, inclusive and equal place to work.

This conference calls for it to be usual, not exceptional, for HMRC buildings with flag poles to fly flags promoting diversity and inclusion on key dates such as flying the Rainbow flag (celebrating the diversity and inclusion of LGBT members and public in society) on dates to include:- local Pride events, during LGBT History Month in February, 17th May for IDAHOBIT, 20th November for Trans Memorial Day, 1st December World Aids Day, 27th January for Holocaust Memorial Day (honouring the memory of those known by name and unknown who have died in the holocaust and subsequent pogroms and programmes around the world).

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate (making full use the relevant Advisory Committees for members' input) with HMRC to achieve agreement on a policy for the flying of diversity flags on HMRC building flagpoles with the above ethos, as soon as possible after conference and to present the ongoing calendar of dates agreed, and the process to add other dates and flags too, so that every additional celebration or memorial event that has a flag does not require actions at group conference to gain departmental agreement.

Conference further instructs the GEC to provide quarterly updates to all members on the progress of these negotiations with a full report to Group Conference 2019.

200145 – R&C HQ London
(Covers motions 100 – 101)
(Seconded by West Mercia)

Motion 53

This Group Delegate Conference notes that the number of people aged 65 and over has grown by almost half over the last 40 years and by 2050 will double to around 19 million.

We no longer have a default retirement age but real change is needed to address age bias and discrimination.

Within HMRC many people are choosing to retire rather than endure longer travelling time and distances to the new regional centre.

The GEC are instructed to negotiate with HMRC to agree more support to enable older workers to stay and thrive in work enabling longer and fuller working lives.

The negotiation to include but not be restricted to negotiating more flexibility for allowing part time working, alternative working patterns and partial retirement. Flexible work and job design which is good for both older workers and the business balancing work with other responsibilities. Taking action to remove age bias from management procedures such as performance reporting, promotion and recruitment. Providing and encouraging a culture of development at any stage of career but also enhancing the support for those who wish to retire by offering better support to a staged retirement and pre-retirement training.

200070 – R&C London North

Motion 54

Pernicious anemia is one of the vitamin B-12 deficiency anemias. It's caused by an inability to absorb the vitamin B-12 needed for your body to make enough healthy red blood cells. This conference instructs GEC, via Disability Committee, to raise the profile of this lifelong condition within HMRC and to ensure Thompson Solicitors are briefed on the impact this condition may have on a person's work. (BT Ops).

200082 – HMRC Northern Ireland Branch

Section 13 – Business Stream

Motion 55

HMRC members within some locations are due to transfer into DWP to work in Universal Credit.

Whilst some members of the NW & Central Lancs Branch have already moved department under COSOP working practices and the 'measures agreement' there is still uncertainty from both DWP and R&C sides of PCS of what this actually means for these and members yet to transfer. This is impacting on outgoing members uncertain about what terms and conditions are protected under COSOP, and which are new work practices under the 'measures agreement' they are expected to comply with.

This motion instructs the Universal Credit Liaison Group to meet with all branches affected before further transfers take place (or as soon as practicable), and to ensure that clear and direct routes exist for all members and PCS Representatives to check understanding and ask questions relating to COSOP, 'the DWP employee deal' and the 'measures agreement'.

The Universal Credit Liaison Group is to ensure clear guidance of COSOP and all other local agreements relating to the transfer to UC, is fully available to all PCS Representatives working in both DWP and HMRC to support them to support to those members effectively with accurate advice.

The UCLG should start to act on the instruction within

this motion no longer than two weeks after R&C Group Conference 2018 closes.

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire

Motion 56

This conference notes the announcement made on 17th January that Benefits and Credits members in Liverpool, Bootle, Netherton and St Helens and PT Operations members in Merry Hill Contact Centre would not be moving to Department for Work and Pensions Universal Credits as originally planned.

Members in these locations are understandably concerned about their future in the Department and need assurances as soon as possible.

The GEC are therefore instructed to negotiate with HMRC to:

1. Secure alternative posts with good quality work for every affected member
2. Obtain assurances that the members can be accommodated in the Regional Centres, or in additional locations closer to their current workplaces
3. Ensure that any posts offered won't be detrimental to members e.g. in terms of working patterns etc.
4. Provide appropriate training & support for any new job roles
5. Carry out appropriate Risk Assessments prior to any moves
6. All Workplace Adjustment Passports, with all reasonable adjustments to be put in place prior to the commencement of the new job role.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(Covers motion 102)
(Seconded by Bootle Taxes)

Motion 57

That this Conference be informed that a "trial" is underway in Portcullis House, Glasgow to assess the possible integration of work of the former Directorates of Business Tax Operations and Personal Tax Operations specifically, for the moment, in the regime of VAT.

Conference has an established policy to monitor the merger of Directorates, in this case under the moniker of the Customer Services Group. This trial has raised concerns that traditional processing staff are to be used solely as telephone operators without the sharing of the processing work with established telephone operators; that the intention is simply to get more staff "on the phones."

The GEC is therefore instructed to monitor this development and if necessary address the following concerns:

- That no staff who are not able to take on telephony work are not required to do so
- That those who are able to do so are provided with sufficient support, time and training
- That those staff who enjoy the traditional contracted Flexible Working Frameworks are not expected to adopt new Frameworks, in fact that those staff who do not currently enjoy traditional "full flexi" are represented in negotiations to be awarded those T&Cs.
- That any threat to an attack on "full flexi" be subject to full consultation and balloting on Industrial Action.

The above concerns are not exhaustive.

The above instructions are considered to be immediately implementable.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation

Motion 58

This ADC notes that across the department casework is being carried out by grades AO to G6. Despite guidance (SOPs/SWIs) being drawn up by compliance business streams, it does not identify which grade of officer should undertake each element of casework; this ADC is concerned at the effects of this - case workers doing work they have not been trained to do, the department having work done on the cheap and workers' health and safety being put at risk.

The GEC is instructed to do the following:

1. Negotiate with management to have a JEGS exercise carried out for each element of casework undertaken across the department
2. Undertake a comprehensive stress survey for all grades working in compliance
3. Ensure a review is undertaken of all compliance guidance (including SOPs/SWIs) within compliance to identify whether it is fit for purpose and meaningful
4. Use the findings of the stress survey and JEGS exercise to demand changes in the current guidance and structure of compliance case working.

200040 – R&C Euston Tower

Motion 59

Conference notes there has been little progress in establishing a realistic job design with Personal Tax management, for A-grade members, as set out in motion 5 at GDC 2017. Our members are still expected to undertake a seemingly limitless stream of work type : that is poorly planned, badly supported and serves only to contribute to the turgid swirl of misery that is our lot.

Furthermore conference notes that the ongoing issues around phone work; with its significant impact on members health is leading to an unsustainable turnover of staff.

Conference agrees that whilst looking forward to coming to work, and longing away the weekends in eager anticipation of Monday is an unlikely to ever be the norm within PT, steps can be taken to at least alleviate the burden placed upon our members; to bring the job design within in the parameters of mutual bearableness.

As such conference instructs the GEC to :

- Call for specialisation of more complex work to ensure members can receive appropriate training and support, working consistently on one field.
- Seek agreement on a definitive job design that specifies the roles a member may have to undertake.
- Seek an agreement with official side that members should not be asked to undertake any new line of work without appropriate consultation with local as well as national PCS reps. This agreement should ensure members are protected from being asked to undertake work they are not trained to deal with.
- As part of the job design seek agreement that no member should have to spend more than half of any day on phone work unless they so wish.
- Seek assurance that the job design can factor out phone work for those unable to undertake it. If this assurance can't be given seek urgent clarification of what the department plan to do with these members.
- Report progress on this motion to branches by September 2018, and quarterly thereafter.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch

Section 14 – Organising

Motion 60

Conference is dismayed that, despite repeated, detailed and logical representations made by PCS, RCDTS management has refused to formally recognise PCS for bargaining purposes.

As part of the break-up of the Aspire IT contract, RCDTS (a Govco) was formed in 2015 to enable HMRC to bring back some IT work in house. PCS welcomed this development as it restored this vital work to the public sector. The TUPE transfer of around 1500 staff took place over 4 phases from 2015 to 2017, and following discussions within the Group and Commercial sector, PCS members from Capgemini, Fujitsu and other suppliers were absorbed into local HMRC branches.

Conference notes that despite the workers being absorbed into CDIO, an HMRC business stream, RCDTS was established as a Govco, which meant staff were outside the Civil Service, but still considered Public Servants. Immediately, PCS sought to extend formal recognition rights in relation to the agreement in place for HMRC, but this has been continually resisted by RCDTS management on the spurious grounds that, despite being in HMRC CDIO, and despite RCDTS being managed and directed entirely by people who are senior HMRC employees, HMRC and RCDTS are entirely separate organisations. Furthermore, RCDTS management insisted they were not going to voluntarily recognise PCS for bargaining purposes, claiming staff would prefer to enjoy consultation via an employee forum.

RCDTS management have engaged in informal discussions and meetings with PCS reps, but this ad-hoc approach falls significantly short of what our members have a right to expect of a progressive employer who is genuinely interested in engaging in good employee relations.

Conference believes that the RCDTS management approach:

- Smacks of hypocrisy and inconsistency as RCDTS staff are treated as civil servants when it is convenient to the employer; for example staff are invited to complete the CS staff survey and HMRC and RCDTS staff are embedded in the same teams, sit alongside each other within CDIO, and in some cases RCDTS staff are managed by staff in HMRC.
- Creates a 2 tier workforce where some team members who enjoy the full support of a recognised trade union sit alongside colleagues who are in the same union but are denied those protections and support
- Is counter-productive as it encourages division, dissatisfaction and fails to recognise that staff in in a workforce with a fully recognised union are more productive, healthier and endure less sick absence and fewer accidents in the workplace.

Conference recognises the work of the GEC so far in pushing for a robust comprehensive recognition agreement and to support branches in their recruitment activity, but now instructs the GEC to build on this work and formulate and institute a renewed strategy to campaign for securing formal recognition of PCS across RCDTS. This campaign and strategy should aim to continue dialogue with RCDTS management but also build towards statutory recognition; the GEC should consider all available options, including:

- Recruitment drives,
- Political lobbying and use of the PCS parliamentary group,
- Legal challenges,
- Industrial campaigning.

200114 – R&C Telford

(Covers motion 103)

(Seconded by Sussex branch)

Motion 61

This conference notes the great work that the GEC do organising our union and negotiating on our behalf. However many members and Reps put forward motions each year and quite often don't see any final results.

The GEC produce a report each year summarising what work they have done each year just before conference begins.

Members and reps can sift through these reports for feedback or ask for an update throughout the year on a particular motion that was important to them but the Annual report can be very vague and lack in detail.

In response to the above, this conference instructs the GEC to create any easily accessible database where members and Reps can access regular updates on individual Motions important to them.

A database would make the work PCS does more visible to members.

One of the issues we have when recruiting, is that people don't see the work that we do day to day. One way to tackle this, would be for communication Reps to issue regular newsletters locally, containing updates from the GEC.

An easily accessible database would make this possible throughout the year not just around the time of Conference. It would also encourage transparency of the work being carried out by the GEC.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch

Motion 62

That the GEC investigates the possibility of setting up a PCS app enabling members to access all relevant information quickly and easily.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 63

Although pcs is against the closure of local offices and acknowledges that a new learning agreement is being explored, 1 2 1 help and training for reps/members who are facing redundancy is vital. The only thing worse than training your staff and having them leave, is not training them and having them stay. This GDC instructs the GEC to discuss with the Regional Learning Coordinators (RLC) immediately after close of conference a plan to roll out 1 2 1 training by 1 September 2018.

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Section 15 – Redundancies

Motion 64

That this conference recognises the devastating impact moving to regional centres has had and will have on our members who are on Alternative Working Patterns.

Many members with caring responsibilities will not be in a position to change their working pattern, to factor in the extra travel time from their home to the new Regional Centre and in some cases may resort to reducing their

working hours even further, risking financial hardship. Public transport is not always suitable and - depending on where they live - members might not be able to get home by a reasonable time.

These members may decide working for HMRC is unsustainable and we would therefore lose a wealth of knowledge and expertise. Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to carry out an impact assessment on those affected and to use the finding of this assessment to find alternatives to the BoF migration paths, which may include but are not exhausted to keeping smaller offices open in their current locations or homeworking options.

Additionally Conference instructs the GEC to work with and support branches to undertake their own impact assessments, the results of which can be used to challenge departmental plans, analysis and assumptions.

Group Executive Committee

(Covers motion 104)

(Seconded by East Kilbride)

Motion 65

This Conference notes that HMRC has committed to move 1,500 jobs out of London. Many of these roles in Customer Services (largely Debt Management) are at AO grade.

We also note that HMRC plans to have far fewer AA & AO roles in Regional Centers, particularly in London due to the policy of placing more senior roles in the Regional centres.

This means that these AA & AO grades are heading towards being made surplus and likely redundancy if they are unable to gain promotion to a limited number of vacancies within Reasonable Daily Travel.

We also note that Business Support Units where AA and AO staff are mainly employed are generally understaffed, and businesses such as Estates in many Regional Centres do not have any staff below Higher Officer level. This has led to, for example, HOs carrying out admin jobs such as issuing passes. It is also noticed that Grade 7's have been known to send emails about parking and pool car compliance. Officers in other areas are burdened by admin tasks due to a lack of admin grades.

This is not just a serious misuse of departmental resources but importantly leads to potential redundancies for AA's and AOs who are not able to obtain jobs by promotion, causing immense stress for these members.

Conference therefore calls upon the GEC to:

- Negotiate a re-evaluation of staffing requirements with an object of retaining AA and AO grades in all locations
- If this fails to reinvigorate a campaign to fight against redundancies amongst AA and AO grades including the consideration of industrial action.

200026 – R&C London South Thames

Motion 66

Currently staff of NICS can transfer into HMRC on Level 3 Vacancy Filling procedures, but this is not reciprocated for HMRC staff

If there is no reciprocal agreement agreed/in place by end of July 2018, this Conference instructs GEC to consult members as to whether NICS should continue to be able to move into HMRC, and if consultation shows there is a demand for this agreement to cease, then GEC should implement a plan by end of October 2018 as to how this will be complied with. (BT Ops)

200082 – HMRC Northern Ireland Branch

Motion 67

Conference notes the Department's announcement late last year that it would be reviewing the processes and services of the Estates Hub Service Centre in Bootle.

The introduction of the SAP Ariba system, allowing for 'self-service' to replace the work staff in the Hub do, presents a clear threat to jobs. In addition, HMRC's decision that any remaining such work will not be delivered in Liverpool has told members that the outcome of the review is a fait accompli and their jobs are no longer wanted.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Negotiate for safeguards against automation costing jobs, including members being moved to other Estates or Corporate Services work where this is possible
- Fight to keep any remaining Estates Hub work from being moved out of Bootle.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch

Motion 68

This conference notes the continued use of overtime by HMRC to mask resource pressures and to meet targets which would not otherwise be achieved.

With a declining headcount as a result of the office closure programme, the inability to adequately manage established peaks in work, the failing aspiration of digitalisation, the over 15,000 years of experience lost to HMRC in 2017, and the imminent pressures of BREXIT, it is clear HMRC cannot continue to adequately service the needs of the country unless it is sufficiently resourced.

The use of overtime, while presenting an opportunity for additional income for HMRC staff who have faced years of unsustainable austerity, is allowing HMRC to achieve essential targets and meet key deadlines by the backdoor, rather than ensuring business areas are sufficiently resourced and staffed to cope with regular peaks and pressures in work and offering a reasonable customer service to the public.

This conference instructs the GEC to:

- Implement an overtime ban in all HMRC lines of business at the earliest opportunity
- Review HMRC's staffing position to establish the resource required to adequately carry out all of HMRC's required roles and functions
- Negotiate with HMRC to achieve the required level of resource in all business areas as identified above
- Keep the overtime ban in place until the above point is achieved and staffing is maintained at an acceptable level

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Section 16 – Outsourcing

Motion 69

That this conference notes with concern the decision by HMRC to propose an outsourced option for the security guarding & associated activities at its future locations. The intervention from the GEC to secure a period of meaningful consultation on the future of the guarding service is welcomed & the outcome which commits to considering the feasibility of an in-house bid is noted.

The decision taken by HMRC Estates to move for an outsourced security service is mistaken & does not have

the support of PCS members. Conference also notes that following the collapse of Carillion the whole issue of outsourcing is called into question. This situation provides an opportunity to press for a wholly in-house security guard service provision as an alternative.

GEC is therefore instructed to fully resource the campaign to oppose privatisation & demand a security guards service that is delivered, managed & controlled in-house.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(Covers motions 105 – 108)
(Seconded by R&C East Midlands Branch)

Motion 70

That this Group Delegate Conference notes the appalling pay and conditions of ancillary staff on the HMRC estate. Cleaners, security guards and on some sites other roles such as catering or nursery workers are most often outsourced and nearly always on the bare minimum pay and conditions that their employer can get away with.

However, Conference also notes the stunning victories scored by some of the lowest paid and precarious workers in the country in recent years. Such workers have won the real living wage, equality of conditions between in-house and outsourced staff and even had outsourced workers brought back in-house.

Conference instructs the Group Executive Committee to heed the lessons of these struggles. Particularly that they have been won with union structures built from the grassroots, where the workers directly decide on the course of their own disputes, and using loud, creative and combative direct action tactics alongside more conservative tools such as Employment Tribunals and judicial reviews.

Conference instructs the GEC to commit to the organisation of all ancillary staff on the HMRC estate, whether in-house or outsourced and to build a campaign in which the following demands are made of both HMRC and any private contractors:

- a. The Real Living Wage (£8.75/h national and £10.20/h London) to underpin the salary structure
- b. Equivalent Terms and Conditions to in-house HMRC staff, particularly holiday entitlement and occupational sick pay
- c. All outsourced staff to be brought back in-house.

The GEC is further instructed to provide the resources to branches to encourage the kind of organisation and tactics that have proven successful at creating leverage in other precarious workers' disputes.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch

Motion 71

This conference notes that following the significant victory achieved in getting cleaners' hours restored on Merseyside in 2016, PCS won back pay and compensation for the lost hours.

Conference notes that further talks with the company have taken place, trying to secure:

- Payment of the real Living Wage as set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Adequate staffing levels so that HMRC offices are cleaned to a good standard without undue pressure on cleaning staff
- Better terms and conditions such as sick pay, holidays and special leave similar to those of HMRC staff.

Conference understands that winning on those issues will

require local activists to recruit large numbers of ISS staff into the Union.

Conference recognises that outsourcing leads to low wages and poor service, and rejects the attempt by HMRC senior managers to wash their hands of the way cleaners and other staff who provide services to HMRC are treated.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Campaign for cleaning services to be brought back in house with acceptable wages, staffing levels, terms and conditions
- Campaign for HMRC to become a Living Wage Employer, ensuring that all directly and indirectly employed staff working on its premises receive at least the wage set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Encourage and support branches in recruiting cleaners who work in HMRC offices into PCS
- Pursue a permanent settlement with the private sector companies ISS, Salisbury, Mapeley and with HMRC on pay, staffing and terms and conditions, with further strike action and public campaigning if that is necessary.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(Covers motions 109 – 111)
(Seconded by Glasgow)

Section 17 – Training & Continuous Improvement

Motion 72

That this Conference acknowledges the discrepancy between HMRC's guidance around managers' approach to Mental Health Awareness and the training that they receive.

The guidance states that team leaders should be aware of the potential signs of a developing or recurrent mental health condition yet they aren't given adequate training to back the guidance up, aren't equipped with the necessary skills to identify the signs of mental illness or where to go for support.

We are in an age where Mental Health is being taken seriously as an illness yet managers are unable to get what they feel is adequate support which in turn results in members not being given adequate support.

Conference calls on the incoming Group Executive to negotiate with HMRC to:

- Provide better initial face to face training for managers to have the confidence to speak to their team about mental health
- Provide specific mental health training to help them provide support for their team
- Ensure managers are required to refresh their mental health training every 2-3 years so it treated the same as DSE and Fire Safety.
- Provide better visual support, such as posters, to break down the stigma of mental health
- Provide a safe space in each building where staff can go to speak privately or just relax until calmer.

200031 -- R&C East Kilbride

Motion 73

This Conference notes that the overall standard of training across HMRC is extremely poor. The department have created a situation where SWI's and SPD's are often the default method of learning a role.

There is a very limited infrastructure for in depth

training which meets the commitments within the national Pacesetter Agreement where everyone should be "comprehensively trained in all aspects of their role". As a result, our members are increasingly reporting a lack of confidence in their ability to do their job. This then leads onto PMR consequences or attendance management issues due to stress causing absences from work.

Various recording methods are used to note training undertaken but the underlying principle is just to ensure figures are shown for data purposes. There is in reality no assurance process looking at the actual training, whether it's fit for purpose or where there are improvement opportunities.

This situation is now becoming even more important as work is regraded or re-engineered and staff move to new work or lines of business as part of the BOF programme. One of the regular management statements suggests that there are jobs available in Regional Centres if staff "have the necessary skills or can acquire them".

This Conference instructs the GEC to put forward a paper to HMRC requesting a formal agreement on an across the board training strategy which will fulfil the needs of our members. This strategy should include:

1. Each line of business to detail job roles and the training methods to be delivered for each.
2. Full and robust structure for training including the availability of all necessary strands such as trainer led, workshops and e-learning.
3. Assurance process which ensures the correct provision and assimilation of learning.
4. Reasonable consolidation periods based on individual needs
5. Streamlined and functional escalation process when training issues identified.

The GEC paper to be put forward to HMRC within 2 months of the end of this Conference with a deadline of 31st October 2018 for the formal agreement to be completed. If no agreement reached by this date guidance will be issued to members on not undertaking work without adequate training. The GEC will also consider further options in consultation with Branches.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 74

That Conference recognises that the majority of Debt Management staff previously based within Debt Management Telephone Centre welcome the introduction of the Debt Resolution Team way of working, increasing the variety and responsibility of work assigned to AO's in the former DMTC.

Conference however notes that the transition to the new way of working under Debt Resolution Teams fell far short of what our members expect in terms of detail and in particular training.

Conference agrees that where new ways of working are to be introduced that appropriate and importantly full training should be given on all aspects of this new way of working to ensure that those staff tasked with carrying out the work are fully supported during any change in work type, including any potential reasonable adjustments where these are required.

Conference recognises that there are now many members throughout Debt Management who are responsible for handling sensitive customer information who have not been given full training, placing them at potential risk of poor performance or misconduct proceedings through no fault of their own.

Conference calls on the incoming Group Executive Committee to raise this issue with management as soon as possible following the close of Conference to press for the

introduction of full and proper training for all staff based within the new Debt Resolution Teams and those carrying out Debt Management work.

Conference agrees that the GEC should provide an update for no later than three months following the close of Conference on progress of this request and any further updates thereafter.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(Covers motion 112)

Motion 75

This ADC recognises that the current HMRC policy of only requiring staff to complete an online course in equalities is inadequate and is failing new and existing members. Previously HMRC required all staff to attend diversity workshops which increased members understanding of the underlying issues and the need to handle them in an appropriate manner. Whilst some members prefer e-learning it has been demonstrated that especially in policy areas such as this some staff will skip through the module not absorbing the material. The new policy in conjunction with the influx of new staff is causing additional stress and in some cases offence and is leading to an increase in personal cases. The GEC is therefore instructed to enter into negotiations with the department for the restoration of diversity workshops. This will create a more harmonious workplace as well as reduce the number of grievances, management interventions and conduct & discipline events and should therefore be welcomed by ExCom.

200011 – R&C Bristol West Country

Motion 76

Conference notes that it remains unclear exactly how HMRC plan to implement Continuous Improvement in terms of impact on our member's jobs; save for a few choice catchphrases like 'Be the Change'.

Conference instructs the GEC to urgently seek talks with the department Continuous Improvement Service to establish how they envisage this philosophy being implemented in the workplace; and how that will impact on our members. They should be asked whether individual targets and or KPI's will be used.

In the event 'continuous improvement' within HMRC mandates the use of such targets the GEC should:

- Oppose continuous improvement
- Recommend members do not engage in the process
- Consult branches as to further action.

In the event that 'continuous improvement' is a genuine attempt by the department to embrace its principles, as defined by motion 68 of GDC 2017, whilst stopping short of instructing the GEC to 'be the change' - conference instructs the GEC:

- To seek regular dialogue with the Continuous Improvement team in order to help ensure an effective rollout as long as doing so is not to the detriment of members.

The GEC shall report back to branches by September 2018, and quarterly thereafter.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch

Section 18 – PMR

Motion 77

Conference notes the work done by the Group last year and the number of trials run across the business by HMRC.

However, the headline announcement of the new policy has raised significant concerns.

In the Intranet message in February 2018 it was announced that the revised PMR system from 2018/2019 would focus on 3 areas:

1. Lighter touch and continuous

No formal twice-yearly moderation or validation meetings. A continuous process where staff will meet with their manager more regularly to discuss performance, development and wellbeing.

2. Reward and recognition

A reward for good work straight away. From 2018-19 there will be additional in-year rewards. Groups, directorates and teams will have the flexibility to decide how and when they reward individuals or teams.

3. Managing poor performance

Help for staff in but if poor performance persists for some time, equip managers to be able to deal with this fairly, appropriately and with confidence.

Whilst the removal of the detested moderation and validation process is welcomed there are still some worrying aspects within the new policy.

More regular meetings means more time for staff and managers in particular. It is also likely that additional meetings may be used as an opportunity to find fault.

In year awards will prove to be very divisive and cause tensions and stress for our members. It is also clearly a backhand way of undermining pay rises for staff and trying to force our members to work longer and additional hours in order to achieve cosmetic targets and a financial reward.

Our members continue to regularly report unachievable targets, almost total reliance on Standard Work Instructions and extremely poor levels of training, support and consolidation. We have also seen evidence each year in HMRC's own PMR statistics that our members who have a disability, are part time or are in an older age group are being discriminated against in terms of markings.

The new policy clearly indicates that there is a steer towards encouraging managers to implement poor performance measures.

Conference instructs the GEC to raise the relevant issues with the employer and a demand that the new performance management system must be implemented with sufficient assurances and safeguards for our members. These must address key points ensuring no link to pay and a fair and non-discriminatory process for all members. These also need to look at the workload of managers.

Conference agrees that the new system must meet the criteria determined by PCS policy and be underpinned by a collective agreement with the employer. The terms of the collective agreement if achieved should be subject to membership consultation in the form of a ballot to determine whether the new system is acceptable to members. Members and Branches should be consulted by 31st October 2018 where no agreement has been reached.

200037 -- R&C Edinburgh

Motion 78

As Group Conference may be aware the VOA does not have performance related pay instead it operates a Bonus Award Scheme which has been proven to discriminate against all

protected characteristics and working patterns other than full time . It is also 'gradist' in its application The GEC is instructed to support VOAC in its efforts to get this scheme either significantly improved or abolished and the money saved to be included in the annual pay award

200141 -- R&C VOA Central Valuation

CATEGORY "E" **MOTIONS 79 – 112**

MOTIONS WHICH ARE COVERED IN CATEGORY A

Motion 79

This conference notes the continuing announcements by HMRC of its Regional Centre & other future locations. PCS remains committed to opposing the disastrous & misnamed Building our Future programme, recognising however that the accommodation & facilities at many locations occupied by HMRC staff have been allowed to deteriorate over the course of the contract with Mapeley.

Conference also agrees that all HMRC workers deserve & require quality accommodation & equipment, along with building services delivered to a standard that meets the needs & demands of PCS members. This meeting is clear that the control of building services must remain in-house to enable the appropriate scrutiny & application of appropriate standards. This meeting also reaffirms the PCS policy that the preferred method of service delivery is via an in-house workforce.

The GEC is instructed to ensure that:

- Appropriate structures for consultation & negotiation with DTUS on the future building service standards are in place
- Members & branches are directly consulted over proposed changes to the provision of building services
- Commitments are sought from the employer for in-house control & delivery of building services to be the preferred option for all HMRC occupied premises.

200033 – R&C East Midlands

(Covers motion 19)

(Covered by and identical to motion 1)

Motion 80

That this conference notes the continuing announcements by HMRC of its Regional Centre & other future locations. PCS remains committed to opposing the disastrous & misnamed Building our Future programme, recognising however that the accommodation & facilities at many locations occupied by HMRC staff have been allowed to deteriorate over the course of the contract with Mapeley.

This meeting agrees that all HMRC workers deserve & require quality accommodation & equipment, along with building services delivered to a standard that meets the needs & demands of PCS members. This meeting is clear that the control of building services must remain in-house to enable the appropriate scrutiny & application of appropriate standards. This meeting also reaffirms the PCS policy that the preferred method of service delivery is via an in-house workforce.

The GEC is instructed to ensure that:

- Appropriate structures for consultation & negotiation with DTUS on the future building service standards are in place
- Members & branches are directly consulted over proposed changes to the provision of building services
- Commitments are sought from the employer for in-house control & delivery of building services to be the preferred option for all HMRC occupied premises

Group Executive Committee

(Covered by and identical to motion 1)

Motion 81

PCS has always been at the fore front of environmental campaigning amongst the unions. PCS needs to continue to promote this fight. To continue to pressure the government into taking the action that is necessary to clean up our planet not just our atmosphere, our land and our seas they have all been negatively impacted up on by human consumerism.

You may have seen recently the televised Blue Planet II series where Sir David Attenborough filmed the devastating effects of the tons of plastic waste that has been dumped in the world's oceans. Many people were shocked and horrified at the extent of the problem. Since then the Scottish government took action and more recently the BBC and other organisations have reviewed their policies and have started to take action on wasteful use of plastics.

This GDC instructs the incoming GEC to negotiate:

1. That HMRC withdrawals from any purchase activity on items made from non-recycled plastics.
2. That HMRC is encouraged to take a lead role, leading the government by example, in the fight against the use of non-recyclable disposable plastics.
3. To encourage HMRC to follow the lead of the Scottish government and implement measures to cut the amount of plastics being disposed of in a non-recycled manner.
4. That HMRC reinvigorates and asserts its recycling policy. Encouraging all HMRC sites to have specific recycling points, that these are taken seriously and to enforce that the waste disposed of in this way is actually recycled and not just given lip service.
5. PCS green reps are given official time to determine and assess the final destination of HMRC waste, with a clear route to challenge the contract under which the recycling waste is managed.
6. HMRC to arrange with their waste contractors for PCS Green Reps to be invited to visit HMRC contracted waste management sites.

This GDC expects the incoming GEC to reports back to membership by the end of November 2018, reporting both activity taken and progress made in pursuit of these aims.

Group Executive Committee
(Covered by and identical to motion 3)

Motion 82

That this conference, both with some reluctance and some appreciation, accepts that progress is being sought and gradually achieved by the GEC on tackling the issues faced by our most vulnerable Members following HMRC's adoption of the CSEP (Civil Service Employee Policy) Attendance Management procedures in early 2017.

That being said we instruct the GEC to widen their stated bargaining aims (R&C/BB/132/17) to specifically include the recognition of, and proportionate action against, the perpetual breach of the only emboldened text in the entire policy that "the decision on the action to be taken remains the responsibility of the line manager and must not be escalated to, assumed by or attributed to the person giving the advice."

Whilst line managers absolutely should seek appropriate advice and support where necessary, the manifest pattern of pressure being placed upon them by their subsequent line managers and/or HR case workers to change decisions not "to move" is unacceptable, in equal measure, to the both staff awaiting the decisions and our line manager members being constantly place in this position. Frequently this pressure is being applied, not as a means of support to managers or from a wider perspective as promoting a

healthier workforce, but as simply as a means of achieving statistical aspiration.

The GEC is therefore instructed to

- Specifically include this point in all related negotiations with the employer
- Prepare a briefing for line manager members highlighting this guidance with a view to their empowerment
- Include this aspect in all by future training information or correspondence issued by the GEC Attendance Management Working Group (such as identifying Branches with particular issues)
- Obtain expert advice regarding what evidence we need of contravention of the guidance in order to give us the best chance of success in tribunal. Where possible this should be by reference to actual cases.

These instructions are to be regarded as implementable with immediate effect.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covered by and identical to motion 5)

Motion 83

That this Conference, both with some reluctance and some appreciation, accepts that progress is being sought and gradually achieved by the GEC on tackling the issues faced by our most vulnerable Members following HMRC's adoption of the CSEP (Civil Service Employee Policy) Attendance Management procedures in early 2017.

That being said we instruct the GEC to widen their stated bargaining aims (R&C/BB/132/17) to specifically include the recognition of, and proportionate action against, the perpetual breach of the only emboldened text in the entire policy that "the decision on the action to be taken remains the responsibility of the line manager and must not be escalated to, assumed by or attributed to the person giving the advice"

Whilst line managers absolutely should seek appropriate advice and support where necessary, the manifest pattern of pressure being placed upon them by their subsequent line managers and/or HR case workers to change decisions not 'to move' is unacceptable, in equal measure, to the both staff awaiting the decisions and our line manager members being constantly place in this position. Frequently this pressure is being applied, not as a means of support to managers or from a wider perspective as promoting a healthier workforce, but as simply as a means of achieving statistical aspiration.

The GEC is therefore instructed to:

1. Specifically include this point in all related negotiations with the employer
2. Prepare a briefing for line manager members highlighting this guidance with a view to their empowerment
3. Include this aspect in all by future training information or correspondence issued by the GEC Attendance Management Working Group (such as identifying Branches with particular issues)
4. Obtain expert advice regarding what evidence we need of contravention of the guidance in order to give us the best chance of success in tribunal. Where possible this should be by reference to actual cases

These instructions are to be regarded as implementable with immediate effect.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(Covered by motion 5)

Motion 84

Conference notes with concern the increasing aggression and dogmatism evident in management of staff who are off sick under the discredited Managing Attendance Procedures.

Conference further notes that, despite Senior Management protestations to the contrary, the system is being applied in a mechanistic fashion, and with no genuine attempt to facilitate improved health and well-being of staff.

Conference is alarmed at the increased pressure seemingly being applied by senior managers and HR caseworkers on line managers to move quickly and mechanistically through the attendance process, issuing formal warnings, with the associated inherent threats, instead of encouraging discretion or genuine consideration of the underlying causes of the absence, or the impact on staff of the threatening nature of the process. This is particularly true for those suffering mental health related absences or with underlying mental health conditions.

Conference instructs the GEC to challenge HMRC on this overbearing approach, seeking examples from reps where appropriate to support this challenge. In addition, the GEC is instructed to develop support and guidance for member managers to enable them to manage with discretion without fear of interference or criticism with senior managers and HR Caseworkers, who are there to advise and not instruct or pressurise managers.

200114 – R&C Telford
(Covered by motion 5)

Motion 85

This R&C Annual General meeting recognises that the current sick absence policy does not provide enough support to members afforded protection by the Equality Act 2010.

The policy at HR27008 states “Managers should not take a mechanistic approach to setting a Disability Trigger Point; there is no set formula to follow. However, it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be an increase in the region of 25% or 50% on the standard trigger point (based on a jobholder’s working pattern). Managers considering increasing a jobholder’s trigger point by more than 100% may want to obtain advice from Civil Service HR Casework. The decision to make an increase which is greater than 100% must be signed off by a senior manager in the business chain, at least Grade 7 or above. This is to ensure consistency in approach.”

As Conference can see, to state that there is no set formula then state “it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be the region of 25%-50%” is contradictory. Managers have only looked at what is “expected for the vast majority” and not given due consideration to other possibilities, such as 75% or 100% automatically as it is not mentioned, any consideration over 100% requires a senior manager at Grade 7 or above to sign off the increase so again is actively discouraged.

Conference does not need reminding that the trigger is to hold a formal meeting so even if the outcome of the meeting is no action at this time disabled members, and especially members with mental health concerns are put through a stressful process.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to remove percentages and days from disability trigger point guidance and introduce a policy based on reasonable adjustment that reflects the size of the employer and the resources including staff at its disposal.

The GEC with the assistance of the Disabled Members Advisory Committee and FTO support is to investigate how

other Civil Service Departments and large private sector employers approach this issue and use any areas of best practice in its negotiations.

The GEC is to report back progress to the membership at 6 months and at 9 months from the date of the first full GEC called after end of conference 2018.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(Covered by and identical to motion 6)

Motion 86

That this Conference recognises that the current sick absence policy does not provide enough support to members afforded protection by the Equality Act 2010.

The policy at HR27008 states “Managers should not take a mechanistic approach to setting a Disability Trigger Point; there is no set formula to follow. However, it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be an increase in the region of 25% or 50% on the standard trigger point (based on a jobholder’s working pattern). Managers considering increasing a jobholder’s trigger point by more than 100% may want to obtain advice from Civil Service HR Casework. The decision to make an increase which is greater than 100% must be signed off by a senior manager in the business chain, at least Grade 7 or above. This is to ensure consistency in approach.”

As Conference can see, to state that there is no set formula then state “it is expected that the vast majority of increased trigger points will be the region of 25%-50%” is contradictory. Managers have only looked at what is “expected for the vast majority” and not given due consideration to other possibilities, such as 75% or 100% automatically as it is not mentioned, any consideration over 100% requires a senior manager at Grade 7 or above to sign off the increase so again is actively discouraged.

Conference does not need reminding that the trigger is to hold a formal meeting so even if the outcome of the meeting is no action at this time disabled members, and especially members with mental health concerns are put through a stressful process.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to remove percentages and days from disability trigger point guidance and introduce a policy based on reasonable adjustment that reflects the size of the employer and the resources including staff at its disposal.

The GEC with the assistance of the Disabled Members Advisory Committee and FTO support is to investigate how other Civil Service Departments and large private sector employers approach this issue and use any areas of best practice in its negotiations.

The GEC is to report back progress to the membership at 6 months and at 9 months from the date of the first full GEC called after end of conference 2018.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(Covered by motion 6)

Motion 87

That this conference notes that the Paradise Papers again demonstrate that the PCS / Tax Justice Campaign estimates of the tax gap are far more likely to be accurate than the government / HMRC figures.

Conference notes that PCS, and in particular the R&C group, was the driving force behind the setting up of the Tax Justice Campaign, and that the facts and arguments from this campaign are now commonly accepted and have reached millions of people in the UK and even more abroad.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue pressing our Tax Justice demands, in doing so reminding members of the

role that PCS has played and continues to play.

Conference further instructs the GEC to pursue the following bargaining objectives:

1. Further input into tax policy, including Parliamentary submissions when requested, and directly to the opposition parties when requested, through the PCS Parliamentary Group
2. Continued campaigning on the need for adequate compliance staffing to tackle evasion and avoidance
3. A locations programme that would enable non-compliance to be tackled wherever it arose.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(Covered by motion 10)

Motion 88

That this conference notes that the Paradise Papers again demonstrate that the PCS / Tax Justice Campaign estimates of the tax gap are far more likely to be accurate than the government / HMRC figures.

Conference notes that PCS, and in particular the R&C group, was the driving force behind the setting up of the Tax Justice Campaign, and that the facts and arguments from this campaign are now commonly accepted and have reached millions of people in the UK and even more abroad.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue pressing our Tax Justice demands, in doing so reminding members of the role that PCS has played and continues to play. Conference further instructs the GEC to pursue the following bargaining objectives.

- Further input into tax policy, including Parliamentary submissions when requested, and directly to the opposition parties when requested, through the PCS Parliamentary Group
- Continued campaigning on the need for adequate compliance staffing to tackle evasion and avoidance
- A locations programme that would enable non-compliance to be tackled wherever it arose.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(Covered by and identical to motion 10)

Motion 89

That this conference notes Jon Thompson's comments to the PAC committee last year, in which he called into question the credibility of the department being able to continue to undertake its current organisational activities, before going on to state that in a no-deal Brexit scenario, the department will need to recruit up to 5,000 additional staff to cope with the fall-out.

Conference agrees that prior to Brexit, BoF was already an ill-conceived and dangerous proposition and with Brexit looming ever-closer, BoF is now so obviously unrealistic that even HMRC's Chief Executive has been forced to admit that it lacks credibility.

As such, conference instructs the GEC to reiterate our demand that BoF be paused until after the full impact of Brexit has been ascertained, pointing out the inconsistency with a department closing offices and shedding jobs whilst its Chief Executive simultaneously talks of the necessity to recruit thousands of additional staff.

Give that the department has thus far rejected this demand, conference, in anticipating a continuation of this position, furthermore instructs to GEC to campaign for the following (taking into account the additional jobs cited by Thompson).

- Adequate trained staff to administer the huge increase in work, particularly on Customs and International Trade,

that will arise from Brexit

- A re-evaluation of the numbers and locations of compliance officers who will have to respond to requests to attend at ports and airports
- A locations and compliance strategy that is driven by what the work of the department needs, rather than trying to fit the work needs around the estates programme.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covered by and identical to motion 14)

Motion 90

That this conference notes Jon Thompson's comments to the PAC committee last year, in which he called into question the credibility of the department being able to continue to undertake its current organisational activities, before going on to state that in a no-deal Brexit scenario, the department will need to recruit up to 5,000 additional staff to cope with the fall-out.

Conference agrees that prior to Brexit, BoF was already an ill-conceived and dangerous proposition and with Brexit looming ever-closer, BoF is now so obviously unrealistic that even HMRC's Chief Executive has been forced to admit that it lacks credibility.

As such, conference instructs the GEC to reiterate our demand that BoF be paused until after the full impact of Brexit has been ascertained, pointing out the inconsistency with a department closing offices and shedding jobs whilst its Chief Executive simultaneously talks of the necessity to recruit thousands of additional staff.

Give that the department has thus far rejected this demand, conference, in anticipating a continuation of this position, furthermore instructs to GEC to campaign for the following (taking into account the additional jobs cited by Thompson).

- Adequate trained staff to administer the huge increase in work, particularly on Customs and International Trade, that will arise from Brexit
- A re-evaluation of the numbers and locations of compliance officers who will have to respond to requests to attend at ports and airports
- A locations and compliance strategy that is driven by what the work of the department needs, rather than trying to fit the work needs around the estates programme.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(Covered by and identical to motion 14)

Motion 91

This Conference agrees the following Rule Amendment which has the effect of reducing the SOC from five to three people.

Replace existing rule 7.20 with the following:

- 7.20 There shall be a group standing orders committee (SOC) consisting of three members. Each member will serve for three years. Each year the Chairperson shall be elected by the SOC. Where the chairperson is absent, the SOC shall elect a temporary substitute. The quorum shall be two out of three of the elected members together with a deputed member of the Secretariat.

Replace existing Appendix C: Transitional Arrangements with the following:

- Appendix C: Transitional arrangements
In 2019, elections will be held for all three places on the group standing orders committee (SOC) and candidates

will be advised that the highest polling candidate will serve for three years (retiring in 2022), the second highest polling candidate will serve for two years (retiring in 2021), the third highest polling candidate for one year (retiring in 2020). In 2020 a new SOC member will be elected for three years and the cycle of yearly elections for one SOC member to serve for three years will be repeated annually thereafter.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covered by and identical to motion 25)

Motion 92

This Conference agrees the following Rule Amendment which has the effect of reducing the SOC from 5 to 3 people.

Replace existing rule 7.20 with the following:

- 7.20 There shall be a group standing orders committee (SOC) consisting of 3 members. Each member will serve for 3 years. Each year the Chairperson shall be elected by the SOC.

Where the chairperson is absent, the SOC shall elect a temporary substitute. The quorum shall be 2 out of 3 of the elected members together with a deputed member of the Secretariat.

Replace existing Appendix c: Transitional Arrangements with the following:

- Appendix C: Transitional arrangements.

In 2019, elections will be held for all 3 places on the group standing orders committee (SOC) and candidates will be advised that the highest polling candidate will serve for 3 years (retiring in 2022), the second highest polling candidate will serve for 2 years (retiring in 2021), the third highest polling candidate for 1 years (retiring in 2020). In 2020 a new SOC member will be elected for 3 years and the cycle of yearly elections for 1 SOC member to serve for 3 years will be repeated annually thereafter.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(Covered by and identical to motion 25)

Motion 93

This Group Conference notes that the Building our Future Location announcements stated that there are no regional centres planned across the South Coast. There is no planned HMRC presence south of Bristol to Land's End and from Bristol in the west to Worthing in the east. It is noted that the capacity of Lynx House in Portsmouth is about 1000 members of staff when full and conference recognises that not all staff are ever in all at once. This Conference is aware that as with other branches there is local fight back and this campaign has started with an invited drop in for South Coast MPs in Parliament on the 14 March 2018.

This conference calls on the GEC to continue to provide support and secure PCS organising resources for the South Coast Campaign including funding. This conference agrees that a presence with reasonable daily travel of existing staff should be kept. To keep the pressure on ExCom and the government using PCS resources, identifying areas where a judicial review on the lack of both Equality and Economic impact assessments could be used to PCS' political advantage, to use the Brexit argument to explain why our members are needed to protect borders and tax revenues from smugglers and cheats.

This conference further agrees that the campaign should fight for the provision of sustainable good quality jobs in each location and upgrading accommodation to match that being offered at the Regional Centres & Specialist Sites.

This conference instructs the GEC to appoint a South Coast Campaign GEC Liaison Officer as a lead and point of contact, with a remit of working with local branches, their GECLOs, ARMS members in the south, and PCS FTOs to forward the campaign and report back to members in due course.

200024 – R&C Cornwall Devon and Somerset
(Covered by and identical to motion 33)

Motion 94

This Group Conference notes that the Building our Future Location announcements stated that there are no regional centres planned across the South Coast. There is no planned HMRC presence south of Bristol to Land's End and from Bristol in the west to Worthing in the east. It is noted that the capacity of Lynx House in Portsmouth is about 1000 members of staff when full and conference recognises that not all staff are ever in all at once. This Conference is aware that as with other branches there is local fight back and this campaign has started with an invited drop in for South Coast MPs in Parliament on the 14 March 2018.

This conference calls on the GEC to continue to provide support and secure PCS organising resources for the South Coast Campaign including funding. This conference agrees that a presence with reasonable daily travel of existing staff should be kept. To keep the pressure on ExCom and the government using PCS resources, identifying areas where a judicial review on the lack of both Equality and Economic impact assessments could be used to PCS' political advantage, to use the Brexit argument to explain why our members are needed to protect borders and tax revenues from smugglers and cheats.

This conference further agrees that the campaign should fight for the provision of sustainable good quality jobs in each location and upgrading accommodation to match that being offered at the Regional Centres & Specialist Sites.

This conference instructs the GEC to appoint a South Coast Campaign GEC Liaison Officer as a lead and point of contact, with a remit of working with local branches, their GECLOs, ARMS members in the south, and PCS FTOs to forward the campaign and report back to members in due course.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(Covered by and identical to motion 33)

Motion 95

That this Conference acknowledges that HMRC's ill-thought out, short-sighted and under-scrutinised 'Building Our Future' restructuring plan continues to represent a step in the wrong direction, and is being exposed as deeply flawed.

Conference further notes that recent events have reinforced the need to step up the campaign against BOF; namely:

- local individual campaigns, from Dundee to Ipswich to Porthmadog, have successfully delivered - without strike action - the retention of jobs in those locations from entirely different platforms
- public outrage has been provoked by the worldwide press publication of the 'Panama Papers' and the 'Paradise Papers'
- That millions of voters in the 2017 General Election rejected the austerity policies of the Government in favour of parties pledging support for investment in public services & an end to job cuts and needless reorganisations.
- HMRC Chief Executive Jon Thompson stated in September 2017 that 'Brexit' could require an extra

- 5,000 Departmental jobs
- The collapse of Carillion has placed private sector delivery of major building projects under the microscope
- The NAO has cast doubt on the viability of the HMRC BOF programme, noting: 'HMRC has acknowledged its original plan for regional centres was unrealistic and is now re-considering the scope and timing of the programme. It should step back and consider whether this strategy still best supports its wider business transformation and will deliver the sustainable cost savings it set out to achieve in the long run.'

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to continue to challenge the employer on the validity of its BOF plans, and to step up the campaign on BOF, with an emphasis on:

- Working with branches to build local campaigns against office closures, helping with the collation of key information that will help build support for the campaign among local staff, residents, businesses, and local politicians. This aim can be helped by sharing widely the lessons of those successful campaigns mentioned above.
- Surveying members in all locations to obtain data about RDT, increase in travel costs, childcare costs, caring responsibilities and reasonable adjustments.
- Working with Advisory Committees and Health & Safety teams to highlight inadequacies of existing Regional Centre plans, emphasising the issues for disabled members.

200114 – R&C Telford
(Covered by and identical to motion 38)

Motion 96

That this Group Conference condemns VOA management for the fiasco of the TOM re-organisation. From the initial application procedures where some people were barred from applying for their current job and the lack of job descriptions for the new roles to the I/T crashing and people receiving multiple letters saying they were unsuccessful and would be placed in the redeployment pool, to "congratulations" on being technically demoted. Added to this the non-receipt of letters by some people the whole process is unsatisfactory.

VOAC are therefore requested to call for a fair and transparent enquiry into the whole shambles, something the VOA is denying members.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation
(Covered by motion 45)

Motion 97

This Conference recognises the changed situations caused by BoF and "New ways of Working"; Conference particularly notes the risk that these might have a disproportionately detrimental impact on disabled colleagues.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC an agreement that no new IT systems, Applications or working practices will be introduced unless they are compatible, accessible and usable for the department's assistive technology (specialist software) users, including (but not limited to) Dragon, Jaws, Supernova, Zoomtext, Magic, Read & Write Gold.

Furthermore, conference instructs the GEC to ensure that the Department will carry out a full Equality Assessment to establish and analyse the impact of the new system on disabled staff, and states clearly either how the system can be adjusted to ensure compliance with, or else

is clear that the system can NOT support staff with those disabilities and produces a clear strategy as to how the any Staff displaced as a result of implementation are to be found meaningful and worthwhile work of equal value.

200144 – R&C South East Essex
(Covered by motion 49)

Motion 98

This Conference recognises the changed situations caused by BoF and "New ways of Working"; Conference particularly notes the risk that these might have a disproportionately detrimental impact on disabled colleagues.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC an agreement that no new IT systems, Applications or working practices will be introduced unless they are compatible, accessible and usable for the department's assistive technology (specialist software) users who use the following assistive software products:

- Dragon
- Jaws
- Supernova
- Zoomtext
- Magic
- Read & Write Gold

The Department will be expected to carry out a full Equality Assessment to establish and analyse the impact of the new system on disabled staff, and states clearly either how the system can be adjusted to ensure compliance with or else is clear that the system can NOT support staff with those disabilities and produces a clear strategy as to how the any Staff displaced as a result of implementation are to be found meaningful and worthwhile work of equal value.

The GEC is to report back Progress to the Membership at the next conference.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(Covered by motion 49)

Motion 99

This Conference recognises the changed situations caused by BoF Locations and "New ways of Working"; Conference particularly notes the risk that these might have a disproportionately detrimental impact on disabled colleagues.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC an agreement that no new IT systems, applications or working practices will be introduced unless they are compatible, accessible and usable for the department's assistive technology (specialist software) users who use the following assistive software products, which can include:

- Dragon
- Jaws
- Supernova
- Zoomtext
- Magic
- Read & Write Gold

Furthermore the GEC is instructed to demand that the Department will carry out a full Equality Assessment to establish and analyse the impact of the new system on disabled staff, and states clearly either how the system can be adjusted to ensure compliance with; or else is clear that the system can NOT support staff with those disabilities and produces a clear strategy as to how the any staff displaced as a result of implementation are to be found meaningful and worthwhile work of equal value.

The GEC is to report back progress to the membership at the next conference.

Group Executive Committee
(Covered by motion 49)

Motion 100

Conference Notes HMRC makes great claims and statements about being a diverse and equitable workplace. To the public on the outside and members on the inside this is often not visible and does not promote an atmosphere of a diverse, inclusive and equal place to work.

This conference calls for it to be usual, not exceptional, for HMRC buildings with flag poles to fly flags promoting diversity and inclusion on key dates such as flying the Rainbow flag (celebrating the diversity and inclusion of LGBT members and public in society) on dates to include:- local Pride events, during LGBT History Month in February, 17th May for IDAHOBiT, 20th November for Trans Memorial Day, 1st December World Aids Day, 27th January for Holocaust Memorial Day (honouring the memory of those known by name and unknown who have died in the holocaust and subsequent programs and programmes around the world).

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate (making full use the relevant Advisory Committees for members input) with HMRC to achieve agreement on a policy for the flying of diversity flags on HMRC building flagpoles with the above ethos, as soon as possible after conference and to present the ongoing calendar of dates agreed, and the process to add other dates and flags to, so that every additional celebration or memorial event that has a flag does not require actions at group conference to gain departmental agreement.

Conference further instructs the GEC to provide quarterly updates to all members on the progress of these negotiations with a full report to Group Conference 2019

200149 – R&C West Mercia
(Covered by motion 52)

Motion 101

HMRC makes great claims and statements about being a diverse and equitable workplace. To the public on the outside and members on the inside this is often not visible and does not promote an atmosphere of a diverse, inclusive and equal place to work.

This conference calls for it to be usual, not exceptional, for HMRC buildings with flag poles to fly flags promoting diversity and inclusion on key dates such as flying the Rainbow flag (celebrating the diversity and inclusion of LGBT members and public in society) on dates to include:- local Pride events, during LGBT History Month in February, 17th May for IDAHOBiT, 20th November for Trans Memorial Day, 1st December World Aids Day, 27th January for Holocaust Memorial Day (honouring the memory of those known by name and unknown who have died in the holocaust and subsequent programs and programmes around the world).

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate (making full use the relevant Advisory Committees for members input) with HMRC to achieve agreement on a policy for the flying of diversity flags on HMRC building flagpoles with the above ethos, as soon as possible after conference and to present the ongoing calendar of dates agreed, and the process to add other dates and flags to, so that every additional celebration or memorial event that has a flag does not require actions at group conference to gain departmental agreement.

Conference further instructs the GEC to provide quarterly updates to all members on the progress of these negotiations with a full report to Group Conference 2019.”

Group Executive Committee
(Covered by motion 52)

Motion 102

Conference notes the announcement back in January that Benefits & Credits members in Bootle, Liverpool and Merry Hill would no longer be transferring into Universal Credit. In particular, Conference is concerned by the threat this poses to members' job security.

Conference believes that this decision demonstrates the poor planning behind the Universal Credit programme. Conference further believes that this was entirely preventable, had HMRC not treated members like disposable assets it was willing to give away without a second thought and instead committed to ensuring there was a Plan B.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to campaign to secure HMRC work for those staff affected (and any who may be affected by further such changes in the future) including the retention of additional sites as necessary.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch
(Covered by motion 56)

Motion 103

That this Conference is dismayed that, despite repeated, detailed and logical representations made by PCS, RCDTS management has refused to formally recognise PCS for bargaining purposes.

As part of the break-up of the Aspire IT contract, RCDTS (a Govco) was formed in 2015 to enable HMRC to bring back some IT work in house. PCS welcomed this development as it restored this vital work to the public sector. The TUPE transfer of around 1500 staff took place over 4 phases from 2015 to 2017, and following discussions within the Group and Commercial sector, PCS members from Capgemini, Fujitsu and other suppliers were absorbed into local HMRC branches.

Conference notes that despite the workers being absorbed into CDIO, an HMRC business stream, RCDTS was established as a Govco, which meant staff were outside the Civil Service, but still considered Public Servants. Immediately, PCS sought to extend formal recognition rights in relation to the agreement in place for HMRC, but this has been continually resisted by RCDTS management on the spurious grounds that, despite being in HMRC CDIO, and despite RCDTS being managed and directed entirely by people who are senior HMRC employees, HMRC and RCDTS are entirely separate organisations. Furthermore, RCDTS management insisted they were not going to voluntarily recognise PCS for bargaining purposes, claiming staff would prefer to enjoy consultation via an employee forum.

RCDTS management have engaged in informal discussions and meetings with PCS reps, but this ad-hoc approach falls significantly short of what our members have a right to expect of a progressive employer who is genuinely interested in engaging in good employee relations.

Conference believes that the RCDTS management approach:

- Smacks of hypocrisy and inconsistency as RCDTS staff are treated as civil servants when it is convenient to the employer; for example staff are invited to complete the CS staff survey and HMRC and RCDTS staff are embedded in the same teams, sit alongside

each other within CDIO, and in some cases RCDTS staff are managed by staff in HMRC.

- Creates a 2 tier workforce where some team members who enjoy the full support of a recognised trade union sit alongside colleagues who are in the same union but are denied those protections and support
- Is counter-productive as it encourages division, dissatisfaction and fails to recognise that staff in a workforce with a fully recognised union are more productive, healthier and endure less sick absence and fewer accidents in the workplace.

Conference recognises the work of the GEC so far in pushing for a robust comprehensive recognition agreement and to support branches in their recruitment activity, but now instructs the GEC to build on this work and formulate and institute a renewed strategy to campaign for securing formal recognition of PCS across RCDTS. This campaign and strategy should aim to continue dialogue with RCDTS management but also build towards statutory recognition; the GEC should consider all available options, including:

Recruitment drives, political lobbying, use of the PCS parliamentary group, legal challenges and industrial campaigning.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(Covered by motion 60)

Motion 104

That this conference recognises the devastating impact moving to regional centres has had and will have on our members who are on Alternative Working Patterns.

Many members with caring responsibilities will not be in a position to change their working pattern, to factor in the extra travel time from their home to the new Regional Centre and in some cases may resort to reducing their working hours even further, risking financial hardship. Public transport is not always suitable and - depending on where they live - members might not be able to get home by a reasonable time.

These members may decide working for HMRC is unsustainable and we would therefore lose a wealth of knowledge and expertise.

Conference calls on the incoming Group Executive Committee to call on HMRC to carry out an impact assessment on those staff working alternative working patterns and/or with caring responsibilities affected and to use the findings of this assessment to find alternatives to the BoF migration paths, which may include but are not exhausted to keeping smaller offices open in their current locations or homeworking options.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(Covered by motion 64)

Motion 105

This conference notes with concern the decision by HMRC to propose an outsourced option for the security guarding & associated activities at its future locations. The intervention from the GEC to secure a period of meaningful consultation on the future of the guarding service is welcomed & the outcome which commits to considering the feasibility of an in-house bid is noted.

The decision taken by HMRC Estates to move for an outsourced security service is mistaken & does not have the support of PCS members. This situation provides an opportunity to press for a wholly in-house security guard service provision as an alternative.

The GEC is therefore instructed to fully resource the

campaign to oppose privatisation & demand a security guards service that is delivered, managed & controlled in-house.

200033 - R&C East Midlands
(Covered by motion 69)

Motion 106

That this conference notes with concern the decision by HMRC to propose an outsourced option for the security guarding & associated activities at its future locations. The intervention from the GEC to secure a period of meaningful consultation on the future of the guarding service is welcomed & the outcome which commits to considering the feasibility of an in-house bid is noted.

The decision taken by HMRC Estates to move for an outsourced security service is mistaken & does not have the support of PCS members. This situation provides an opportunity to press for a wholly in-house security guard service provision as an alternative.

The GEC is therefore instructed to fully resource the campaign to oppose privatisation & demand a security guards service that is delivered, managed & controlled in-house.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(Covered by motion 69)

Motion 107

That this conference notes with concern the decision by HMRC to propose an outsourced option for the security guarding & associated activities at its future locations. The intervention from the GEC to secure a period of meaningful consultation on the future of the guarding service is welcomed & the outcome which commits to considering the feasibility of an in-house bid is noted.

The decision taken by HMRC Estates to move for an outsourced security service is mistaken & does not have the support of PCS members. This situation provides an opportunity to press for a wholly in-house security guard service provision as an alternative.

The GEC is therefore instructed to fully resource the campaign to oppose privatisation & demand a security guards service that is delivered, managed & controlled in-house.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covered by motion 69)

Motion 108

That this conference notes with concern the decision by HMRC to propose an outsourced option for the security guarding & associated activities at its future locations. The intervention from the GEC to secure a period of meaningful consultation on the future of the guarding service is welcomed & the outcome which commits to considering the feasibility of an in-house bid is noted.

The decision taken by HMRC Estates to move for an outsourced security service is mistaken & does not have the support of PCS members. This situation provides an opportunity to press for a wholly in-house security guard service provision as an alternative.

The GEC is therefore instructed to fully resource the campaign to oppose privatisation & demand a security guards service that is delivered, managed & controlled in-house.

Motion 109

This conference notes that following the significant victory achieved in getting cleaners' hours restored on Merseyside in 2016, PCS won back pay and compensation for the lost hours.

Conference notes that further talks with the company have taken place, trying to secure:

- Payment of the real Living Wage as set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Adequate staffing levels so that HMRC offices are cleaned to a good standard without undue pressure on cleaning staff
- Better terms and conditions such as sick pay, holidays and special leave similar to those of HMRC staff.

Conference understands that winning on those issues will require local activists to recruit large numbers of ISS staff into the Union.

Conference recognises that outsourcing leads to low wages and poor service, and rejects the attempt by HMRC senior managers to wash their hands of the way cleaners and other staff who provide services to HMRC are treated.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Campaign for cleaning services to be brought back in house with acceptable wages, staffing levels, terms and conditions
- Campaign for HMRC to become a Living Wage Employer, ensuring that all directly and indirectly employed staff working on its premises receive at least the wage set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Encourage and support branches in recruiting cleaners who work in HMRC offices into PCS
- Pursue a permanent settlement with the private sector companies ISS, Salisbury, Mapeley and with HMRC on pay, staffing and terms and conditions, with further strike action and public campaigning if that is necessary.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(Covered by and identical to motion 71)

Motion 110

This conference notes that following the significant victory achieved in getting cleaners' hours restored on Merseyside in 2016, PCS won back pay and compensation for the lost hours.

Conference notes that further talks with the company have taken place, trying to secure:

- Payment of the real Living Wage as set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Adequate staffing levels so that HMRC offices are cleaned to a good standard without undue pressure on cleaning staff
- Better terms and conditions such as sick pay, holidays and special leave similar to those of HMRC staff.

Conference understands that winning on those issues will require local activists to recruit large numbers of ISS staff into the Union.

Conference recognises that outsourcing leads to low wages and poor service, and rejects the attempt by HMRC senior managers to wash their hands of the way cleaners and other staff who provide services to HMRC are treated.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Campaign for cleaning services to be brought back in

house with acceptable wages, staffing levels, terms and conditions

- Campaign for HMRC to become a Living Wage Employer, ensuring that all directly and indirectly employed staff working on its premises receive at least the wage set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Encourage and support branches in recruiting cleaners who work in HMRC offices into PCS
- Pursue a permanent settlement with the private sector companies ISS, Salisbury, Mapeley and with HMRC on pay, staffing and terms and conditions, with further strike action and public campaigning if that is necessary.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(Covered by and identical to motion 71)

Motion 111

This conference notes that following the significant victory achieved in getting cleaners' hours restored on Merseyside in 2016, PCS won back pay and compensation for the lost hours.

Conference notes that further talks with the company have taken place, trying to secure:

- Payment of the real Living Wage as set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Adequate staffing levels so that HMRC offices are cleaned to a good standard without undue pressure on cleaning staff
- Better terms and conditions such as sick pay, holidays and special leave similar to those of HMRC staff.

Conference understands that winning on those issues will require local activists to recruit large numbers of ISS staff into the Union.

Conference recognises that outsourcing leads to low wages and poor service, and rejects the attempt by HMRC senior managers to wash their hands of the way cleaners and other staff who provide services to HMRC are treated.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Campaign for cleaning services to be brought back in house with acceptable wages, staffing levels, terms and conditions
- Campaign for HMRC to become a Living Wage Employer, ensuring that all directly and indirectly employed staff working on its premises receive at least the wage set by the Living Wage Foundation
- Encourage and support branches in recruiting cleaners who work in HMRC offices into PCS
- Pursue a permanent settlement with the private sector companies ISS, Salisbury, Mapeley and with HMRC on pay, staffing and terms and conditions, with further strike action and public campaigning if that is necessary.

Group Executive Committee
(Covered by and identical to motion 71)

Motion 112

That Conference recognises the burdens being placed on managers within Debt Management, in particular the newly formed Debt Resolution Teams.

Conference agrees that all managers should be fully trained to ensure that staff being managed are fully supported in all aspects of their work to protect staff and the wellbeing of both staff and managers.

Conference recognises that following the introduction of the new Debt Resolution Teams within Debt Management that there has been a distinct lack of training for Band O managers, leaving many managers unclear and, in some

cases, unable to support their staff handling DRT work.

Conference calls on the incoming Group Executive Committee to raise this issue with HMRC as soon as possible following the close of Conference to seek agreement and implementation of full and proper training for all managers within Debt Resolution Teams and those carrying out Debt Management work.

Conference requests that the GEC will report back to Branches by no later than three months following the close of Conference to update members on progress made on this issue and any further updates, if applicable, thereafter.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(Covered by motion 74)

CATEGORY “X” MOTIONS 113 – 117

Motion 113

(X marked as factually incorrect)

Conference notes that it remains unclear exactly how HMRC plan to implement Continuous Improvement in terms of impact on our member’s jobs; save for a few choice catchphrases like ‘Be the Change’.

Conference instructs the GEC to urgently seek talks with the department Continuous Improvement Service to establish how they envisage this philosophy being implemented in the workplace; and how that will impact on our members. They should be asked whether individual targets and or KPI’s will be used.

In the event ‘continuous improvement’ within HMRC mandates the use of such targets the GEC should:

- Oppose continuous improvement
- Recommend members do not engage in the process
- Consult branches as to further action

In the event that ‘continuous improvement’ is a genuine attempt by the department to embrace its principles, as defined by motion x of GDC 2017, whilst stopping short of instructing the GEC to ‘be the change’ - conference instructs the GEC:

- To seek regular dialogue with the Continuous Improvement team in order to help ensure an effective rollout as long as doing so is not to the detriment of members.

The GEC shall report back to branches by September 2018, and quarterly thereafter.

200006 – HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch

Motion 114

(X marked as exceed 500 word count limit)

That this Conference acknowledges that, in our fourth year of collective debate on HMRC’s manifestly ridiculous, ideological and unscrutinised ‘Building Our Future’ restructuring plan, an absurdly galvanising sequence of events have taken place. Conference must be aware of the critical juncture we find ourselves in, with the reality of BoF Phase 1 a mere two years away, and that our campaign must be stepped up now.

Conference can agree:

- That local individual campaigns, from Dundee to Ipswich to Porthmadog, have successfully delivered - without strike action - the retention of jobs in those locations from entirely different platforms
- That public outrage has been provoked by the worldwide press publication of tax pornography such as the ‘Panama Papers’ and the ‘Paradise Papers’ and the same public is now aware of the fundamental lack of funding for the tax collection that our Department is absolutely obligated to provide
- That millions of voters in the 2017 General Election rejected the austerity policies of the Conservative Party in favour of others; Labour, SNP, PL; indicating support for investment in public services & an end to job cuts
- That HMRC Chief Executive Jon Thompson stated in

September 2017 that 'Brexit' could require an extra 5,000 Departmental jobs

We instruct the GEC to concentrate on the latter comment on all future negotiations with HMRC.

We instruct the GEC to campaign against BoF within the changing political context to:

- Identify Branches, equally, who can
- Activate their Members to campaign for job retention
- and those who are unable to do so,

Where branches are well organised, offer support. Where branches need help, the GEC should actively assist.

- Allocate resource to the compilation of data to strengthen the case for job retention in those areas which are vulnerable. Hub leads can produce information based on SIP figures, BoF migration plans and KAI wastage rates which will identify likely redundancies in each directorate per location post attrition. This data will give branches the information required to motivate members to think twice about HMRCs BoF propaganda.
- To seek support from all Parliamentary Groups to support those comrades in their valued work on our behalf to actively lobby council taskforces and parliamentary groups in all Parliaments for a new, alternative vision for HMRC modernisation based on the Tax Justice documents created by Scottish and UK-wide PCS campaigners over the past two years, based around tax justice, good customer service, higher local compliance presence and adequate IT & skills investment.
- To survey members in all HMRC locations, obtaining data about increase in travel costs, childcare costs, caring responsibilities and reasonable adjustments.
- To work with Advisory Committees and Health & Safety teams to highlight inadequacies of existing Regional Centre plans, highlighting inadequacy for disabled members as an example of Government bias against all PCS members.
- To ramp up our National Press Campaign. Our hard work in localised campaigns has been published in local newspapers. These press releases have been picked up by senior management in HMRC. Our collective national BoF voice has the potential force a change in opinion if the National Press Campaign is utilised properly. HMRC fear one thing above all : bad press.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire

Motion 115

(X marked as exceed 500 word count limit)

This Conference acknowledges that, in our fourth year of collective debate on HMRC's 'Building Our Future' restructuring plan, an absurdly galvanising sequence of events have taken place. Conference must be aware of the critical juncture we find ourselves in, with the reality of BoF Phase 1 a mere two years away, and that our campaign must be stepped up now.

Conference can agree:

- That local individual campaigns, from Dundee to Ipswich to Porthmadog, have successfully delivered - without strike action - the retention of jobs in those locations from entirely different platforms
- That public outrage has been provoked by the worldwide press publication of tax pornography such as the 'Panama Papers' and the 'Paradise Papers' and the same public is now aware of the fundamental lack of funding for the tax collection that our Department is absolutely obligated to provide
- That millions of voters in the 2017 General Election rejected the austerity policies of the Conservative Party

in favour of others; Labour, SNP, PL; indicating support for investment in public services & an end to job cuts

- That HMRC Chief Executive Jon Thompson stated in September 2017 that 'Brexit' could require an extra 5,000 Departmental jobs.

Conference instructs the GEC to concentrate on the latter comment on all future negotiations with HMRC.

Conference also instructs the GEC to campaign against BoF within the changing political context to:

- Identify Branches, equally, who can
- activate their Members to campaign for job retention
- and those who are unable to do so,

Where branches are well organised, offer support. Where branches need help, the GEC should actively assist.

- Allocate resource to the compilation of data to strengthen the case for job retention in those areas which are vulnerable. Hub leads can produce information based on SIP figures, BoF migration plans and KAI wastage rates which will identify likely redundancies in each directorate per location post attrition. This data will give branches the information required to motivate members to think twice about HMRCs BoF propaganda.
- To seek support from all Parliamentary Groups to support those comrades in their valued work on our behalf to actively lobby council taskforces and parliamentary groups in all Parliaments for a new, alternative vision for HMRC modernisation based on the Tax Justice documents created by Scottish and UK-wide PCS campaigners over the past two years, based around tax justice, good customer service, higher local compliance presence and adequate IT & skills investment.
- To survey members in all HMRC locations, obtaining data about increase in travel costs, childcare costs, caring responsibilities and reasonable adjustments.
- To work with Advisory Committees and Health & Safety teams to highlight inadequacies of existing Regional Centre plans, highlighting inadequacy for disabled members as an example of Government bias against all PCS members.
- To ramp up our National Press Campaign. Our hard work in localised campaigns has been published in local newspapers. These press releases have been picked up by senior management in HMRC. Our collective national BoF voice has the potential force a change in opinion if the National Press Campaign is utilised properly. HMRC fear one thing above all – bad press.

200033 – R&C East Midlands

Motion 116

(X marked as award not appropriate to Group)

That this GDC notes that Stevie Ferrier retired at the end of January 2018 after 30 years (to the day!) with the department, as well as being an active rep within PCS and its predecessor unions throughout that time. Stevie is well known throughout PCS as a passionate and highly-experienced rep. Whilst Stevie spent most of career in Dundee Branch, he has had two spells in Glasgow, previously as vice-chair during a period of significant change for the branch, whereby Stevie's support & experience was invaluable in ensuring a smooth transition for the branch - and most recently as the branch treasurer - a position he held until his retirement.

This Conference instructs the award of the Distinguished Lifetime Membership award to Steven Ferrier.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation

Motion 117

(X marked as not appropriate to Group)

PCS has always been at the fore front of environmental campaigning amongst the unions. PCS needs to continue to promote this fight. To continue to pressure the government into taking the action that is necessary to clean up our planet not just our atmosphere, our land and our seas they have all been negatively impacted up on by human consumerism.

You may have seen recently the televised Blue Planet II series where Sir David Attenborough filmed the devastating effects of the tons of plastic waste that has been dumped in the world's oceans. Many people were shocked and horrified at the extent of the problem. Since then the Scottish government took action and more recently the BBC and other organisations have reviewed their policies and have started to take action on wasteful use of plastics.

This GDC instructs the incoming NEC to negotiate:

1. That government withdrawals from any purchase activity on items made from non-recycled plastics.
2. That the Government is encouraged to take a lead role, leading the business world by example, in the fight against the use of non-recyclable disposable plastics.
3. To encourage the Government to follow the lead of the Scottish government and implement measures to cut the amount of plastics being disposed of in a non-recycled manner.
4. To task the PCS parliamentary campaigning group to pressure the government to develop, set-up and implement plans to prevent further plastic waste generated by the UK from entering into our seas; to do this through a combination of reducing plastic usage, improving UK recycling technology and facilities, increase research funding into biodegrading plastics and "plastic eating" technologies.

This ADC expects the incoming NEC to reports back to membership by the end of November 2018, reporting both activity taken and progress made in pursuit of these aims.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Appendix: Branches Guide to Motions submitted

Branch	Name	Motion Number
200	GEC	19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 32, 45, 64, 80, 81, 99, 101, 108, 111
200006	HMRC Bootle Taxes Branch	56, 67, 70, 76, 102, 113
200011	R&C Bristol West Country	75
200024	R&C Cornwall Devon and Somerset	93
200026	R&C London South Thames	4, 15, 65
200027	R&C Cumbernauld	8, 34, 44, 63, 68
200031	R&C East Kilbride	17, 72, 74, 86, 98, 104, 112
200033	R&C East Midlands	79, 105, 115
200036	R&C VOA Eastern Counties Valuation	16, 31
200037	R&C Edinburgh	7, 40, 41, 73, 77
200039	R&C Criminal Justice Branch	14, 27, 69, 88, 92
200040	R&C Euston Tower	58
200070	R&C London North	36, 43, 53
200082	HMRC Northern Ireland Branch	13, 51, 54, 66
200091	R&C Portsmouth - Portsdown Vectis	33, 85
200108	R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire	1, 83, 114
200114	R&C Telford	28, 39, 48, 60, 84, 95
200119	R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation	10, 38, 57, 82, 89, 91, 107, 109, 116
200126	R&C Benton Park View	29
200133	R&C Salford Revenue	50
200136	R&C Liverpool Branch	56
200141	R&C VOA Central Valuation	11, 12, 18, 37, 46, 47, 48, 62, 78, 96
200144	R&C South East Essex	35, 97
200145	R&C HQ London	2, 52
200146	R&C North West & Central Lancashire	9, 55
200147	R&C Anglia	49
200149	R&C West Mercia	3, 30, 42, 100, 117
200152	R&C Sussex	5, 94, 103, 106, 110
200200	R&C Five Shires	6

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES



Public and Commercial Services Union | pcs.org.uk