

Revenue & Customs Group

Annual Delegate Group Conference 2017

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

**Auditorium 2 (ex-Hewison Hall)
Brighton Conference Centre
Monday 22 and Tuesday 23 May 2017**



INTRODUCTION TO STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (SOC) REPORT NO. 1

This document contains the first report of the Standing Orders Committee with our recommendations for debate.

The opportunity to have your say will be at your branch mandating meeting. At that meeting, members instruct their branch delegates how to vote on motions to ensure that their delegates represent the views of members. Your office/branch secretary will have details of when this meeting will be held.

131 motions were received from branches and the Group Executive Committee, all but a handful were submitted electronically. There were issues with the system in PCS, but these were rectified to ensure that no extension deadline was required.

We have considered these and allocated them to the appropriate categories.

We have also this time used our SOC instructions to create 2 Composite Motions for the first time, these are Motion 19 & 70.

We realise that some branches will be disappointed that their motions have not been included in the primary agenda. However, we believe that this agenda gives the opportunity for a full and balanced debate on a wide range of issues. We believe that if conference is disciplined with its time, it will have the opportunity to debate all the major issues of importance to members.

After our initial sift & sort of the motions received, we had confirmation that our Guest Speakers slots needed adjusting so the Motion categories have moved around the timetable. Any further changes if required will be detailed in the SOC 3 Report published before Conference opens.

As far as references back are concerned, it is our view that branches can greatly assist the SOC by making reference back only on motions submitted by themselves. If branches identify a problem in another branch's motion, which in

their opinion requires reference back, it would be appreciated if they could approach the moving branch and advise them of the problems identified and suggest that the moving branch makes the appropriate reference back.

Moving branches and seconders wishing to speak should move adjacent to the rostrum in anticipation of being called by the conference chair to speak to the motion. This will save conference time and enable 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.

Andrew Forster – Chair
Dominic McFadden
Niall McInnes
Dave McNeely
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, 22 May 2017 – 09.00 – 17.30
Tuesday, 23 May 2017 – 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, Friday 19 May 2017. This written notice should be sent to Laura Lloyd, SOC Secretary, at PCS Group Office in Liverpool, or to R&Cconf@pcs.org.uk as explained in R&C/BB/006/17. The branch delegations will be able to meet the SOC between 14.00 and 16.30 on Sunday 21 May 2017 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 (2017) 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 composite 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** 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, or to R&Cconf@pcs.org.uk as explained in R&C/BB/006/17, by 3.00pm on Friday, 19 May 2017.

- 8 **Rule Amendments**
All rule amendments require a 2/3rds majority.
- 9 **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.
- 10 **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.
- 11 **Log of Branch submitted Motions** An Appendix at the back of this book contains for easy reference details for Branches to look up their Motions submitted.
- 12 **Guillotined motions section** It is the intention of the SOC to bring guillotined motions back on to the agenda in a short session immediately prior to the close of Conference at the end of each day. Branches wishing to request that a motion be included in this section should obtain form "SOC B" from the SOC during conference.

Timetable 2017

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 2016 Annual Report	
09:40–10:00	Pay, Terms & Conditions	1-6
10:00–10:20	Guest Speaker: Janice Godrich, National President	
10:20–11:00	Organising	7-12
11:00–11:55	Attendance Management	13-21
11:55–12:20	Estates	22-26
12:20–12:30	Rules	63
12:30–13:30	LUNCH	
13:30–13:45	ISS	27-28
13:45–13:50	ESA	29-34
13:50–14:00	Presentation of ESA	
14:00–14:20	Guest Speaker: Mark Serwotka, General Secretary	
14:20–15:20	Building Our Future	35-45
15:20–15:40	BREAK	
15:40–15:55	Guest Speaker: Peter Dowd, Shadow Chief Secretary	
15:55–16:55	Tax Justice	85-90
16:55–17:20	Business Stream	79-84
17:20–17:30	Guillotined Motions	
17:30	Conference Adjourns	

Tuesday

	Section	Motions
09:00–09:25	Redundancies	73-76
09:25–09:35	Financial Report	
09:35–09:50	Guest Speaker: Chris Baugh, Assistant General Secretary	
09:50–10:05	Benefits & Credits	77-78
10:05–10:50	HR	46-59
10:50–11:10	PMR	69-72
11:10–11:20	Guest Speaker: Credit Union/ARMs	
11:20–11:30	VOA	60-62
11:30–11:45	Continued Improvement & Training	64-68
11:45–12:05	Guillotined Motions	
12:05–12:15	Close of conference	

“A” MARKED MOTIONS 1 – 90

Section 1 – Pay, Terms and Conditions

Motion 1

Conference notes the difference in terms and conditions for newly recruited and promoted PT Operations staff since October 2016, requiring them to work more frequent weekends and late nights than their colleagues; in many cases working to 10pm up to twice a week and every alternate Saturday. The only explanation given by the department for these changes is “business need”, despite staff reporting significant breaks between calls on late evening and Saturday shifts.

Conference notes that HMRC’s Contact Centres used to be open between 8am and 8pm on both Saturdays and Sundays, before dropping weekend opening down to 8am to 4pm on Saturday only because customers were not using the service. This choice to expand opening hours again is a political decision, not based on actual customer needs.

Conference notes HMRC’s stated commitment to ensuring staff at all grades maintain a proper work/life balance that supports personal wellbeing and family life, and believes this new working pattern is in direct contradiction to that.

Conference instructs the GEC to obtain a commitment from the employer that its policy on work/life balance will be adhered to, and rotational weekend and late night working patterns for established workers will be extended to all staff, and that any future changes will be subject to joint agreement. The GEC should be prepared to report back within three months from the close of conference. If the employer has not made this commitment by then, the membership should be consulted on strike action and action short of strike.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 2

“Conference notes the collapse of the Tax Credits Error and Fraud contract with Concentrix, leading to hundreds of claimants suffering financial hardship and, eventually the early cessation of the contract.

Several cases of Concentrix incorrectly stopping tax credits claims became high profile media stories, causing significant embarrassment for the department and the redeployment of HMRC resources to cover the increase in demand and the reworking of claims. The effects of this are still being felt now.

Following pressure from PCS, not only has the error and fraud work now been bought back in house, the former Concentrix staff have been transferred into HMRC, based at the Belfast office. The GEC is continuing to negotiate on behalf of these workers on the basis they should enjoy the same terms and conditions as existing staff. Although HMRC have agreed in principle with this, the GEC has needed to intervene where former Concentrix staff have been subject to disparity in treatment.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC:

To continue with negotiations with HMRC on the harmonisation of terms and conditions for staff transferred from Concentrix, on the basis on all staff doing work for HMRC being on the same terms.

To use the example of the Concentrix disaster in future campaigns against the privatisation of public sector work.”

GEC

Motion 3

Conference acknowledges that HMRCs drive over the last few years to ‘Modernise’ staff conditions has led to a plethora of differing Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) of employment across HMRC. HMRC have even had the audacity to blame the workforce for demanding these detrimental changes during Francis Maude’s rigged consultation on T&Cs several years earlier.

This multi-tiered mess has resulted in people on different levels of pay for doing the same job, and having different annual leave and sick pay entitlements based simply on when they were recruited or promoted. This is exemplified by the mess that is RCDTS, which is a private company wholly owned and run by HMRC where there are overlapping pay scales. Where in the private sector would someone’s T&Cs actually get worse because they were moving up the organisation?

Conference calls upon the GEC to campaign to end HMRCs ludicrous policy of reducing T&C’s on promotion and to work towards a fair, equitable and workable system of recognition, reward and T&Cs that does away with multi-tier T&Cs. This is to be done on a no detriment basis, harmonising to the best T&C.

In conducting this campaign the GEC is also to seek legal advice as to whether HMRCs current T&Cs are in breach of any legislation that covers those staff that have protected characteristics.

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 4

This conference notes the business digital agenda set out by HMRC aims to create `greater flexibility` within the context of a 24 hour seven days a week service. This poses questions over the working terms and conditions of HMRC employees current and new. The GEC are asked to engage in negotiations with the employer to ensure that the best terms are achieved for any future staff hired under unsociable hour contracts. Alongside this conference requests the GEC to notify HMRC that if there is any attempt to alter current members working terms and conditions i.e. flex-time, working hours,etc then PCS Revenue & Customs will ballot its members for industrial action. Any action that is called for to defend members terms and conditions will only be called off after being subject to a ballot of the aforementioned members

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld

Motion 5

Conference notes the increasing burden being placed on “A” grade members in the Customer Services Directorate with regard to being expected to take on additional lines of work, often with little training and usually with no consultation.

Conference believes this amounts to fundamental

redesign of the AO role – yet note that no grading review has taken place.

As such the GEC are instructed to -

Demand a complete job description detailing all work that any given AO role is expected to undertake.

Demand that be subject to a grading review.

Demand that full consultation takes place before any amendment to any given job description.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 6

This R&C Group Conference notes that, despite the passage of motion 18 last year, we have still yet to see any group-specific campaigning over pay. Whilst also reaffirming the resolution of motion 20 to avoid any link between pay and any revision of terms & conditions, conference therefore instructs the GEC to carry out the instructions of this motion as a matter of urgency.

200008 – R&C Bradford & District
(covers motion 93)

Section 2 – Organising

Motion 7

“This Group Conference endorses Conference Briefing No. 9: Group Organising Strategy.”

GEC

Motion 8

Conference notes that the Croydon Regional Hub in South London and the East London Transition Site (ELTS) are going to be amongst the first large scale moves of staff under the Building our Future programme in the London region. These moves will be followed by the setup of the Stratford Regional Hub in East London. The impact of the moves is already having an effect on the ability of London Branches to effectively serve their members, as various buildings vacate and hundreds of members move offices. The moves include Branch Officers and BEC members in some Branches. Branch Organisers are already struggling to keep track of their members. BEC members suddenly find themselves in different geographic areas. This also impacts their facility time agreements and performance objectives. As a result transitional arrangements need to be put in place whereby activists can continue to provide a seamless service to members. This can only be done by ensuring that their facilities time agreements are maintained and they are, if circumstances dictate, able to get co-opted to a new Branch easily or operate as members of their existing Branch. As it is, London Branches already deal with such problems and regularly help each other out by picking up personal cases in other areas, especially where large teams have moved from one site to the other.

Conference accepts that there will be no easy solutions and each hub's circumstances will be different. This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to ensure that where Branches work out local solutions to suit their circumstances, the GEC will facilitate the movement of facilities time allocations, the transfer of branch funds and

the election or co-opting of activists to a different branch to ensure that the best possible service to members is maintained, even if this involves exceeding constitutional BEC numbers of a Branch in the short-term.

Conference further instructs the GEC to produce a paper that addresses the issue and provides transitional and long-term solutions in the interest of all members in the Group.

200145 – R&C HQ London
(General debate with motion 9)

Motion 9

All decisions on branch restructures arising from HMRC's office closure programme should be left to ordinary branch members to organise; the successful merger of former Inland Revenue and Customs and Excise branches bears this out. We instruct the GEC to commit to a policy whereby all decisions regarding the restructuring of branches, are left to local branches to make.

200040 – R&C Euston Tower
(General debate with motion 8)
(Falls if motion 8 is carried)

Motion 10

That this conference recognises the possibility of PCS facing logistical difficulties in bringing an increasing amount of cases to employment tribunal where members have been made compulsorily redundant by the department as a result of its BoF programme. Conference agrees that the best way to avoid this situation is to run a successful campaign against office closures and job losses, but that where such campaigns are unsuccessful, conference agrees in principle that every PCS member who could improve their situation by taking their redundancy to ET – and meets PCS' criteria for having their case taken to ET level – should be supported by PCS to do so. Conference notes that this motion does not seek to change extant ET processes within PCS, but simply wishes to ensure that this group is dealing with potential ET cases as efficiently as possible, so as to ensure that the aforementioned logistical difficulties are diminished to the greatest possible extent.

Conference instructs the GEC to do the following...

- Produce guidance, within three months of the close of conference, outlining the processes which should be followed and detailing the preparatory work which should be done by branch reps prior to handing off cases to qualified ET specialists
- Survey branches, within three months of the close of conference, to identify the level of understanding amongst branches of ET processes and prep work that could be done at branch level
- Based on survey results, consider if either all or some branches will require extra support or specific training in preparing for ETs and roll out extra support/ training as appropriate
- The GEC should have discretion over how this is implemented based on resources, the BoF timetable (and any changes to it) etc
- If training needs are identified and are covered by pre-existing training, the GEC could signpost branches to this training instead of attempting an in-house solution
- Work with relevant sections of the union to ensure that a framework is in place so that ETs of the manner described in the opening paragraph can be pursued without falling foul of logistical difficulties

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation

Motion 11

This conference recognises that continuing hostility in industrial relations makes it very difficult for branches to communicate with their members using departmental facilities. Conference further recognises that the use of departmental facilities restricts what we can say to our members effectively allowing censorship of our communications with our members.

Conference applauds those branches that have set up websites and forums to circumvent these restrictions but recognises that not all branches have the necessary resources in terms of skills or time to create their own websites.

Conference also recognises that this leads to a degree of inequity in the ability of branches to communicate with our members with some branches better equipped than others who do not have websites.

Conference agrees that if possible this facility should be extended to all members and instructs the GEC to investigate the possibility of creating a standard deployable website and forum that can be supplied to branches. Conference instructs the GEC to report back to conference 2018 with analysis to include

- Costing's for procuring a standard, customisable site including a forum which can be deployed and then maintained by branch officers,
- Cost benefits of securing hosting for branch sites in bulk vs each branch procuring their own.
- Assessment of whether PCS already has the necessary skills in-house
- Assessment of whether any existing branch websites could be used as a generic branch site template which could be rolled out across all branches.

Despite the above branches that already have websites and wish to maintain them independently will remain free to do so.

200144 – R&C South East Essex

Motion 12

That this conference notes rule 6.5 of the group constitution which states...

“The Group Executive Committee shall meet at least five times a year, and a simple majority of those eligible to vote shall form a quorum. An agreed record of the decisions (with details of attendees, apologies and absentees) for each meeting of the Group Executive Committee will be published to branches within 10 weeks of the meeting being held.”

Conference censures the GEC for failing to adhere to this and furthermore instructs the GEC to start adhering to this rule with immediate effect.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation

Section 3 – Attendance Management

Motion 13

This Group notes the introduction of an updated Attendance Management Policy in September of last year, the implementation of which was opposed by the GEC. We also note that a number of positive changes were introduced,

such as the disregarding of all pregnancy related sickness absence for the purposes of attendance management, and the increase of the number of days and instances of illness that a colleague can accrue prior to any trigger points being hit. However, despite a small number of positive changes, it is obvious from both the experiences of colleagues that have to go through the attendance management process that this updated system is not fit for purpose, and only seeks to further punish those who decide that their priority is not the employer, as they believe it should be, but to their own health and recovery.

The removal of informal discussions prior to a formal review following a hitting of the trigger points only serves to increase the stress on colleagues to remain in work, even if they are ill and should not reasonably be in the office, which further causes illnesses to spread throughout an office and only increase the number of colleagues suffering from illness, many of which, through various issues or disabilities, may be more susceptible to infections and result in them needing to take time off themselves. We have also noted the increasing number of colleagues, due to the worry of having to deal with formal attendance management action, taking their own hard-earned annual leave or flexi-leave instead of sick leave, in order to avoid the stress caused by the new system. This sort of leavism should not be needed in a reasonable place of work. The distribution of Surface Pro tablets amongst staff has furthered this issue, where colleagues feel pressured into presenteeism, where rather than taking the time to recover from illness, they work from home instead.

Furthermore, we have seen managers being pressured by their own management chain to enforce strict interpretations of the guidance, and management ignoring suggestions given in Occupational Health reports, rather than taking each case on its own merits and making a decision based on the specifics of that colleague's individual issue. This is compounded by the inflexibility of the follow-ups to formal meetings, where Improvement Periods and Sustained Improvement Periods are rigid and cannot be customised to the circumstances of the individual. This has greatly impacted many colleagues, and especially those who suffer from issues such as mental illness and non-presenting long-term medical issues.

This Conference instructs the GEC to:

- 1 Begin a consultation with branches to establish a compilation of amendments to the attendance management scheme that would:
- 2 Remove the need for leavism or presenteeism, as our annual leave should be for rest and relaxation, not recovery;
- 3 Re-establishes informal discussions following a number of illnesses, rather than formal meetings;
- 4 Increase the flexibility of attendance management to take into account the needs of the individual, especially those with disabilities that result in increased sick leave;
- 5 Increase the rights of managers to make exceptions and customised agreements with their staff without suffering pressure from their own management chain;
- 6 Ensures that Occupational Health reports are followed, and not ignored, as management are not medical professionals and should not be overruling specialist advice;
- 7 Removes the risk of downgrading or dismissal unless exploitation of sick leave is found; and
- 8 Any other reasonable changes branches and the GEC determine would benefit our colleagues.
- 9 Push for further negotiations with the employer to implement these changes, as there is no reason why there cannot be an attendance management system that both works for staff and the employer in a cooperative manner; and
- 10 Plan and support a group-wide campaign on this subject, given the unhappiness of staff about the implementation of the attendance management system, to apply pressure to the employer and engage our members on a subject they deeply care about.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 14

This R&C Group Conference reaffirms its opposition to the Attendance Management policy introduced by HMRC on 26 September.

The policy, which replaces flexible 'consideration points' for informal action with rigid 'trigger points' for formal action, amounts to enshrining and enabling the most mechanistic misapplication of the previous policy.

This will disproportionately impact upon disabled members, with the disability trigger point a poor substitute for the more reasonable approach of retroactively discounting disability related sickness absence.

It also risks increasing presenteeism, given the explicit disciplinary threat to those who call in sick, and therefore greater harm to the health and wellbeing of members.

Noting that the GEC opposed the new policy and established an Attendance Management Working Group to address it, Conference is disappointed that we have yet to see any result from this. Guidance for members and branches on tackling the policy is still yet to emerge months after the policy was introduced and there has been no campaigning activity to speak of.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to act with urgency on this issue and launch a high profile campaign around the following concrete demands -

- That the trigger points for formal action are revoked;
- That disability related sickness absence is discounted from any formal disciplinary process in line the current equalities legislation
- That a policy built around improving health and wellbeing, in ongoing consultation with the union, is established in place of a policy which punishes genuine illness.

The GEC is instructed, as part of this campaign, to ensure that the working group -

- Produces guidance on dealing with and challenging the policy for members, including managers, and for branches in a timely fashion;
- Uses case studies of unjust management action, where members are willing to speak out, as an organising and agitational tool to fight the policy;
- Works with branches and with the NDC to encourage and support local disputes at the earliest possible stage where potential unfair dismissals arise, and to coordinate these across branches where possible;
- Keeps members across the Group regularly updated on the campaign as it develops.

This work should begin within a month of the close of Conference.

200008 – R&C Bradford & District
(covers motions 94 – 95)

Motion 15

This Conference recognises that the current Attendance Management Process has created many concerns and queries for members and reps alike. The establishment of an Attendance Management Working Group (AMWG) to coordinate the union's on-going work in this area was a positive move. However, there appears to have been a lack of guidance for members and reps since it has been established. This Conference instructs the AMWG to provide regular update briefings outlining the work undertaken so far; provide a summary of types of cases and outcomes which have been reported to them; and importantly, provide updates guidance and advice based on the information it has received. These briefings to begin to be issued no later than June 2017.

200082 – R&C Northern Ireland Revenue Branch

Motion 16

This Conference censures the GEC for their reaction to the implementation of the new HMRC attendance management policies in September 2016. Yet again the lack of robust resistance has left members and reps exposed and trying to fight against even more discriminatory and harrowing procedures.

It was a dereliction of duty for the disparate approach within the GEC when faced with these HMRC plans. It is not good enough to wait until members have been subjected to these procedures and placed on unwarranted formal warnings or dismissed. It is not good enough to subject reps to the number of difficult cases nor our manager members to the incessant pressure and stress.

We seriously question how HMRC have been allowed to ignore the Equality Act 2010 and their own Diversity and Equality policies. This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to meet HMRC within 60 days and formally request the following:

- Cessation of automatic trigger points. Each case looked at on its own merits taking all circumstances into account.
- Cessation of automatic formal meetings at specific intervals. Each case looked at on its own merits taking all circumstances into account.
- Compliance with the EA2010 and full adherence to proper and sensible reasonable adjustments.
- Compliance with HMRC's own diversity and equality policies.
- Removal of Attendance Champions across all lines of business.
- Managers to have full unhindered discretion to manage cases without fear of PMR or any other consequences.

In the meantime Conference instructs the GEC to obtain legal advice on the procedural changes and mount a challenge where possible. The GEC will also provide effective guidance and support to Branches in individual cases.

This Conference instructs the GEC to consult with Branches by 31st October 2017 and if no significant progress has been made to immediately begin the process to ballot members on industrial action.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 17

Conference censures the GEC for failing to oppose the new sick absence procedures.

Conference notes the new sick absence procedures have given licence to those managers who obsess over attendance to treat members, who suffer ill health, in an appalling manner.

Whilst the guidance allegedly provides managers with discretion – whether that is applied depends on the nefariousness or lack thereof within you management chain or through HR caseworkers.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to seek the following amendments to the guidance:

- Absences related to accidents whether in or outside of work to be discounted.
- Absences related to mental health issues where the member is receiving new or altered treatment to be discounted.
- Absences related to sectioning under the mental health act to be discounted.
- The practice of holding formal meetings at the month 1 stage to stop.
- Members to have a right to be at or be represented at case conferences.

- PCS to challenge the changes to policy as a variation of contract.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 18

The branch asks that PCS seek proper training for management in HMRC/VOA in the correct implementation of the Attendance Management policy. This training should be extended to PCS representative to ensure a common understanding of the policy.

Our reps are seeing an increasing level of casework relating to the policy finding our members being put onto formal action each time one of them hits the review points set. This is not what the policy states should happen. Formal action is an option, not mandatory.

Line managers are reporting that senior managers are pressuring them into putting people on formal action once the review points are reached rather than allowing them to use discretion and common sense where appropriate.

Senior management are clearly more concerned with driving sickness levels down than genuinely supporting ill members. They are using their influence to put undue pressure on both those individuals concerned and their line managers who ultimately know their people best. This adds to the stress levels of all involved, exasperating the situation for all rather than acting as the support mechanism Management would have us believe the process is designed to do.

Line managers must be allowed to manage their people without the outside influence of those whose sole interest is in keeping sickness statistics down. To do this effectively they require consistent, clear training by the respective HMRC/VO HR teams to ensure that the policy is adhered correctly and consistently.

200090 – R&C VOA South West Valuation

Motion 19 – Composite A

This branch notes the new Attendance Management process imposed by HMRC and the movement toward overly formalising processes therein. Notwithstanding the comments from HMRC that this process is intended to support staff get well and facilitate the return to work there is widespread concern that this new process will actually make matters worse with staff returning to work and being faced with formal meetings and increased concerns and stress levels.

People could be forgiven for feeling that the new process appears to be designed to press management down the formal routes with potentially the ultimate aim of making it easier to dismiss staff due to unsatisfactory attendance or capability.

Given the new process and how it feels to staff facing the new process there appears to be a belief within certain sections of HMRC management that anyone who is ill is either:

- a) a malingerer who needs to be taken to task at a formal meeting to scare them into not being ill in the future; or
- b) someone who is so ill they are a drain on HMRC resources who needs to be pushed out of the door as soon as possible.

The new process does not appear to recognise that with the best will in the world people will get ill at one point or another. The vast majority of staff who are ill are actually ill. The best way to support and encourage someone back into work is to provide them with support and help not through threats and overbearing processes. Some managers appear to get this and try to operate the process sensibly and

reasonably but others do not.

We are particularly concerned on the potential impact on people with specific conditions and disabilities that may lend themselves to increased illness. The protections within the process for such staff seem minor at best with a subjective increase in trigger points seeming to be the main safeguard.

This safeguard may not even matter, since evidence suggests a significant number of line managers are failing to follow the process as written by not using their own discretion on whether or not to issue warnings or apply disability trigger points. Decisions are being taken by more senior managers or attendance management champions under the guise of “advice”, leading to a mechanistic approach across the Department.

Given the apparent attacks on Disabled staff numbers through the Building Our Future programme to date effectively forcing such staff out of the Dep’t. as they are unable to travel to the new regional Centres is it likely the new Attendance Management process will lead to the loss of many more such staff.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Formally request confirmation from the Dep’t. of the numbers of staff having been placed on formal warnings through to dismissals due to ill health under the new attendance management process since its introduction last year and in particular the numbers of staff therein with conditions or illnesses that would qualify for recognition as a “disability”
- Request ongoing quarterly reports showing where formal actions have been taken under the new attendance management process, broken down by both Equality strand and by area of business. These reports should indicate how many members of staff have been issued a warning, what level of warning, and how many have been dismissed, as well as the numbers of appeals submitted and their outcomes.
- Support staff identified by these reports in taking all necessary steps to challenge these actions both internally via the appeals process, and externally through Employment Tribunals or by other legal action against the Department.

Conference also calls for the GEC to negotiate for a new attendance policy that:

- Highlights the manager’s discretion when choosing to issue formal action; it is not mechanistic.
- Allows for disability-related absences to be discounted based on adjustments considered reasonable for a business of the size and resources of HMRC.
- Recognises that where members have multiple medical conditions covered by the Equality Act 2010, each condition is accounted for separately when setting reasonable adjustments

The GEC shall report back on these negotiations within 6 months. If no sufficient progress has been made, the GEC is instructed to begin a campaign comprising possible judicial review under the Equality Act 2010, and industrial action.

(Mover: R&C South London)
(Secunder: R&C Portsmouth)
 (covers motions 96-99)

Motion 20

That this ADC expresses its dismay at the introduction of yet another draconian sick absence policy. Conference notes especially the intrusive nature of theme policy, the harsh wording contained in the policy and letters to members, and the focus on the members actions as opposed to the department

Conference believe is the GEC response to have been lacklustre and instructs the GEC to

- Research best practice for Attendance policies

- Negotiate a new policy based on this and the following core principles
- Genuine help and support for members who are ill
- Recognition of the stress etc. that constant change and rigid work practices have on our members
- Recognition of the diverse nature of our members including age
- Recognition of the right to dignity of our members
- A genuine commitment and understanding by HMRC of the issues of such things as disabilities
- This to be achieved by all means necessary including appropriate industrial action

200078 – R&C North Wales & North West Branch

Motion 21

This Group Conference notes the new attendance management process introduced by HMRC ostensibly at the behest of the Cabinet Office drive to modernise HR policies and bring uniformity across the Civil Service

However we note the interpretation of those requirements by HMRC has been far more draconian than across other Departments leaving members facing a number of specific detriments. While this Conference appreciate the decision of the GEC to remain involved with the implementation as it hoped that there would be opportunity to ameliorate the worst aspects of the changes it is clear that this decision is hindering the ability of the Group to push back resolutely and launch a campaign for the full withdrawal of all the detrimental aspects of these changes.

Therefore Conference instruct the GEC to do everything possible to build support for a renewed membership mandate for the national campaign and co-ordinated programme of action. This can be based on national strikes, targeted action, and working with other Groups and through the NEC for co-ordinated action and generalised action.

200144 – R&C South East Essex

Section 4 – Estates

Motion 22

Conference notes that in the 2016 HMRC Estates Customer Survey, the 60% staff satisfaction score for 'Your Working Environment' was described as 'just acceptable' by the HMRC Estates Director.

This disappointing result forced Estates to introduce a Customer Charter, a Single Escalation Process, and a Feedback form. Despite this, HMRC Leadership have totally failed to address employee concerns by not introducing any measures to improve the comfort of their workers. It is not good enough of HMRC just to issue words and gimmicky charters, processes that amount to nothing, and show total disregard for the feelings of their workforce.

The 'BoF standard' accommodation that HMRC intends to roll out across the department has met with a very poor reaction by members unimpressed with what they have seen. This BoF Standard accommodation may be bright and colourful, but it is not an improvement on the existing workstations and furnishings in HMRC offices that have not been refitted to this standard.

Consultation with staff or their TU reps on this issue has not happened. Workers, reps and local managers have been side lined, and a standard 'template' has been applied to offices being fitted out.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to ensure that there is proper consultation before

the kitting out offices, in order to ensure that staff are properly consulted via PCS on office layout, workstations and furnishings before moves are made.

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 23

That this ADC note the increasing use of hot desking and the aim of HMRC to make this a permanent feature of day to day work in the BOF plans

Conference expresses its concerns over hot desking and notes the increasing evidence that hot desking is detrimental to workers health

Conference instructs the GEC to obtain an agreement on hot desking to include

- Full consultation with health and safety reps where hot desking is to be implemented
- Full risk assessments to ensure reasonable adjustments for members with health, disability issues
- Sufficient desks for those needing them at any one time
- Time spent finding a desk and making any necessary adjustments is work time

Conference also instructs the GEC to do a full review of hot-desking, including its effect on health and day to day working such as teamwork.

200078 – R&C North Wales & North West Branch

Motion 24

That this conference recognises the need for greater transgender inclusion in the workplace. Not all people identify strictly as men or women, there are many who identify as neither or both. For people in this situation, being confronted on a daily basis with a choice between male and female toilets is a constant source of anxiety. This can lead to health problems and can make it difficult for people to maintain their working life.

By providing gender-neutral facilities alongside male and female facilities, a third option can be added without taking any existing options away.

It is important to remember that some transgender people do identify as men or women. Many have fought for the right to use the toilets specific to their gender and the addition of gender-neutral facilities should not be used as a vehicle to erode those rights. It is also important to remember that while existing accessible toilets may not specify gender, people who do not identify strictly as a man or a woman do not have a disability.

Conference instructs the GEC to work both the department and branches to ensure that all parties...

- Are aware of the issue, the harm it causes, and the benefits of providing a gender-neutral option.
- Understand the need for clear communication if choosing to roll-out this option to ensure that transgender staff are not prohibited from continuing to use male or female toilets if they prefer to.
- Understand the need for accessible toilets to be reserved for those with actual accessibility difficulties.
- Feed back successes and any further issues encountered so that these can be shared with other branches.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(covers motions 100 – 101)

Motion 25

This conference notes that defibrillators are now being provided in increasing numbers in many different locations. These locations are varied but include schools, sports clubs, public parks and even on public streets in villages, towns and cities across the UK.

The notable exception are our places of work and this is unacceptable.

With the attacks on the NHS and the increased waiting times for paramedics a defibrillator could be the difference between life and death.

Conference instructs the incoming GEC to enter in to meaningful negotiations immediately to secure the provision of a defibrillator in each HMRC office.

200082 – R&C Northern Ireland Revenue Branch

Motion 26

Due to the increasing use of desk sharing this Conference is instructed to negotiate with HMRC for the free provision of antibacterial wipes/ hand sanitisers to be supplied for staff who request them.

Desk sharing has potential hygiene risks, such as spreading germs and bacteria, which may have a detrimental impact on those staff who have auto-immune conditions or are recovering from illness.

Vulnerable staff should not be expected to provide their own antibacterial wipes when they are being forced to share desks and office equipment.

Current Attendance Management Process has also the potential to dissuade staff who are sick from taking days off, and instead, they are likely to attend work when ill. In turn, this increases the potential for germs and bacteria to spread through sharing a desk if not cleaned after each member of staff leaves the work station – mouse, keyboard and phone particularly.

HMRC has a responsibility to look after the health and welfare of staff and free antibacterial wipes/hand sanitisers for those who request them, should be provided as soon as possible.

200082 – R&C Northern Ireland Revenue Branch

Section 5 – ISS

Motion 27

“This conference notes the significant victory achieved in getting cleaners’ hours restored on Merseyside in 2016, and preventing cuts in hours in other areas.

Conference congratulates the members who work for the private cleaning contractor ISS in the 6 Merseyside buildings, the two local PCS branches, local reps and the national Union and its staff for a real team effort.

This huge multinational was persuaded to back down by:

- A successful 2 day strike,
- A campaign of complaints by staff of inadequate cleaning
- A national and local press campaign
- Political campaigning and
- The threat of a 3 day strike

Conference notes that despite the restoration of the lost hours, at the time of drafting this motion all the issues are still unresolved.

These are:

- A permanent agreement on the hours of work

- Back pay for the period of the reduced hours, which PCS argues was an unlawful deduction
- 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;
- Encourage and support branches in recruiting cleaners who work in HMRC offices into PCS;
- Pursue a permanent settlement with the private sector company ISS.”

GEC

(covers motions 102 – 103)

Motion 28

This Conference notes the success of the strike of ISS cleaners within the Liverpool and Bootle to win back the hours stolen from them by their employer in a greed driven plan to avoid an increase in wages following the increase of the minimum wage from £6.70 an hour to £7.20, abusing the system to get around the intent of increase wages for minimum wage staff.

However, many other offices have not been so lucky, with hours for cleaners cut to avoid an increase in pay, with no reinstatement of their lost hours following the Liverpool/ Bootle success. This has resulted in many of our cleaning staff to work beyond their contracted hours in order to attempt to ensure the cleanliness of our offices, with no reward from their employer. This is resulting in more and more cleaners ending up on sick leave or unable to adequately do their job, which has the knock-on effect of impacting the health and safety of members in those offices.

Many of these cleaners are members of PCS and proud of it, despite the refusal by their employer to recognise the union, and they need our support if they are to not only regain their lost hours and pay, but also to prevent ISS from cutting their hours further following future increases in the National Minimum Wage – an increase that they deserve.

This Conference instructs the GEC:

- 1** To plan and support campaign activity to encourage members to back their colleagues who clean the offices they work in and support their claim for their hours to be repatriated to them;
- 2** To discuss with branches with ISS cleaners as members the will of the cleaners to be balloted for industrial action, be it work to rule, strikes, or both; and
- 3** To apply pressure, through direct channels, the media, and via HMRC and Mapeley, on ISS to come to the table and give our colleagues their hours back, and to pledge not to cut them in future in reaction to increases in the minimum wage; and
- 4** To make every attempt to gain recognition by ISS of PCS as the representative union of ISS employees working in HMRC buildings and properties.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Section 6 – ESA

Motion 29

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Jeanette Brooke.

Conference recognises Jeanette’s many years of service to members in the IRSF, PTC and PCS at all levels of our Union and in particular her determination to give a voice to VOA members.”

GEC

Motion 30

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Margaret ‘Mags’ Davies.

Conference recognises Margaret’s many years of service to members in the South Wales Branch and in particular her leadership of the successful campaign to save Merthyr Tydfil Office in 2008 that saw her recognised as Wales TUC rep of the year in 2009. Later closure proposals saw the office finally close but her efforts extended the life of the office for a further 6 years, providing quality jobs in an area of economic need.”

GEC

Motion 31

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Jim McKenna.

Conference recognises Jim’s many years of service on the VOAC, as a Branch Secretary and as a voice for Scottish VOA members prior to his election on to the VOAC and at Conference as a delegate. Jim has been a firm advocate for VOA interests on the only merged HMRC/VOA Branch in the UK, a structure he played a key role in establishing.”

GEC

Motion 32

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Martin Page.

Conference recognises Martin’s role in building a strong and well organised Branch in Leicester that led the way in the Group in the early stages of the check off campaign. He has acted as a mentor and role model for many of the new activists he has identified and developed and has supported many members needing assistance with Personal cases.”

GEC

Motion 33

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Andy Reid.

Conference recognises Andy’s long service to PCS and predecessor unions. He first attended conference back in the 1980s in the IRSF and remained an activist right up to retirement. Andy was a long serving member of the VOAC and the NEC in addition to his role at Branch level.”

GEC

Motion 34

“This ADC agrees to confer a Group Exceptional Service Award on Allan Tait.

Conference recognises the critical role Allan played in fighting the closure of the Wick office from the point he stepped forward, without any formal training, to act as Office Secretary and lead the campaign locally. Allan supported members through several different campaign stages to fight off closure, first winning a two year reprieve in 2011, then a homeworking scheme that allowed Members to continue in work long after HMRC had said they would be gone. Allan continued to fight to get the best deal for members to the last, ensuring that when the final Wick Member ceased HMRC work in December 2016, they did so voluntarily, on their own terms, more than a decade after the closure was first threatened.”

GEC

Section 7 – Building Our Future

Motion 35

That this conference notes that HMRC has continued to implement its plans for Building Our Future, with the first wave of office closures and compulsory redundancies having now been issued. Conference also notes that to date there has yet to be any group-wide campaign launched against Building Our Future, nor have we built towards one. This is in part due to the fact that both members’ and branches’ attitudes towards BoF are at different stages – many feel they will not be affected by the office closure programme or that office closures are so far in the future that they haven’t got to grips with what it means for them. However, this is no excuse for a lack of a group-wide campaign, despite previous conference motions and the fact that members are already losing their jobs.

Already, some branches have run excellent campaigns supporting members and saving jobs and the GEC has helped apply political pressure, however this work needs to be stepped up and emulated in every branch across the UK. However, we cannot leave branches to fight isolated local campaigns to defend offices and let the employer divide and conquer by shutting down offices one by one. For every office that is closed, our overall strength decreases and only makes fighting the next wave of closures harder. We need the group to take a lead on fighting against BoF both politically and industrially, providing the arguments, resources and support to branches to build a campaign and to organise and recruit. Only through a unified and national campaign can we make the argument for keeping tax local and for investment for a fair and well-resourced HMRC.

Group conference instructs the GEC to launch a campaign

following conference with the following demands:

- No to office closures – To maintain local tax presences in our communities
- No compulsory redundancies, transfers or redeployment
- For all exit packages offered to be provided under the original terms & conditions
- For recruitment for additional staff to deliver a well-resourced and fair tax system.

To implement this campaign, conference further instructs the GEC as follows:

- Include a BoF campaign agenda item at each GEC meeting to discuss the wider campaign and what support branches require
- To identify branches or regions where practical support is desired to commence campaigns & distribute campaign packs via the regional hubs as a means of practical assistance
- Monthly updates via circulars to branches
- Produce a publicly available briefing pack setting out the economic arguments against BoF including the impact of on tax collection & customer service
- Use this as a tool to provide a coherent & cohesive educative plan throughout all branches, targeting those branches who believe themselves “least affected” by BoF
- Continue political work with the PCS Parliamentary Group and actively seek to involve branches, reps & members in lobbying political figures
- Tie the campaign for jobs and offices into the regions, including the consultation over Scottish taxation
- Join up with the DWP group and other groups facing office closures to link up campaign’s where possible

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(covers motions 104 – 106)

Motion 36

This Conference acknowledges the litany of issues regarding the “Building our Future” campaign, from alleged cost overruns, the lack of engagement with local councils and MPs in the impacted areas, to the serious issues this will cause our members.

Conference recognises the information provided from the Building our Future survey carried out at the West Midlands Live event by PCS reps, which showed that, of the people currently working outside of Birmingham, more than 77% are not confident about having access to training or new roles within the Regional Centre, that the average increase in commuting time was 52 minutes, and the average annual increase in transport costs was a staggering £2,121. These sorts of figures are entirely unacceptable.

The pleas of those who completed the survey were clear – they wanted local offices, full impact assessments involving staff surveying, their jobs guaranteed, increased access to home working, engagement between the union, members, local councillors and MPs, wanted protection for those who are disabled, have children or have caring responsibilities that might prevent them from moving to a regional centre, and wanted decent, reasonable exit packages for those who cannot or will not move offices.

The respondents also believed that the union needed to push their campaign harder into the limelight, including via the media, for more information to be provided to branch representatives to allow them to keep members aware of all progress on our campaigns and negotiations regarding BoF, and permanent union presence and facilities within any new Regional Centres.

Therefore, this Conference instructs the GEC to:

- 1** Request a postponement of the Building our Future project until such time as all staff are surveyed for a national and regionally-based impact assessment, including true figures on the number of staff who would

refuse to move, whether that be due to disability, lack of transport, costs, caring responsibilities, family, etc;

- 2** Engagement with all councils and MPs where an office closure is planned to take place, and where a regional centre is proposed to be;
- 3** Request a guarantee from the Cabinet Office and Government that staff will be able to attend the office closest to them should BoF continue, including at currently slated transitional and specialist sites, and not be forced to go to just one office;
- 4** Campaign for greater access to tablets, etc, for any staff member that requests them, and to increase the access for staff to home working;
- 5** Increase funds to allow reps to represent and protect our members during 1-2-1 meetings and appeals, especially those with disabilities, caring responsibilities, etc, that would otherwise prevent them from moving offices;
- 6** Engage with the media to increase awareness of the significant negative impacts Building our Future will have on tax collection, members and the public;
- 7** Demand increased subsidies for those with increased travel expenses, even if within reasonable travel, including any tax or National Insurance contributions that might otherwise be paid by recipients due to this benefit;
- 8** If Regional Centres become a certainty, negotiate for PCS branches to have union rooms and facilities within the office to ensure that we are best able to deal with our members confidentially, and to give a place where members can easily approach reps; and
- 9** If Regional Centres become a certainty, for the GEC to strongly negotiate for and demand high-quality, reasonable exit packages for all members of staff that request them, not just those outside reasonable daily travel, or due to a variety of issues are not able to travel to a new office.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 37

That this conference supports the work of Scottish R&C branches over BoF. Conference notes that Dundee Branch has already won a great victory in ensuring that members facing redundancy in Caledonian House now have the option of transferring to Sidlaw House to avoid redundancy. Additionally, conference notes that Scottish branches have done a great deal of work to increase membership levels & the organising capacity of PCS within Scotland, as well as building up strong political links at both Westminster and Holyrood levels and using local authorities to produce detailed reports of the economic impact that closures will have within local communities.

Conference agrees that the hub model and organising strategy agreed by the GEC shortly after GDC 2016 has worked well for Scotland as it has allowed Scottish branches to organise collectively, taking into account the differences in the political situation in Scotland with the rest of the UK, especially in the context of devolution. Thus conference notes changes to the funding arrangements in the Scottish Government budget, whereby devolved tax-raising powers will now have a direct impact on the Scottish budget (including the ability to record a surplus or deficit against the comparative UK budget), which is a marked change from the block grant funding mechanism that has been in operation since the Scottish Parliament was first established.

Conference notes that whilst these tax raising powers have been devolved, this tax will still be collected by HMRC, which makes the Scottish Government a serious stakeholder in the BoF programme. Conference notes that very rough estimates of the Scottish share of the tax gap for the devolved taxes (per government figures) amount to around £700m, which if collected, could mitigate all local authority cuts across Scotland. However, neither government

(Westminster or Holyrood), nor HMRC have investigated the true extent of this figure. Similarly, conference notes a recent NAO report which highlighted HMRC's failure to identify 420,000 potential Scottish taxpayers. Conference agrees that this is error could have had huge implications for the Scottish Rate of Income Tax, given that this failure potentially affected around 13% of the Scottish Income Tax paying population. Conference agrees that with HMRC's BoF programme and digitalisation agenda, these errors are likely to get worse as time goes on.

Consequently, conference condemns the position taken by the Scottish Government's Finance Secretary, Derek Mackay MSP, who in response to questions about the BoF programme stated that he had been "informed that staff moves would not impact on the collection of Scottish income tax," adding that "how HMRC deploys its resources is its own decision." Conference agrees that this position is dangerously negligent and calls on the Scottish Government to take seriously its duty to protect the Scottish economy by properly scrutinising the information being provided to it by HMRC and by doing everything in its power to support PCS' campaign against the damage that the BoF programme will do to the economy.

Conference also recognises the similarities faced by branches and members in Scotland when compared to the rest of the UK – including the negative impact that closures will have on local economies and serious concerns over the impact BoF will have on the diversity profile of HMRC offices – and agrees that a Scottish Campaign can best be supported by PCS in the context of a wider group campaign.

Conference notes that Scottish branches have structured campaigning activities around the following key principles'.

No compulsory redundancies or forced redeployments beyond RDT

Implementation of a tax collection regime which supports both the new devolved tax arrangements as well as HMRC's wider obligations to UK taxpayers

Local & national socioeconomic responsibility

Development of an alternative vision of tax collection by using the skills and experience of tax workers for service design

Conference notes that in relation to the last point, PCS has taken advantage of monies made available through the Scottish Union Modernisation Fund (UMF) to facilitate this work, which has increased PCS' ability to map out our alternative to BoF. UMF has allowed PCS to take direct feedback from members about the specific barriers and constraints they face in doing their jobs (with particular reference to BoF), as well as looking at solutions. In effect, this work allows PCS to put forward an alternative vision, based on the skills and experience of staff who actually understand the work, which lies in stark contrast to HMRC's discredited top-down approach.

Finally, conference notes extant PCS policy to support individual branches in the pursuit of industrial action, where this is possible. As such, conference instructs the GEC to fully support Scottish branches in the advancement of this campaign, as well as supporting any outcomes of UMF-related work where they can support the further development of the campaign against BoF in both Scotland and the wider UK.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(covers motion 107 – 109)

Motion 38

This Conference is disappointed in the lack of a centrally driven coherent and effective strategy since the first announcements were made in November 2015. There are recognised difficulties around the Trade Union Bill and membership density but the reliance on Branches taking action has not delivered sufficient impact.

The lack of an effective overarching strategic plan

including collective action has enabled HMRC to force through their initiatives which will see thousands of our members lose their jobs and many others sacrifice time and money just to keep theirs. It is now imperative that we take stock of the situation and use all available means before it becomes far too late to effect any change.

This Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Meet within 30 days to take a critical look at what has been achieved across the country.
- Compile a robust central strategy by 31st August 2017 which uses every option including Group, Branch, Regional, industrial and legal opportunities.
- Consult with Branches and finalise the updated strategy which should be implemented by 1st October 2017.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 39

This ADC instructs the GEC to formally request confirmation from HMRC of the exact number of staff who have left HMRC under the Building Our Future programme to date to determine the impact of the BOF programme on staff across the board.

Within that overall number of staff losses the GEC should request clear & specific confirmation of the numbers of staff who were outside of RDT to the new Regional Centre location appropriate to them &/or who were unable to travel due to Disability / Mobility issues or Caring Responsibilities.

Additionally HMRC should be required to provide a commitment to provide ongoing confirmation of the numbers of staff being lost due to moves moving forward on a regular basis.

The move to a Regional Centre model as outlined within BOF appeared at the outset to clearly disenfranchise staff with particular concerns such as mobility issues, disability and caring responsibilities yet the Dept claimed it would be doing all it could to support staff and retain staff where possible.

We have seen no exact numbers of staff lost to the Dept as a direct result of BOF and in particular no numbers of staff in the above categories being published. Can these numbers be obtained and published by PCS to bring home to the wider staff and the wider public the impact of BOF on hardworking & experienced staff by an employer that professes to want to be a good modern employer but that puts in place plans that would appear to directly contribute to the loss of jobs for Disabled Staff and Carers.

Obviously we appreciate that some staff in this position have been forced by circumstances to accept "voluntary exits" rather than wait for compulsory redundancy (with the potential loss of thousands of £ in compensation) which may make the figures more tricky to compile but surely the Dept. can confirm the numbers of staff who have left HMRC under each exit package (voluntary exits, voluntary redundancy & compulsory redundancy) as a result of BOF to date and the numbers therein who were registered disabled &/or who had mobility issues or the numbers with caring responsibilities / carers passports etc.

The concern we see is that BOF may lead to staff in these categories effectively being cleansed from the HMRC workforce as it will be disproportionately harder for anyone with caring commitments or disabilities to travel the increased distances to the Regional Centres.

This branch calls on this ADC to instruct the GEC to obtain the numbers and breakdown of staff losses from HMRC as outlined above and to continue all its efforts to challenge and counter the Depts plans.

With particular reference to any members of staff with specific issues and challenges due to disability and caring commitments identified the GEC should obtain legal advice

and prepare cases for Employment Tribunal, legal action & challenge under Constructive Dismissal & Discrimination grounds where appropriate.

200026 – R&C South London

Motion 40

HMRC Group Conference welcomes the Government National Audit Office (NAO) view that HMRC has failed to evaluate the impact of its Building Our Future (BoF) programme on staff, customer service and revenue collection.

In their report, the NAO said:

- The original plan was “unrealistic” and HMRC now estimates it could mean 5,000 of the 38,000 affected staff losing their jobs, a higher proportion than initially suggested. Overall HMRC plans to cut another 8,000 staff by 2020
- Estimates of the total cost of the new estate over 10 years have risen by almost £600 million, an increase of 22%
- The estimate of the cost of redundancies and reimbursing staff for travel to the new offices has risen to a quarter of billion pounds, including estimates for travel costs more than trebling from £17 million to £54 million.
- HMRC “has yet to demonstrate how in practice the regional centres will help its employees provide a better service” and tackle tax evasion and avoidance
- More than one year on from the plans being announced, and with the contract signed for its first regional centre due to open this summer, HMRC “does not yet have an agreed programme business case”

This lamentable HMRC legacy left by Lin Homer the previous Chief Executive is nothing new. She has left a trail of similar disasters in the other government departments she has led and her BoF vandalism needs to be stopped.

Conference therefore instructs the PCS HMRC Group Executive Committee (GEC) to escalate their opposition to BoF by:

- Campaigning for proper parliamentary and public scrutiny of BoF before any further office closures are announced and new Regional Centre contracts are signed
- Using the media to high light the impact BoF is likely to have on revenue collection at a time when public services are crying out for money e.g. the NHS, transport etc
- Identifying the potential impact to businesses post BREXIT by the loss of local offices and staff expertise dealing with business tax and imports & exports
- Highlighting the impact to the local economies in struggling towns by the withdrawal of HMRC
- Highlighting potential recruitment problems to HMRC Regional Centres in cities where HMRC pay structures are unlikely to be attractive to new employees

200114 – R&C Telford

Motion 41

That this ADC notes with anger that despite all evidence to the contrary HMRC press ahead with the BOF programme

Conference believes that BOF will destroy jobs, seriously affect community s and the ability to deliver customer service where needed and render compliance totally ineffective in vat areas of the UK.

It will also have an environmental impact on local communities, transport etc.

Conference notes the sterling work done in branches and the environmental advisory committee to highlight these issue but believes that a national campaign is needed, which combines both a political and industrial response

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to

1 Mount a proper national campaign to highlight the dangers of BOF, including detailed facts on the potential effects on communities, the environment, and areas such as compliance

2 Lead a national industrial response to BOF , including strike action and to coordinate action with workers elsewhere , for example, DWP EHRC

200078 – R&C North Wales & North West Branch

Motion 42

This Group Conference recognises that the initial first phase of Building Our Future is about to happen, with the opening of Croydon Regional Centre.

This Group Conference notes with alarm that when the Croydon Regional Centre opens no AA grade staff will be based there. 4 AA staff based in Southern House, Croydon were offered voluntary redundancy in January 2017 because HMRC determined that there were no AA jobs available for them in the Croydon Regional Centre.

This Group Conference instructs the GEC to press HMRC to ensure that there is a post implementation review of the Croydon Regional Centre. This should be a wide ranging review which includes the impact on staff who transferred into the regional centre as well as testing HMRC’s assumption that it can conduct effective compliance activity regardless of where its offices are based.

200040 – R&C Euston Tower

Motion 43

This Conference notes with dismay and anger the efforts of HMRC Excom to steamroller ahead with their ill-thought plans under the misnomer term “Building our Future” and calls for an immediate halt to this complete waste of time exercise.

Conference is alarmed that the outcome of this jobs cull will be detrimental to the economy and an increase in tax avoidance and tax evasion. At a time of government inflicted austerity and massive cuts to the public sector ethos conference acknowledges that this is an ideological attempt to transfer wealth in society from the poor to the rich.

Conference therefore agrees to intensify our work in parliament and in the media to expose BoF for the sham and fallacy that it is. Conference calls on our PCS parliamentary committee to support local and national campaigns to retain sites by instructing HMRC to carry out local and national impact assessments on the communities affected by this short-sighted strategy.

200027 – R&C Cumbernauld
(covers motion 110)

Motion 44

Business Streams in HMRC continue to offer seemingly unlimited overtime at a time when office around the country are being closed with staff being forced to leave the department or travel unrealistically long distances to get into regional centre. The issue of overtime affects the PT Operations stream the most. This is a business stream within HMRC that knows it has no future in regional centres.

Conference finds it unacceptable that the Union has no form of overtime ban in place.

The incoming GEC is instructed to ballot members across HMRC on the issue of an overtime ban.

Motion 45

This GEC recognises that the initial first phase of Building Our Future is about to happen, with the opening of Croydon Regional Centre.

This Conference instructs the GEC to ensure HMRC provide adequate funding to cover all posts required within that Regional Centre.

200040 – R&C Euston Tower

Section 8 – HR

Motion 46

That this Group Conference is concerned that there appears to be a massive difference between the job that new applicants are applying for, and the job which they are actually getting. Salford Revenue Branch have noticed cases from several business streams where the actual job/terms don't match the information provided in the job advert/offer. For example;

- Jobs in PT Operations advertised as "Customer Service Centre" and "IT" roles and actually turning out to be Contact Centre roles
- Roles in HR being advertised with the promise of being put through a professional qualification as part of the job, are then being given without the professional qualification part ever materialising
- The job adverts and interview process are exaggerating the amount of flexibility HMRC offer for things like child care and studying, and HMRC then seem to refuse to be as flexible when people are in the actual job
- The job adverts and interview process, and even the job acceptance letter, giving standard 9am-5pm working hours, and then HMRC presenting the new starter with a 5 out of 7 (8am-10pm working hours) contract without any consultation with the member

This has led to members resigning from HMRC because they are not getting what they have seemingly been over-promised by HMRC, and has also led to low moral for the people who have decided to stay.

This GDC instructs the GEC to;

- Enter into discussions with HMRC to review the recruitment process to ensure it accurately describes the job which an applicant will actually be doing.
- Discuss with HMRC to ensure that the contract given to a new starter is the same as what is described on the HR acceptance letter
- Look into the possible equality impact of this issue, as the promised (and then lack of) flexibility relating to childcare primarily affects women, predominantly female BAME members, at least from the cases being dealt with in this Branch
- Report back to the membership of progress made on the issue no later 30 September 2017.

200133 – R&C Salford Revenue

Motion 47

That Conference recognises HR15006 'Probation: probationer appeals' incorrectly omits the probationer's right to appeal action taken under the new Attendance Management policy. This has led to probationers, upon

submitting appeals, being declined the right to appeal based on advice from HR to the manager; HR's advice being that the probationer does not have the right to appeal action taken under the Attendance Management policy.

Conference agrees that this contradicts HR27002 'Attendance management: Policy' which clearly states "This policy applies to all jobholders including probationers."* HR seems to be ignoring this clear policy statement, resulting in a detriment to our members undergoing probation.

Conference acknowledges our formal disagreement with management over the new Attendance Management policy but agrees action must be taken to ensure probationers are able to exercise their right of appeal under the new policy, Conference therefore instructs the GEC to request the probationers right to appeal guidance set out under HR15006 is updated immediately to reflect the probationers right to appeal a warning under the Attendance Management policy as set out in HR27002.

Please note grammatical error is accurate quotation from HR guidance

200031 – R&C East Kilbride

Motion 48

That this Group Conference is concerned that since the change in compensation on dismissal tariff guidance in November 2016 that the role of HR directors and advisers has been seen to lead managers and decision makers towards challenging sick members to justifying an award of 100%. This is despite them clearly falling into category 1 of PIN40. An example being awards being reduced if Workplace Wellness are not involved when it is clearly a confidential service between member and that organisation if the member decides to use it. The independence and capability of decision makers are also called in question. If their intended award should be 100% it has to be submitted to HR Directors to authorise with the scope for HR to reduce the Decision Makers award.

This has also led to delays and to members being paid statutory notice at half pay rate rather than full pay by the time the dismissal letter is issued.

This GDC instructs the GEC to:

- 1 Enter in to negotiations with HMRC to change the guidance on compensation on dismissal awards to state that the final decision on the percentage award is made by the decision maker, and
- 2 Only then is it sent to HRD to check procedures have been carried out correctly with a maximum 14 day turnaround to return the case to the decision maker.
- 3 And the GEC to report back to the membership of progress made on the issue no later 30 September 2017.

200133 – R&C Salford Revenue

Motion 49

Conference notes that the role of HR caseworkers within sick absence capability and C&D cases is ill defined and inconsistent.

Furthermore conference notes the complete lack of accountability of the caseworker, and the lack of any audit trail to test any innate prejudices and capability issues of the caseworker.

Conference notes that legally members are entitled to know who managers have spoken to in relation to their case and what the advice was. Yet conference notes that often such advice is not recorded and seldom properly attributed.

Conference instructs the GEC to seek the following:

- Clear terms of reference for the caseworker role in line with established case law
- Members to be advised automatically when their manager seeks advice from Civil Service Case Work.
- Members to be notified of what advice the manager is seeking.
- Members to be notified of the resulting advice and who gave it.
- A clear reporting process where the HR advice can be challenged.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes
(covers motion 111 – 113)

Motion 50

That this Conference recognises the work done through the years in improving Maternity, Paternity and Adoption Rights for parents. However Conference notes its concern that members returning from maternity, paternity or adoption leave, of all grades, are not being given structured retraining and/or offered the opportunity to return to work on a phased basis in order to ease themselves back into work as well as beginning to spend time away from their new child which can prove stressful for many parents.

Conference acknowledges that this has led to numerous cases whereby many new parents, already stressed at having to leave their child after completing the appropriate leave, have ended up going off work sick due to stress through lack of support upon their return to the workplace.

Conference agrees that an opportunity of agreeing a phased return to work or offering a temporary reduction in working hours alongside a structured training plan for new parents prior to returning to work should be introduced to current Departmental policy. Conference recognises that this would benefit both the member by reducing their risk of stress and anxiety at a difficult time, particularly in cases where additional issues such as post natal depression are involved, as well as the business by helping to contribute towards reducing employee sickness rates and therefore reducing resources require in managing sick absence as per the new Department Attendance Management policy.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to enter into negotiations with the employer with a view to securing the introduction of agreed phased and structured return to work procedures as well as appropriate job training plans for all members returning from maternity, paternity and adoption leave, tailored to suit each individuals needs. Conference also instructs the GEC to ensure that any new proposals make clear that any such actions must be agreed by both the manager and jobholder prior to the return to work date. Conference agrees that the GEC shall be required to report back on negotiations no later than the opening of Group Conference 2018.

200031 – R&C East Kilbride
(covers motion 114)

Motion 51

This conference notes the departments increasing collation of personal information by their AMC'S and data from line managers in instances of managing staff attendance. Conference is concerned that the requests are not always related to staff absences but, are requesting from managers, more details that do not relate to their role i.e. Special leave entitlements and disability adjustment leave statistics.

This conference calls for a review of what data is actually required by AMC'S as their requests breach data confidentiality and in the case of disability adjustment leave the Equality Act 2010. Conference request the review asks

- 1 What data do AMC'S need to see?
- 2 What data is confidential to the individual and line manager?
- 3 What data is covered under the Equality Act?
- 4 Whether the data guardian is aware of the situation?
- 5 What safeguards can be put into place?
- 6 What steps should line managers take when AMC'S ask for data that is confidential to the person or covered under E due to their protected characteristics Equality Act 2010?

Conference notes the urgency of this motion and asks that the review is concluded within 3 months of this conference. The review to include clear guidance for line managers as this policy potentially puts them at risk for breaches of confidentiality or worse disclosing data which may breach the law.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 52

This Conference considers that HMRC is seriously failing in its duty of care toward staff with mental health issues. It therefore instructs the GEC to enter into negotiations with the department for the department to have a formal policy for mental health issues that include the following points:

- 1 Staff with mental health issues are not malingers, faking it or simple attention seekers. They have a genuine illness which can be difficult to identify, treat and manage and managers and staff should show greater tolerance and patience toward staff with mental health issues;
- 2 An amended sickness absence policy that reflects the following points:
 - 3 Greater awareness and tolerance for the side effects of psychiatric medication;
 - 4 That it can take significant time to find the right medication and dosage levels for individuals;
 - 5 That psychiatric medication often takes time to become fully effective;
 - 6 That psychiatric medication can lose its effectiveness over time as a result of prolonged use;
 - 7 That the effects of changing medication can be debilitating, as individuals then must deal with withdrawal symptoms whilst also dealing with the initial side effects of their new medication;
 - 8 That one of the major factors in mental health issues is that the same issue, such as depression or PTSD, can and will impact individuals differently, and as such cannot be painted with a broad brush policy and must be dealt with on an individual basis; and
 - 9 That a significant number of mental health issues can result in physical issues such as a depressed immune system which leave people susceptible to illness, fatigue, headaches, etc, and that these physical symptoms and illnesses should be treated as a part of the mental health issue, not as a separate unrelated issue that would attract formal warnings if taken in isolation.
- 10 Managers should be required to seek the advice of HR Support, Occupational Health, the Reasonable Adjustment Support Team, and any other suitable resources, and must be able to demonstrate that every consideration of potential reasonable adjustments and support have been undertaken prior to any formal action being carried out;
- 11 The improvement of the Occupational Health referral system, as the use of scripted questions is counter-productive and doesn't allow for the individual nature of an illness to be discussed and taken into account;
- 12 Learning time and funding provided to allow all managers of staff to attend at least basic levels of training on mental health issues, in order to provide them with the adequate knowledge to deal with these situations; and
- 13 A greater focus on what the member of staff can do

rather than what they can't.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 53

Menopause can affect women of all ages. Menopausal symptoms can have a significant effect on women's lives, and have the potential to affect them at work; symptoms include hot flushes, night sweats, depression, mood swings, weight gain, sleeping problems, fatigue, lack of confidence and self-esteem, and osteoporosis. HMRC's diversity data at 30 September 2016 shows that 56.43% of its staff are female and that 76% HMRC's workforce are between the ages of 35 and 64, suggesting that a large percentage of HMRC staff are experiencing menopause and its symptoms.

Despite this, there is currently little advice for jobholders, their managers, and their supporters on HMRC's intranet. Managers are currently not being provided with any awareness, advice or support at all in their training about menopause and its potential effects on their staff; this can and does lead to bullying, unjust performance markings, and even to unfair dismissal.

We instruct the GEC to immediately draw up a policy on menopause with HMRC which includes:

- 1 a toolkit for all staff which gives informed guidance, awareness, help, and support for jobholders and managers on menopause, its symptoms and its potential effects (a menopause toolkit has already been provided for all staff working in the Home Office)
- 2 a website on its intranet dedicated to providing awareness, information, support, help and guidance for jobholders and managers on menopause

200040 – R&C Euston Tower

Motion 54

Conference notes with concern the figures published by Labour Research relating to problem gambling. They estimate that 600,000 individuals are themselves problem gamblers, and 6 million are either at risk of, or are affected by, problem gambling.

Gambling addiction can be hard to identify in an individual, as unlike drugs or alcohol there is no substance to cause physical side effects. Gamblers can progress their addiction 24/7 in anonymity, especially since the introduction of smart phones and online gambling.

The consequences of problem gambling can be devastating. Personal health can suffer due to irritability, extreme moodiness, problems with personal relationships (including divorce), absenteeism from work, family neglect, and bankruptcy. There can also be adverse health consequences for both the problem gambler and their partner including depression, insomnia, intestinal disorders, migraines, and other stress-related disorders

In 2013 Compulsive and pathological gambling was redefined from a compulsion to a mental health disorder, a move which has huge ramifications for an employer in terms of duty of care and responsibility. Although employers may want to view problem gambling from a purely operational perspective, they must also fulfil their duty of care to their employees.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate a Problem Gambling Policy with HMRC. The policy should:

- Raise awareness of gambling issues at work
- Encourage individuals with gambling problems to seek help
- Support individuals and managers when dealing with problem gambling

200131 – R&C Waterview Park Branch

Motion 55

The Health & Safety Act 1974 states that each employee is "to take reasonable care for the health and safety of himself and of other persons who may be affected by his acts or omissions at work;"

This means that each employee (And this includes management employees) by their actions must ensure that they do not put themselves or others at risk. The employees must also co-operate with the employer by reporting incidents and following instructions in order not to put themselves or others at risk.

But there is also an extra duty placed on managers under section 2 of the act. The Employers duty of care. It quotes "It shall be the duty of every employer to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare at work of all his employees."

This is reinforced by the civil service management code, under the heading of integrity, that civil servants must "comply with the law and uphold the administration of justice"

HMRC's own policies also endorse this (HR61010) and state that "We will ensure that Directors give proper priority to health and safety and that managers identify and control health and safety risks.

However, even with all this in place our members are in a catch 22 situation where they shouldn't be attending work when they are too ill to do so, but are governed by an attendance management process which is set up to penalise members for adhering to the law when either too ill to attend work or having an illness that may spread to others. Thus creating a very real fear of losing their job

So although there is the proper authority to control the risks, too often the employer's need to punish those who were vulnerable or ill takes priority without a thought given to the associated risks. This, more often than not, results in punishment for the member for something that was beyond their control.

HR Policy HR23007 states "17.Serious Misconduct will require formal management action, but is not of itself serious enough to amount to gross misconduct in the case of a first offence; for example

- Breach of the Health and Safety rules and procedures

Note: that manager's failure to identify and control health and safety risks under sections 7 and sections 2 of the health and safety at work act 1974 and policy HR61010 is classed as serious misconduct in all cases.

This Conference instructs the Group Executive Committee to negotiate with HMRC to better protect our members who are being targeted, often for something that is beyond their control.

The strategy should include but not be limited to the following.

- Provide a grievance template for members and reps to use in order for them to quickly serve these documents on management. Especially when there has been a complete disregard to the Health & Safety implications or risks to the member and others.
- The template should include reference to policy 23007 Serious Misconduct Charge, HR61010 regarding named managers failure to assess the risks properly or give proper consideration to medical practitioners recommendations and advice.
- The Template should also state that HMRC should also consider this grievance as an appeal against the formal action, as well as being a complaint.
- Provide a form Subject Access Request (SARS) letter for members and reps to use when obtaining information from HMRC. This would help highlight who has been involved in the decision making process so they cannot be involved in any decision at stage two.

- The GEC should take steps to ensure HMRC refrains from any harassment of members and reinforce the message that attendance management is a supportive process and should be conducted as such.
- The GEC should highlight to HMRC that if they do not properly manage the risks then they could potentially be breaking the law.

200075 – R&C Northumberland & Durham

Motion 56

This Group Delegate Conference recognises the necessity for Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) for members engaged in Criminal Justice activities. Conference notes with concern that the range and standard of PPE provided to our members in HMRC is inferior to that provided to our colleagues across other Law Enforcement agencies and presents a risk of harm for our members.

The GEC is therefore instructed to negotiate a full review of PPE issued to officers engaged in Criminal Justice activities to include but not limited to quality, type and quantity. The aim of that review to bring HMRC into line with other UK Law Enforcement agencies and to ensure full compliance with Health & Safety legislation.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Motion 57

This Group Delegate Conference welcomes the support provided to newly appointed Investigators into FIS by both Practical Training officers (PTO) and Senior Decision Officers (DO) throughout their Training Assessment Period (TAP).

Conference is however appalled at the lack of any process of appeal available to trainees in FIS where the DO decides to cease the TAP period. This is particularly serious for members recruited externally as failure to complete the TAP results in immediate dismissal.

The Group Executive Committee is therefore instructed to negotiate with HMRC a fair, transparent and independent appeals process for members in FIS as a matter of urgency.

Conference further instructs the Group Executive Committee to request data from HMRC on the no's of affected staff and to consult branches immediately to identify members already affected and to provide support to those who wish to seek leave to appeal.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Motion 58

On 6 October 2016 the HMRC intranet announced a change to guidance on Daily Travel Assistance for early moves to Regional Centre locations. This news item stated:

“We’ve listened to what you told us during Building our Future conversations. We’re now offering DTA for all roles advertised in locations where our Regional Centres and Transitional Sites will be based, for colleagues who want to work in a location ahead of their office opening. Support with additional travel costs will be available for successful candidates who qualify for DTA.”

It was later clarified that “all roles advertised” meant both level and promotion.

However in a number of cases some members had successfully applied for promotion at transitional sites before the guidance was changed and because the change was not backdated, did not qualify for DTA.

These members acted to secure their future as early as

possible and assisted HMRC to reduce headcount at sites due for closure. This was at considerable financial cost to themselves and led to reduced terms and conditions which largely offset any financial gain from promotion.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to negotiate with HMRC to resolve this unfair anomaly by allowing the backdating of the guidance on Daily Travel Assistance for early moves to Regional Centre locations announced on 6 October 2016.

200026 – R&C South London

Motion 59

This Conference instructs the GEC to ensure that all HMRC LOBs follow the departmental procedures for recruitment and expressions of interest. Temporary promotions should only last for 6 months unless there is an exceptional business need agreed by SCS. All members of staff should have equal opportunity to apply for posts. (In one area names in the frame for jobs have been communicated to members who wish to apply and they are being told that it is not worth applying as someone is already earmarked!)

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Section 9 – VOA

Motion 60

Given the VOA’s decision to follow its “ blueprint for the future “ which will see the closure of 75% of its offices, which like HMRC will see vast areas of the country without a VOA office, this GDC is concerned that with the expected conversion of a majority of staff to Home workers. That a fully funded back up support network is introduced. For many people the switch to homeworking will be a substantial change to their working life. It will see people move from the office environment into one of isolation. Whilst some will find no problems, there will be people who will be daunted at the change. This could lead to people suffering from a greater level of stress than currently as they will find themselves with no-one to discuss the matter with quickly. VOAC is therefore asked to ensure with CEO that full personal support is available including if possible moving back into an office or other options if the members is unable to adjust to home working.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 61

We are becoming increasingly aware of members of staff with laptops “working from home” after hours on weekdays and on weekends. This has a detrimental effect on Work/ Home Life balance. It also covers up the work pressure managers are being placed under. VOAC are therefore instructed to clarify with CEO whether this is an acceptable practice as senior managers seem to be ignoring this issue.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 62

CI is adding extra work to an already stressed staff. Completing forms every day and constant telephone conferences due to wide geographic area covered by managers is causing even more stress. This extra work is on top of an already exhaustive workload due to staff cuts. We ask that VOAC seek a full independent review of this system and its impact on staff from the VOA.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Section 10 – Rules

Motion 63

This Conference notes that motions for national conference must not exceed 500 words. This is an efficient method of ensuring that good, succinct motions are read, understood and debated at both AGMs, mandating meetings and at conference. It also ensures that there is sufficient time to read, digest and discuss emergency motions. Conference sees no reason why this discipline cannot be extended to group conference. In recent years, motions – especially emergency motions – have often exceeded 1000 words. Whilst this may help the Standing Orders Committee, it does not leave a lot of room for the mover of the motion to explain the thinking behind the motion to conference. Instead, they often end up repeating the text. This is to the detriment of other good motions that may get guillotined due to lack of time. The situation is exacerbated by the shortening of conference days in recent years.

This Group Conference therefore agrees to amend the Group Constitution as follows. Replace current Rule A4 of Appendix A with the following: “A4: All motions shall be in the affirmative and with the exception of motions proposing to amend the Group Constitution shall contain no more than 500 words. Motions exceeding this number of words which do not contain proposed amendments to the Group Constitution will be categorised as X.”

200145 – R&C HQ London

Section 11 – Continued Improvement & Training

Motion 64

This Group Delegate Conference notes that training programs currently in place appear to be not fit for purpose. This Group Delegate Conference is not at all shocked that 55% of respondents to a PCS R&C West Mercia Branch survey on training within ISBC said they do not feel their training programs are long enough. This Group Delegate Conference is concerned that 74% of respondents feel they do not receive sufficient support from the Tax Academy/Regional Learning Leads. This Group Delegate Conference is deeply disheartened that 68% of respondents stated they do not feel that they will have the knowledge/confidence to do their job.

This Group Delegate Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Hold meaningful discussions with HMRC; Particularity around issues identified with the current Tax Academy Routeway and previous Pathfinder training programs.
- Conduct a wider survey of members in HMRC who are

on training programs – and generate meaningful actions with the results.

- Engage in better communication with the Tax Academy; To provide a clear definition of their role and responsibilities.
- Meet with The Tax Academy and review current training programs

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 65

Conference notes that whilst the staff survey potentially provides leverage in negotiations with official side, this is being negated by the disingenuous attempts by senior managers to influence members responses to provide a perverse bragging right to counter their inept attempts at running HMRC.

Conference notes that in some directorates this stretched from bribery to blackmail – as staff were offered inducements in the run up to the survey as management desperately tried to present a hint of compassion in the workplace to instances where members were threatened with negative consequences should the survey produce poor results for them.

Furthermore conference notes with some degree of hilarity the “HMRC Hashtag Proud” posters emails and corporate videos produced in certain directorates.

Conference holds that co-operation with the survey is only conditional – and based on the survey being conducted in an open and honest way.

As such conference instructs the GEC to -

- Advise the department that the above stated instances or similar examples of disingenuous behaviour in the run up to the survey will result in the withdrawal of co-operation with the survey.
- To support branches in local boycotts should they report concerns.
- To demand that the department instruct management to refrain from any attempt to directly influence how people complete the survey in the run up to its launch.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 66

This Conference is alarmed about HMRC’s programme entitled “New Ways of Working”. Given the track record of departmental initiatives it is inconceivable that this will not have a hugely detrimental impact on our members and has massive implications moving forward.

It is therefore imperative that the GEC secures guarantees and an effective agreement which protect our members. The GEC must also fully recognise the wider context and ramifications as we approach the Regional Centre structure.

This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to form a bargaining and negotiating agenda and secure a robust agreement which includes:

- Full consultation, input and written agreement on suggested changes.
- Terms of reference and specified review dates and escalation routes to be part of any agreement.
- Full people and equality impact assessments as well as generic and individual risk assessments will carried out at the relevant HMRC, directorate and office levels.
- Consultation facilities and time will be given to members to discuss changes and obtain feedback before any formal agreement reached. A formal ballot of members will be required before acceptance of any agreement.
- No changes to any terms and conditions of current contracts unless members wish to alter them.

- Unaltered terms and conditions will be fully honoured and not manipulated to fit in with others.
- All work process changes will be agreed and grading, training and all people issues signed off before any implementation.
- All H&S, EA2010 and diversity and equality procedures and policies will be followed.
- Members will be consulted on a satisfactory agreement.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 67

Continuous Improvement has been rolled out across the VOA. The universal opinion is that this is not Continuous Improvement at all just a management tool to make staff do more work. We ask the R&C GEC and VOAC seek assurances that this will not be used to give poor performance reviews to members.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 68

Conference notes that whilst once being the “one way, our way the Pacesetter way”; HMRC has decided the pacesetter brand (was that all it was?) has served its time and quietly set it off to sail aboard a burning long ship towards the Valhalla of bad organisational ideas.

Conference notes that the department has committed to following a continuous improvement philosophy, whilst not yet defining what this means.

Conference recognises the benefits to our members of a genuine continuous improvement philosophy however is concerned that HMRC will simply focus on KPI as a way of driving more out of the staff.

As such conference instructs the GEC to negotiate for the following -

That HMRC genuinely and without contradiction embrace the principles of William Deming the founder of Total Quality Management and Continuous Improvement – specifically that HMRC must

- Drive out fear from the work place, so that everyone may work effectively for the benefit of the taxpayer.
- Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force asking for zero defects and new levels of productivity. Such exhortations only create adversarial relationships, as the bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the power of the work force.
- Eliminate work standards (quotas. Substitute with leadership.
- Eliminate management by objective. Eliminate management by numbers and numerical goals. Instead substitute with leadership.

To this end the GEC are instructed to demand:

- Individual and team KPI's are abolished and that the only relevant target the department should have is at the end of the year how many people and organisations have paid the correct amount of tax, or received the correct amount of tax credit.
- That instead of focusing on reactionary targets like call handling times and post turnaround the department undertakes work to prevent the need for such contact through reacting to Real Time Information.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Section 12 – PMR

Motion 69

“That this conference notes the discredited & discriminatory Performance Management system has once again delivered results in line with the outcomes shown in previous years. Conference agrees that in line with PCS policy the current system must be brought to an end as quickly as possible.

The statement by the HMRC Chief Executive on the 7th December 2016 confirming the intention to introduce changes to the Performance Management System can be welcomed as an indication that the failings of the current performance management system have at last been recognised by the employer. Conference also welcomes the commitment to engage fully with PCS around the development of the new system.

Conference notes though that the pace of change suggested by the employer is not in line with members' expectations. The minimal changes indicated by the employer for 2017/18 do not go far enough, noting that other civil service employers have moved to make deeper & faster changes to their systems.

Conference instructs the GEC to raise the demand with the employer that the current performance management system must be brought to an end with the aim of introducing an agreed new system by April 2018.

Conference agrees that any new system should meet the criteria determined by PCS policy & 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.”

GEC

Motion 70 Composite B

This Conference recognises the recent announcements that there will be changes to the PMR system from April 2017. We give credit to the many members and reps across the country who have fought tirelessly against this detested system since it was introduced.

The GEC must build on HMRC's willingness to address the PMR failings and ensure the following.

- All new initiatives are discussed with PCS.
- There are no discrimination and equality issues within the revised PMR system and a commitment to address these immediately when identified.
- A firm agreement that there will be no connection between PMR and potential loss of jobs or pay.
- Lines of Business will adhere to the HMRC policies without introducing their own variations.
- There will be no mirrored PMR system where guided distribution or any of the other worst aspects of the previous system are simply rebranded.
- No league tables to be used by Lines of Business to try and compete against each other.
- Maximise the use of the simplified PMR for all staff.
- Adequate training and consolidation is a mandatory requirement to enable members to do their job effectively.
- Removal of the “wider contribution” requirement as this is regularly used to negatively impact staff.
- Complete removal of subjective “behaviours” from any future appraisal system

Given that HMRC seem keen to constructively consult with PCS on PMR, this Conference instructs the GEC to meet with HMRC representatives within 2 months of the end of this Conference and publish progress made to members

after this meeting. The GEC shall also carry out a Branch consultation by 31st October 2017 to gather feedback on the impact of the changes and determine what further action may be necessary.

(Mover: R&C Edinburgh)
(Secunder: R&C Bootle)
(covers motions 115 – 116)

Motion 71

This Group acknowledges the in-year changes to the Performance Management Review system, in addition to the removal of guided distribution for the 2017/18 period. Whilst these changes are good, they do not nearly go far enough to combat the variety of issues with this system, as demonstrated by the PCS/Keele University analysis of PMR, which exposed widespread discrimination against those with disabilities, ethnic minorities, part-time workers, those over 56 or under 25 and those with caring responsibilities, none of which appear to have been reduced by the employer's attempts to address unconscious bias. The fact that the system is rotten from the inside out can be easily demonstrated by the fact that 43% of appeals lodged against performance ratings in 2015/16 were upheld, despite the limited grounds colleagues have to appeal their marking.

This Conference instructs the GEC:

- 1 To continue gathering evidence of the failures of the PMR system following the introduction of the announced changes in April 2017;
- 2 To pressure the employer to allow all appeals against PMR markings on the basis of them being applied due to guided distribution, which HMRC have admitted to being a failed system;
- 3 To push for any links between performance, pay awards, prevention of application for promotions and disciplinary action to be severed;
- 4 To continue campaigning for a new, non-discriminatory and flexible performance management system that does not penalise staff, and instead assists them in developing their career and manages workload and stress.

200149 – R&C West Mercia

Motion 72

This Conference notes the changes in flight in the HMRC Performance management system. Unfortunately we note that these changes are in reality, and despite an attempt at spin, not in response to the GEC campaign against it. This campaign was ill conceived, ill-timed and failed to meet the needs of the members.

The GEC is therefore instructed to undertake a thorough review of its approach over PMR and publish to branches a full timeline of its actions with a commentary on its actions/decisions and lessons learnt.

200144 – R&C South East Essex

Section 13 – Redundancies

Motion 73

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been given no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark and are therefore able to offer limited support or guidance to affected staff. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members needs;
- Provide training and support for members and reps and negotiate with HMRC to provide training for managers tasked with carrying out 1-2-1 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Press for Memorandums of Understanding to be agreed at a national level to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(covers motions 117 – 122)

Motion 74

This conference notes that:

The Gov.UK website states 'Your employer might offer you 'suitable alternative employment' within your organisation or an associated company'. Your redundancy could be an unfair dismissal if your employer has suitable alternative employment and they don't offer it to you;

ACAS state in its Redundancy Handling 'Employers should consider whether employees likely to be affected by redundancy can be offered suitable alternative work. Where alternative work is available within the employer's own organisation or with an associated company, the employee should be given sufficient details to enable him or her to decide whether to accept or not. The search for alternative employment should extend, if possible and appropriate, throughout the group of which the company forms a part'.

ACAS state elsewhere that 'Finding suitable alternative work is part of a robust redundancy selection procedure';

Thompsons state 'Employers are required by law to look

for suitable employment for their redundant employees. If they don't, the dismissal is likely to be unfair';

The employer of all civil servants is the Crown and not our department;

Our departmental redundancy arrangements do not have the Crown finding suitable alternative work as part of the selection procedure;

In some staff rundowns, although suitable alternative employment is available, it is not offered.

Given the above, this conference instructs the GEC to:

Ask for legal advice on the duty on the Crown and the department to offer suitable alternative employment;

Using this, to seek to change the departmental redundancy arrangements accordingly;

To keep the national union informed of progress (or lack of it) in getting the redundancy arrangements;

To seek test cases, if necessary, regarding the duty on the Crown to offer suitable employment; these to be referred to the national union for consideration.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 75

This Group Conference notes that when the Croydon Regional Centre opens in July 2017 there will be no AA grade staff based there. 4 AA staff currently working in Southern House, Croydon were offered voluntary redundancy in January 2017. HMRC gave the following reason: "there are no opportunities for AAs in the Regional Centre which opens July 2017"

The number of AAs has rapidly declined over the years, yet HMRC previously gave assurances that there were no plans to phase out the role completely.

This announcement understandably causes concern for AAs as the future of their grade looks uncertain, despite the fact, there is clearly work to be done at this grade. In offices where there is no longer an AA presence, there have been examples of AOs and even Band Os, carrying out tasks that are appropriate to the AA grade which clearly isn't providing value for money for the taxpayer.

There are also examples of AA staff being made redundant on the basis that they have been assessed as being incapable of undertaking AO grade work. Such assessments have been found to be highly dubious. For example some staff have been given no specific reasons why that assessment has been made.

This Group Conference therefore instructs the GEC to:

- 1 Negotiate promotions for all AAs wishing to move to the AO grade
- 2 Explore the possibility of combining the AA & AO grades
- 3 Request that each of the business streams within HMRC provide a forecast of their AA resource requirements in each of the Regional Centres

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch

Motion 76

Conference notes the inconsistency in approach with the departmental '1-2-1' process being followed currently across sites marked for closure as part of the campaign to move to regional sites.

In some locations, local management have shown a willingness to enter into early discussions with jobholders as to how they will personally be affected by the BoF plans and whether or not they are able to move to the new sites. This gives the opportunity for issues to be presented at an earlier point and allows time and sensitivity for meaningful discussions.

It is disenfranchising to those members who cannot enter

into this procedure early, as it has proven beneficial and preferable in the past. Conference notes HMRC's stated commitment to ensuring staff at all grades maintain a proper work/life balance that supports personal wellbeing and family life, and believes leaving these discussions to the last twelve months before a move is in direct contradiction to that.

While it remains PCS policy at National, Group and Branch level to oppose the "Building our Future" office closure programme, we cannot put our heads in the sand. Getting the employer to properly consult with staff beyond the notional "engagement" of the BOF Events – which only management grades are invited to anyway – can only strengthen our campaign by showing the employer that its estimates of numbers who are willing and able to move to a regional centre is far short of accurate.

Conference instructs the GEC to obtain a commitment from HMRC that the 1-2-1 process will begin for all staff within two months of the end of conference, and will continue as an ongoing conversation between each jobholder and their manager.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Section 14 – Benefits & Credits

Motion 77

In light both the ongoing and proposed forthcoming transfer of staff from HMRC to DWP under the Universal Credit thread;

That this conference instructs the GEC to pursue a policy which ensures that no member of HMRC staff shall be forced to move to DWP against their wishes.

Furthermore that those who choose not to transfer are fully supported by the GEC in securing ongoing HMRC work.

200029 – R&C Dundee
(covers motion 123)

Motion 78

This Group Conference is very concerned with the unacceptable way former Ryscar House branch members have been treated by PCS during the transition and transfer from PCS R&C Group to the DWP Group to administer Universal Credits.

This Conference feels they were let down by both the GEC and the NEC. This resulted in a lack of clarity on agreed protected terms and conditions. The NEC delayed the transfer of the members into a DWP branch which left members with no branch representation. North West and Central Lancashire Branch (NW&CL) reps were left to deal with work issues arising in DWP even though they were in an R&C Group.

The lack of understanding by DWP management around the protected terms and conditions led to wrongful curtailments of flexi, annual leave and term time contracts. This led to members suffering worry and stress requiring more representation from NW&CL branch reps. Many members in Ryscar suffered from stress as a result of inadequate support for the work role they were given. This was vastly different to the role they had trained for and been led to expect.

This Conference calls upon the GEC to appoint a named representative from UC Liaison Group to be in regular contact with Branches which have members transferring to

DWP to administer Universal Credits

The UC liaison Group liaison Rep will:-

- Have a monthly meeting or tele-kit with a named person on the BEC within branches transferring members to UC to discuss and give feedback on any issues arising which may affect members.
- Raise any UC related issues or concerns to the UC liaison group on behalf of the branches

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire

Section 15 – Business Stream

Motion 79

Conference is concerned at the drastic changes planned within the Personal Tax directorate, and the potential impact on tax payer records.

Conference is concerned with the chronic short term approach to planning; the bias in planning priorities towards whatever the Public Accounts Committee has complained about last; the lack of attention to work list often denying taxpayer money owed to them, whilst preventing us from acting on information they or their employer have provided.

Furthermore conference is alarmed at the “robotics” project; the impact of Personal tax Accounts on tax payer compliance; and other uses of “technology” to do the job cheaper, but with no evidence that it will be done to existing standards.

To this end the GEC are instructed to campaign to -

- Ensure that PT provide a plan that clearly demonstrates how all work will be undertaken.
- Ensure work lists are given equal priority to calls and post.
- Campaign for taxpayers to be guaranteed repayments of monies owed to them within 1 month of the department becoming aware of the fact.
- Ensure full disclosure of all reports / plans / reviews of projects and pilots related to robotics and bulk clearance of WMI.
- Ensure that the PTA compliments the service we offer the taxpayer, rather than forcing the taxpayer to undertake our work for us.
- Ensure that compliance undertake regular reviews of all employers with regard to the pay-rolling of employment benefits, and of Taxpayers’ PTAs to ensure this is not abused.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 80

This R&C Group Conference notes that HMRC is planning to roll out the Kcom telephony system across the Department, with all staff required to be logged in throughout their working day.

Conference also notes that the MIS Agreement, which provides protections to members doing telephony work in PT Ops, is being eyed up for dismantling by PT Director Mike Baker.

That these two things are in the offing at the same time is no coincidence.

Conference believes that the environment that the Kcom system fosters on telephony enabled sites, particularly through the excessive monitoring the idle codes facilitate, is that of a ‘digital sweatshop’. It is not for nothing that call centres have been compared to the ‘dark satanic mills’ of

the industrial revolution and to the dystopian ‘panopticon’ prison.

Conference resolves that any workplace culture of over-monitoring and treating staff as somewhere between inmates and untrustworthy children must be vigorously resisted. The potential further roll out of Kcom and attack on the MIS Agreement present an opportunity to push back against that.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to push for an updated MIS Agreement across the department which -

- Prevents real time monitoring of staff MIS information
- Removes the over-monitoring of staff by streamlining the available idle codes so that their only purpose is to prevent inbound calls when an advisor is not available and it cannot be used as a way to monitor our members’ every move
- Secures and expands on the existing protections of the MIS Agreement for all PCS members

The push for this agreement needs to be supplemented with communications to members highlighting the adverse effects of over-monitoring and agitating against “contact centre culture”.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 81

This Conference again expresses concern over the ex CCO line of business, now renamed Campaigns and Planning. It is clear that this is being used as a vehicle to industrialise and devalue Compliance work. At a time when PCS needs to capitalise on the true tax gap this line of business has implemented working practices which reduces compliance work to the lowest common denominator as well as worsening the jobs and working conditions of our members.

There is a much wider context to this issue as it is clear that compliance work which was carried out by well trained and experienced staff is now being done by poorly trained staff using basic standard work instructions. HMRC used Lean to decimate the skills of our members in processing work and they’ve now turned their attention to Compliance. C&P are the vanguard for changes, leading on mass produced low value desk based compliance.

In addition to this, there is a constant theme of deliberate ignorance of the Employee Relations Agreement at LTUS, BTUS and Group level which is causing huge issues for members and activists.

This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to:

- Formally request a full review of all working practices within C&P to be carried out by 31st August 2017.
- Formally request that where changes have resulted in an alteration of grading a full JEGS review will be undertaken.
- Formally request that all staff are given comprehensive training as outlined in the National Pacesetter Agreement.
- Formally request that all future new work is discussed at all PCS levels and there will be full adherence to all departmental level agreements.
- Formally request full adherence to the Employee Relations Agreement and escalate all local and collective failures to DTUS level.
- If insufficient progress is reached by 31st August 2017 ballot members on industrial action.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh

Motion 82

Conference is appalled by the departments move to introduce Online Service Helpdesk telephony work as business as usual. Conference recognises the immediate response and challenge raised by the Customer Service AGS and GEC support team.

It is absolutely vital that OSH work remains a specialist work area undertaken by advisors with the appropriate training and expertise as the team are directly responsible for all Government Gateway services.

There is a need to ensure that the work and jobs of members within OSH remain secure to eliminate the potential of OSH work being absorbed to taxes advisors, thus meaning a move of resource and workload for both OSH and taxes advisors.

As the department continues to press ahead with its making tax digital agenda its clear there is a need for specialist resource to be retained outside of business as usual.

In addition, currently telephony advisors working on taxes are expected to undertake call blending work on a number of different areas. Absorbing OSH calls into that work will without doubt cause an unwarranted level of stress for members already expected to stretch themselves beyond what is reasonable.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to:

- Continue to challenge the decision to move OSH work to business as usual and retain OSH resource and work as specialist work.
- Refer the issue to the Parliamentary Accounts Committee for scrutiny due to the impact on customer service.

200059 – R&C Leicester

Motion 83

Conference notes the appalling state of industrial relations in PT – and the clear unwillingness of PT director Mike Baker to engage in meaningful negotiations.

Conference notes the future vision of PT appears to be best viewed through opaque glasses; with little certainty over job design, little clarity over how we will deliver our legal obligations to collect tax and no understanding on the part of directors how the PAYE and SA systems actually work.

Furthermore conference is appalled at the contemptuous manner in which anyone who dares speak out against the official line – that it will be a glorious, inspirational nirvana where staff voluntarily smile, taxpayers are well served, and senior management competent – is viewed.

Conference also notes that to date the GEC have failed to implement proposed changes to the PT BTUS committee constitution as outlined in BB 064-16.

As such conference instructs the GEC to seek a formalised industrial relations structure in PT with regular meetings at every level of management, and that:

- These meeting should be recorded and the minutes circulated to members.
- Should the department choose to block such a move this should be reported to members. In such an event the GEC shall discourage members from participating in other forms of consultation.

The GEC shall immediately implement the proposed changes to the PT BTUS committee constitution.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Motion 84

Conference notes with concern the exercise in Personal Tax aimed at removing reasonable adjustments from members

who are unable to take phone calls due to health reasons.

Conference is deeply concerned at the way this exercise has targeted those with mental health related issues, through a discriminatory “triaging” process.

Furthermore conference is appalled that HMRC has lied to Occupational Health advisers about future roles in the department – denying the opportunity for OH to suggest non telephony reasonable adjustment.

Conference also notes with concern that secret case conferences are taking place between managers, HR and OH.

Conference instructs the GEC to:

- Demand the end to case “triaging” to prevent discrimination.
- Demand a full and accurate description of various AO roles is supplied to OH and is open to scrutiny by PCS and the member prior to any consultation.
- Demand inclusion of the member and/or their representative in any case conference
- Seek assurances that face to face consultation will take place when requested by the member.
- Support a collective employment tribunal – for cases where discrimination, harassment or victimisation occurs.
- Provide advice to members being forced on to phones through this process on asserting their rights under the health and safety at work act not to undertake work that will cause them harm.

Conference also notes that the department do little to address the fundamental health issues that are caused by call handling, with members exposed to abusive callers whilst being expected to take calls on every aspect of tax/ tax credits, all the while being expected to hit idiotic call handling targets.

Conference therefore also instructs the GEC to:

- Demand HMRC take a zero tolerance approach to abusive calls – whereby members can immediately hang up.
- Demand an end to the use of call handling time as a measure of performance.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

Section 16 – Tax Justice

Motion 85

That this conference reaffirms PCS’ opposition to HMRC’s Building our Future (BoF) programme and applauds the work carried out by both branches and the GEC, who have worked tirelessly over the past year to build the campaign against BoF through political campaigning, organising and bargaining.

Political Campaigning:

- Through political lobbying, including the parliamentary report, ‘Building an Uncertain Future’, conference notes that PCS has demanded the BoF plans be stopped so MPs can fully consider them and so the public can be properly consulted. The report included survey responses from staff that showed 73% thought the closures would have a negative impact on HMRC’s ability to collect tax and more than half said they would damage the department’s efforts to clamp down on avoidance and evasion.
- Conference also notes PCS’ input into the damning report published by the National Audit Office (NAO) on 10th January 2017.

Through its report, the NAO stated:

- HMRC’s original plan was “unrealistic” as a higher proportion of staff would face losing their job as HMRC plans to cut 8,000 staff by 2020;
- Estimates the cost of the new estate over 10 years has risen by almost £600 million, an increase of 22%

- The estimated cost of redundancies and reimbursing staff for travel to the new offices has risen to a quarter of a million pounds, including estimates for travel costs more than trebling from £17 million to £54 million
- HMRC “has yet to demonstrate how in practise the regional centres will help its employees provide a better service” and tackle tax evasion and avoidance
- More than one year on from the plans being announced, with the contract signed for its first regional centre due to open this summer, HMRC “does not yet have an agreed programme business case”
- The timetable for closures has been driven by a troubled private finance deal HMRC has with contractor Mapeley, and more than 15 years on from this being signed “significant risks remain” in the handling of the contract
- Conference notes that PCS has provided evidence to the Public Accounts Committee. In its most recent report, PAC chairwoman Meg Hillier criticised HMRC with the following statements:
- “If the public are to have faith in the tax system then it must be seen to have fairness at its heart. It also needs to work properly. In our view, HMRC is failing on both counts.
- “HMRC’s claims about the success of its strategy to deal with the very wealthy just don’t stack up.”
- To re-build trust, HMRC must be far more transparent about its operations and dealings with the super-rich, said the PAC. And it should consider what further powers it needs.

Organising & Campaigning

Conference notes the following points:

- That group-wide organising and campaigning activity is being driven by branches with the support of GEC leads through the Organising & Campaigning (O&C) Hubs.
- That through the O&C Hub model, both branches and the GEC are working together to increase membership density levels and encourage ordinary members to get involved in the campaign
- There have been early successes in the campaign. Notably, Dundee Branch, who have successfully stopped around 130 proposed redundancies in Dundee and managed to secure jobs, within RDT, for all members who wish to stay within HMRC
- Both branches and the GEC have supported members facing redundancy by providing guidance & support

Bargaining:

Conference agrees that a key part of the bargaining agenda since BoF was first announced was that it should be open to full scrutiny from PCS, HMRC staff, parliament and the general public. Thanks to the political and campaigning work done by branches and the GEC, there is now a growing recognition amongst politicians and the public that the BoF programme is seriously flawed, whilst HMRC’s claims that digitalisation will make up for the huge cuts to staff are seen as dangerously naive. Conference agrees with the importance of branches and the GEC keeping up this pressure as public and parliamentary support will continue to be vital to the success of this campaign.

It is vital that the GEC and branches continue to work together to increase membership density, recruit new activists and continue to improve our organisational structures to improve our industrial strength, drawing on the recent successes of the removal of guided distribution in the Performance Management system, the ISS cleaners dispute and bringing Tax Credit work back in house following the disastrous situation created by private sector company, Concentrix.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue to work with branches, to build on the work that has already been done and to campaign for:

- A fully resourced and extensive tax office network which

meets the demands of taxpayers, as well as allowing HMRC to fulfil its obligation to close the tax gap;

- An extensive local compliance network, focusing on the indisputable fact that a withdrawal of compliance offices from huge areas of the UK will significantly increase tax avoidance and evasion in those areas;
- A similarly extensive geographical spread of staff within areas such as Field Force and Needs Enhanced Support;
- Home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case for that to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.
- Home working for all staff for which this would be a reasonable redundancy avoidance measure

The GEC is further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for all members, taking into account their personal circumstances. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC.

200200 – R&C Five Shires
(covers motions 124 – 128)

Motion 86

This conference agrees that whilst it is a priority that BoF is challenged appropriately, as per existing conference policy and that responses to the employers proposals are dealt with through well thought out counter proposals, political campaigning and other strategies; so far the focus has mainly centered around saving the bricks and mortar and as a consequence saving jobs.

Little has been said about the massive potential impact that working in a digital way will have on our members jobs and the services that we provide by empowering our customers to do our work for us.

In a recent People Impact Assessment (PIA) shared with PCS by the department a simple front end process giving customers the opportunity to self-serve via a digital channel and to appeal against their Self-Assessment penalty identifies that the FTE reduction in headcount is 95 staff located in Stockton Flex Site.

The timeline for these job cuts runs from April 2017 until when Stockton is earmarked to close and members given the option to move to a transitional site at Washington or Regional Centre at Newcastle.

Conference agrees that this is just another sinister approach by the bosses to force redundancy situations on our members.

The digital transformation agenda must therefore be robustly challenged by the incoming GEC; every digital project and initiative must be heavily scrutinised so there is no impact on jobs through redundancy as a result of MTD.

Like most public sector IT projects they run over budget, involve private companies that strip out any value for money and are ill thought out. HMRC are no different and the headcount will fall before they realise the error of their ways.

We are unable to argue for the status quo to remain as we all know that what we have in place doesn’t work so we must establish the full impact that MTD and other digital initiatives will have on the ability for HMRC to carry out its core functions as a taxation authority with properly resources staff levels.

The GEC is therefore instructed to:

- Factoring in MTD into the existing tax justice work,
- Including MTD in to current BoF campaigning work,
- Commission Academic research into the full effects of what the MTD program will mean for PCS members and the ability for HMRC to fulfil its role as a taxation authority whilst closing the tax gap.

The GEC is also instructed whilst this work is being carried

out to:

- Heavily scrutinise all digital initiatives by demanding access to the departmental evidence and evaluation of digital projects,
- Scrutinise all EQIA and PIAs using the equality networks,
- Mitigate any redundancy situations as a result of MTD projects,
- Notify and involve branches where future job losses are identified to unite and agitate members, to increase membership density levels with a view to using extant PCS policy for local submissions to the NDC for industrial action.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(covers motions 129 – 132)

Motion 87

“That this Group Conference endorses the work carried out by the GEC so far in relation to the Devolution of Taxes, including:

- Working with PCS Wales and the Welsh Government Group to fight for Devolved Taxes work in the Welsh Revenue Authority to be offered to HMRC staff abandoned by their employer;
- Working with the NEC and PCS Scotland to ensure that a consultation of R&C Group Members in Scotland informed PCS evidence to the Scottish Parliament;
- Regular contact with PCS Northern Ireland Full Time staff regarding developments there as they may lead to movement on Devolved Corporation Tax, and;
- The opening of dialogue with PCS Campaigns regarding work to identify Devolved Tax Gaps in Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland.

Conference believes that this work must be built upon, and therefore instructs the Group Executive Committee to:

- 1 Continue to monitor developments in the Devolution of Taxes across the UK;
- 2 Through Branches, inform and consult with Members as developments occur, feeding in to the work of the wider Union on that basis;
- 3 Support the ongoing development of National PCS policy around Devolution of Taxes as may be required;
- 4 Work with PCS Regional Committees in each devolved area in support of National Tax Justice Campaign objectives, feeding in to any localised Tax Justice work accordingly;
- 5 Continue to support and, at the request of the National Union, participate in robust parliamentary scrutiny of HMRC plans in each Devolved Parliament and appropriate Westminster Committees, and;
- 6 Work with Branches to ensure that PCS is understood by HMRC tax professional staff in those Grades for which we have recognition to advocate for tax justice, oppose forced relocation or compulsory redundancy and give them a channel to feed their experience in at the very heart of our democracy, in Wales, Northern Ireland, Scotland and at the UK level.”

GEC

Motion 88

The Valuation Office Agency is a small government department with a staff of just over 3000. But this Agency raises billions in revenue for the country. Recently it was announced we would need to reduce staff by 1000 by 2020 which will seriously reduce the amount of revenue collected. What we are asking for from conference is that PCS run a campaign to bring this major issue to the national stage. Like the HMRC campaign for Tax Justice. This would include using the PCS Parliament Group.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

Motion 89

This Conference notes that amongst the large number of Offices HMRC intend to close and move into Regional Centres are the following:

- Ipswich – which amongst other work covers Felixstowe port, the busiest container port in the UK;
- Southampton – which amongst other work covers Southampton port, the second busiest container port in the UK;
- Staines – which amongst other work covers Heathrow Airport, the busiest airport in the UK.

The senior leadership of HMRC seem to be labouring under the illusion that all fraud and smuggling can be investigated whilst sitting in an office (if you can find a desk) looking at a computer screen.

The simple truth is that fraudsters and smugglers tell lies. They can make false declarations or none at all.

For example, a smuggler may declare that a 40’ container is loaded with some innocuous product when in fact it is loaded with 10 Million non-duty paid cigarettes worth about £3 Million in duty.

In order to investigate many cases of fraud and catch smugglers we need investigators able to respond quickly to detections made at ports and airports. The current plans for FIS under BoF will make it difficult or impossible to respond in time.

The GEC are instructed to campaign to ensure that FIS maintain a presence near major ports and airports.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch

Motion 90

This GDC is aware that both HMRC and VOA are using companies as partners who do not pay their required level of tax to the Government, including Google and Specsavers. The GEC is therefore charged with ensuring that it is made clear to the respective senior management that no partnership is entered into whilst a company is allowed to avoid its correct level of tax liabilities.

200141 – R&C VOA Central Valuation

“B” MOTIONS 91 – 92 MOTIONS WHICH CONFIRM EXISTING POLICY

Motion 91

This Group Conference recognises that HMRC strategy on pay freezes combined with “wildly optimistic planning assumptions” of the benefits of BOF and digital transformation is beginning to rapidly unravel.

This GC further recognises that HMRC strategy is blinkered and already impacting on recruitment and retention along with an alarming loss of experienced staff which will inevitably affect future tax receipts and the ability of HMRC to generate the finance required for public services.

Conference does not believe that pay rises at the expense of a reduction in staff terms and conditions is a viable solution to enable HMRC to achieve its mission and strategic objectives and calls on the incoming GEC to ensure that any future pay negotiations do not trade future pay increases or pay progression at the expense of staff terms and conditions.

200013 – R&C East Lancashire

Motion 92

Conference notes that the department still has not revealed the location of the majority of buildings for the new regional centres; nor has it provided a clear vision of how its structures will fit into the new departmental structure.

Conference notes that this prevents the rigorous examination required to substantiate the department’s claims over how the new structure will work.

Conference notes that no directorate has provided detailed breakdowns on staffing numbers, or future roles – again preventing proper scrutiny of departmental plans.

Furthermore conference notes with concern that most of those involved in the high level planning of BOF have no background in taxation and as such are collectively not qualified to make strategic decisions on the UK’s tax collection or inspection.

Conference instructs the GEC to demand HMRC provide detailed plans on how the department is envisaged to operate in the future – this shall include breakdowns of staff by line of business and by grade.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes

“E” MARKED MOTIONS 93 – 132 MOTIONS WHICH ARE COVERED IN CATEGORY A

Motion 93

This R&C Group Conference notes that, despite the passage of motion 18 last year, we have still yet to see any group-specific campaigning over pay. Whilst also reaffirming the resolution of motion 20 to avoid any link between pay and any revision of terms & conditions, conference therefore instructs the GEC to carry out the instructions of this motion as a matter of urgency.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes
(covered by and identical to motion 6)

Motion 94

This R&C Group Conference reaffirms its opposition to the Attendance Management policy introduced by HMRC on 26 September.

The policy, which replaces flexible ‘consideration points’ for informal action with rigid ‘trigger points’ for formal action, amounts to enshrining and enabling the most mechanistic misapplication of the previous policy.

This will disproportionately impact upon disabled members, with the disability trigger point a poor substitute for the more reasonable approach of retroactively discounting disability related sickness absence.

It also risks increasing presenteeism, given the explicit disciplinary threat to those who call in sick, and therefore greater harm to the health and wellbeing of members.

Noting that the GEC opposed the new policy and established an Attendance Management Working Group to address it, Conference is disappointed that we have yet to see any result from this. Guidance for members and branches on tackling the policy is still yet to emerge months after the policy was introduced and there has been no campaigning activity to speak of.

Conference therefore instructs the GEC to act with urgency on this issue and launch a high profile campaign around the following concrete demands -

- That the trigger points for formal action are revoked;
- That all disability related sickness absence is discounted from any formal disciplinary process;
- That a policy built around improving health and wellbeing, in ongoing consultation with the union, is established in place of a policy which punishes genuine illness.

The GEC is instructed, as part of this campaign, to ensure that the working group -

- Produces guidance on dealing with and challenging the policy for members, including managers, and for branches in a timely fashion;
- Uses case studies of unjust management action, where members are willing to speak out, as an organising and agitational tool to fight the policy;
- Works with branches and with the NDC to encourage and support local disputes at the earliest possible stage where potential unfair dismissals arise, and to coordinate these across branches where possible;

- Keeps members across the Group regularly updated on the campaign as it develops.

This work should begin within a month of the close of Conference.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes
(covered by and identical to motion 14)

Motion 95

Conference acknowledges that the Attendance Management Process imposed on staff from September 26th 2016 has been far from successful or popular, with either staff or managers. Conference believes the current system is far too rigid because it does not allow managers proper flexibility to manage staff absence sensibly or compassionately. It is management by rote that fails to take proper account of an individual's personal circumstances. The imposition of trigger points is pushing staff and managers into formal attendance management procedures when a more considered approach would be better for both parties.

This ill thought through system leads to anomalies where old absences are included in considerations under the new process, and where formal warnings are issued under the new process relating to absences which were previously not considered to be worthy of formal action. This new system pressurises staff to come into work when they are sick, and takes no account of the cost of presenteeism.

Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate the removal of hard trigger points and work to agree a system that actively promotes wellbeing in the work place rather than the current punitive system of punishing staff for being sick. The GEC should negotiate a system that is fair and reasonable to all staff, regardless of role or grade.

200114 – R&C Telford
(covered by motion 14)

Motion 96

This branch notes the new Attendance Management process imposed by HMRC and the movement toward overly formalising processes therein. Notwithstanding the comments from HMRC that this process is intended to support staff get well and facilitate the return to work there is widespread concern that this new process will actually make matters worse with staff returning to work and being faced with formal meetings and increased concerns and stress levels.

People could be forgiven for feeling that the new process appears to be designed to press management down the formal routes with potentially the ultimate aim of making it easier to dismiss staff due to unsatisfactory attendance or capability.

Given the new process and how it feels to staff facing the new process there appears to be a belief within certain sections of HMRC management that anyone who is ill is either:

- a) a malingerer who needs to be taken to task at a formal meeting to scare them into not being ill in the future; or
- b) someone who is so ill they are a drain on HMRC resources who needs to be pushed out of the door as soon as possible.

The new process does not appear to recognise that with the best will in the world people will get ill at one point or another. The vast majority of staff who are ill are actually ill. The best way to support and encourage someone back into work is to provide them with support and help not through threats and overbearing processes. Some managers appear

to get this and try to operate the process sensibly and reasonably but others do not.

We are particularly concerned on the potential impact on people with specific conditions and disabilities that may lend themselves to increased illness. The protections within the process for such staff seem minor at best with a subjective increase in trigger points seeming to be the main safeguard.

Given the apparent attacks on Disabled staff numbers through the Building Our Future programme to date effectively forcing such staff out of the Dept. as they are unable to travel to the new regional Centres is it likely the new Attendance Management process will lead to the loss of many more such staff.

We call on this ADC to instruct the GEC to formally request confirmation from the Dept. of the numbers of staff having being placed on formal warnings through to dismissals due to ill health under the new attendance management process since its introduction last year and in particular the numbers of staff therein with conditions or illnesses that would qualify for recognition as a "disability".

If staff in such circumstances are identified this ADC instructs the GEC to fully support those staff in taking all necessary steps to challenge this either internally within HMRC through the appeal process, externally through Employment Tribunals or by formal legal action against the Dept.

200026 – R&C South London
(covered by motion 19)

Motion 97

This R&C Group conference recognises that members being of the human race and not robots have from time to time minor ailments colds, coughs and flu. We recognise that we have an ageing workforce and that the state pension starting age is increasing so members have to work longer.

This conference recognises that members have reduced their hours in order to keep working.

This conference believes that the new attendance management policy introduced on 26 Sept 2016 like the PMR policy discriminates against our most vulnerable members. Disabled and part time members are more likely to be taken into a formal meeting and given a formal warning.

This conference recognises that the Sick Absence policy is one that is devolved to HMRC and the Civil Service policy is a template.

This conference instructs the GEC to take the following actions

- 1 GEC to contact Branches to obtain the numbers of cases under the new policy, numbers of disabled and part time members, and the number of non-disabled part time & full time members affected, and the number of warnings issued.
- 2 To negotiate a new policy that highlights it is a manager's decision in formal warnings, it is not mechanistic and there is no such thing as "special measures"
- 3 To have a discounted disability related element that is based on a reasonable adjustment based on the size and resources of HMRC
- 4 To agree a new policy which recognises where members have multiple medical conditions (if covered by the Equality Act 2010) each condition is covered by a separate adjustment.
- 5 That the GEC reports back to Branches within 6 months on the negotiations. If no sufficient progress has been made the GEC is instructed to start a campaign including judicial review under the Equality Act 2010 and to consider industrial action.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(covered by motion 19)

Motion 98

This Group Conference is very concerned with the manner of how the new sickness policy is being administered. There is evidence that some managers in HMRC are not following guidance and are not using their own discretion. Other managers, not the line manager, are actually making decisions following formal meetings deciding if a warning should be imposed. This is leading to a mechanistic approach to issuing warnings following a “trigger point” irrespective of the reasons for an absence. There is further evidence that disabled members may be discriminated against by a lack of additional tolerance.

This Conference calls upon the GEC to acquire quarterly data from the employer showing actions taken under the new sickness policy by Equality Strand and area of HMRC business. The information should show by equality strand how many members of staff have been issued a warning, what level of warning, and how many have been dismissed.

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire
(covered by motion 19)

Motion 99

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
(covered by motion 19)

Motion 100

“This conference notes that PCS is a diverse and varied organisation with members from across the equality spectrum. PCS has a history of fighting for and defending the equality rights of its members.

Currently most of the HMRC estate has only male, female and disabled/accessible toilets meaning that those members who do not identify themselves as a binary gender do not have the ability to use an appropriate toilet. They are either forced to use a male or female toilet, neither of which does the member identify with, or to use a disabled/accessible toilet. Identifying oneself as a non-binary gender is not an impairment and therefore the disabled/accessible toilet is not right either. This leaves some of our members feeling excluded from something that most of us take for granted – using the toilet of our choice.

The provision of gender neutral toilets, in addition to male, female and disabled/accessible toilets would allow members who identify as non-binary to be able to use the toilet of their choosing and to not feel excluded from this simple everyday act.

Therefore, this conference instructs the GEC working with the LGBT committee to enter into negotiations with HMRC to ensure that all future locations of the HMRC estate have male, female, gender neutral and disabled/accessible toilets. The GEC is also instructed to negotiate with HMRC to make gender neutral toilets available at current estate locations as well.”

GEC
(covered by motion 24)

Motion 101

This conference notes that PCS is a diverse and varied organisation with members from across the equality spectrum. PCS has a history of fighting for and defending the equality rights of its members.

Currently most of the HMRC estate has only male, female and disabled/accessible toilets meaning that those members who do not identify themselves as a binary gender do not have the ability to use an appropriate toilet. They are either forced to use a male or female toilet, neither of which does the member identify with, or to use a disabled/accessible toilet. Identifying oneself as a non-binary gender is not an impairment and therefore the disabled/accessible toilet is not appropriate either. This leaves some of our members feeling excluded from something that most of us take for granted – using the toilet of our choice.

The provision of gender neutral toilets, in addition to male, female and disabled/accessible toilets would allow members who identify as non-binary to be able to use the toilet of their choosing and to not feel excluded from this simple everyday act.

Therefore, this conference instructs the GEC working with the LGBT committee to enter into negotiations with HMRC to ensure that all future locations of the HMRC estate have male, female, gender neutral and disabled/accessible toilets. The GEC is also instructed to negotiate with HMRC to make gender neutral toilets available at current estate locations as well.

200033 – R&C East Midlands
(covered by motion 24)

Motion 102

This Conference notes the victory won by members in Liverpool and Bootle who work for the private company ISS

cleaning HMRC offices. The strike action won the restoration of the hours that were cut as a result of the increase in the minimum wage and the halt to such cuts elsewhere in the country. However, this is still only a temporary settlement.

The other demands of the campaign also remain unresolved. Conference agrees that recruitment of ISS staff into PCS across the country is needed if we are to win a real living wage, as set by the Living Wage Foundation, better staffing levels and other terms and conditions similar to those of HMRC staff. Conference urges activists to work to recruit cleaners into PCS.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue to support our members in ISS, and to encourage branches to build membership amongst ISS staff so that the campaign can be continued.

200136 – Branch name: R&C Liverpool Branch
(covered by motion 27)

Motion 103

This Conference notes the victory won by members in Liverpool and Bootle who work for the private sector company ISS cleaning within HMRC offices.

The strike action won the restoration of hours cut as a result of an increase in the minimum wage and a halt to similar cuts elsewhere in the country. However, this is still only a temporary settlement and other demands of the campaign also remain unresolved.

Conference agrees that recruitment of ISS staff into PCS across the country is essential if we are to win a real living wage, as set by the Living Wage Foundation for these staff. Better staffing levels and other terms and conditions similar to those of HMRC staff should be employed.

Conference urges activists to work to recruit cleaners into PCS, instruct the GEC to continue to support our members in ISS and to encourage branches to build membership among those staff so the campaign can be continued.

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire
(covered by motion 27)

Motion 104

That this conference notes that HMRC has continued to implement its plans for Building Our Future, with the first wave of office closures and compulsory redundancies having now been issued. Conference also notes that to date there has yet to be any group-wide campaign launched against Building Our Future, nor have we built towards one. This is in part due to the fact that both members' and branches' attitudes towards BoF are at different stages – many feel they will not be affected by the office closure programme or that office closures are so far in the future that they haven't got to grips with what it means for them. However, this is no excuse for a lack of a group-wide campaign, despite previous conference motions and the fact that members are already losing their jobs.

Already, some branches have run excellent campaigns supporting members and saving jobs and the GEC has helped apply political pressure, however this work needs to be stepped up and emulated in every branch across the UK. However, we cannot leave branches to fight isolated local campaigns to defend offices and let the employer divide and conquer by shutting down offices one by one. For every office that is closed, our overall strength decreases and only makes fighting the next wave of closures harder. We need the group to take a lead on fighting against BoF both politically and industrially, providing the arguments, resources and support to branches to build a campaign and to organise and recruit. Only through a unified and national

campaign can we make the argument for keeping tax local and for investment for a fair and well-resourced HMRC.

Group conference instructs the GEC to launch a campaign following conference with the following demands:

- No to office closures – To maintain local tax presences in our communities
- No compulsory redundancies, transfers or redeployment
- For all exit packages offered to be provided under the original terms & conditions
- For recruitment for additional staff to deliver a well-resourced and fair tax system.

To implement this campaign, conference further instructs the GEC as follows:

- Include a BoF campaign agenda item at each GEC meeting to discuss the wider campaign and what support branches require
- To identify branches or regions where practical support is desired to commence campaigns & distribute campaign packs via the regional hubs as a means of practical assistance
- Monthly updates via circulars to branches
- Produce a publicly available briefing pack setting out the economic arguments against BoF including the impact of on tax collection & customer service
- Use this as a tool to provide a coherent & cohesive educative plan throughout all branches, targeting those branches who believe themselves “least affected” by BoF
- Continue political work with the PCS Parliamentary Group and actively seek to involve branches, reps & members in lobbying political figures
- Tie the campaign for jobs and offices into the regions, including the consultation over Scottish taxation
- Join up with the DWP group and other groups facing office closures to link up campaign's where possible

200029 – R&C Dundee
(covered by and identical to motion 35)

Motion 105

This Conference recognises the fact that the group has won two massive victories of late, in respect of both Concentrix and Caledonian House (Dundee). This Conference applauds the work of the PCS members and activists involved, not just because of the wins themselves, but also because those wins have demonstrated that early on in the BoF campaign, PCS has successfully managed to defeat the department in areas where many members and activists did not think PCS could win.

This Conference recognises that those involved in these victories showed strong leadership and confidence, good strategic planning and took the initiative when opportunities presented themselves.

However, this Conference recognises that we are still faced with major challenges including the following:

- Membership densities;
- Anti union laws including Ballot thresholds
- Lack of organisational experience and confidence throughout large parts of the group;

This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to consider the above points in the development of its organising plans for the coming year and more specifically, instructs the GEC to prepare plans covering the following areas:

- The development of group-wide bargaining aims providing details on what a fully-staffed and resourced department would have to look like in order to answer demand from tax-payers and to reduce the tax gap – this should consider work already done by branches and hubs;
- A BoF campaign agenda item on the GEC each month to discuss the wider campaign and what support branches require;

- Specific organising training for all GEC members, who in turn should deliver the training to branches (particularly to branch organisers and branch organising committees, where they exist)
- The development of a coherent local political strategy, looking at how to use local politicians in the campaign, as well as using Local Authorities and devolved administrations to produce economic-impact assessments where office closures will have a detrimental impact on local economies;
- Join up with the DWP Group and other Group's facing office closures to link up campaign's where possible.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(covered by motion 35)

Motion 106

This Conference recognises the fact that the group has won two massive victories of late, in respect of both Concentrix and Caledonian House (Dundee). This conference applauds the work of the PCS members and activists involved, not just because of the wins themselves, but also because those wins have demonstrated that early on in the BoF campaign, PCS has successfully managed to defeat the department in areas where many members and activists did not think PCS could win.

This conference recognises that those involved in these victories showed strong leadership and confidence, good strategic planning and took the initiative when opportunities presented themselves.

However, this conference recognises that we are still faced with major challenges including the following:

- Membership densities
- Anti-Union laws including ballot thresholds.
- Lack of organisational experience and confidence throughout large parts of the group;

This conference therefore instructs the GEC to consider the above points in the development of its organising plans for the coming year and more specifically, instructs the GEC to prepare plans covering the following areas:

- The development of group-wide bargaining aims providing details on what a fully-staffed and resourced department would have to look like in order to answer demand from taxpayers and to reduce the tax gap – this should consider work already done by branches and hubs;
- A BoF campaign agenda item on the GEC each month to discuss the wider campaign and what support branches require;
- Specific organising training for all GEC members, who in turn should deliver the training to branches (particularly to branch organisers and branch organising committees, where they exist)
- The development of a coherent local political strategy, looking at how to use local politicians in the campaign, as well as using Local Authorities and devolved administrations to produce economic-impact assessments where office closures will have a detrimental impact on local economies;
- Join up with the DWP Group and other Group's facing office closures to link up campaigns where possible.

200059 – R&C Leicester
(covered by motion 35 & identical to motion 105)

Motion 107

That this conference supports the work of Scottish R&C branches over BoF. Conference notes that Dundee Branch has already won a great victory in ensuring that members

facing redundancy in Caledonian House now have the option of transferring to Sidlaw House to avoid redundancy. Additionally, conference notes that Scottish branches have done a great deal of work to increase membership levels & the organising capacity of PCS within Scotland, as well as building up strong political links at both Westminster and Holyrood levels and using local authorities to produce detailed reports of the economic impact that closures will have within local communities.

Conference agrees that the hub model and organising strategy agreed by the GEC shortly after GDC 2016 has worked well for Scotland as it has allowed Scottish branches to organise collectively, taking into account the differences in the political situation in Scotland with the rest of the UK, especially in the context of devolution. Thus conference notes changes to the funding arrangements in the Scottish Government budget, whereby devolved tax-raising powers will now have a direct impact on the Scottish budget (including the ability to record a surplus or deficit against the comparative UK budget), which is a marked change from the block grant funding mechanism that has been in operation since the Scottish Parliament was first established.

Conference notes that whilst these tax raising powers have been devolved, this tax will still be collected by HMRC, which makes the Scottish Government a serious stakeholder in the BoF programme. Conference notes that very rough estimates of the Scottish share of the tax gap for the devolved taxes (per government figures) amount to around £700m, which if collected, could mitigate all local authority cuts across Scotland. However, neither government (Westminster or Holyrood), nor HMRC have investigated the true extent of this figure. Similarly, conference notes a recent NAO report which highlighted HMRC's failure to identify 420,000 potential Scottish taxpayers. Conference agrees that this is error could have had huge implications for the Scottish Rate of Income Tax, given that this failure potentially affected around 13% of the Scottish Income Tax paying population. Conference agrees that with HMRC's BoF programme and digitalisation agenda, these errors are likely to get worse as time goes on.

Consequently, conference condemns the position taken by the Scottish Government's Finance Secretary, Derek Mackay MSP, who in response to questions about the BoF programme stated that he had been "informed that staff moves would not impact on the collection of Scottish income tax," adding that "how HMRC deploys its resources is its own decision." Conference agrees that this position is dangerously negligent and calls on the Scottish Government to take seriously its duty to protect the Scottish economy by properly scrutinising the information being provided to it by HMRC and by doing everything in its power to support PCS' campaign against the damage that the BoF programme will do to the economy.

Conference also recognises the similarities faced by branches and members in Scotland when compared to the rest of the UK – including the negative impact that closures will have on local economies and serious concerns over the impact BoF will have on the diversity profile of HMRC offices – and agrees that a Scottish Campaign can best be supported by PCS in the context of a wider group campaign.

Conference notes that Scottish branches have structured campaigning activities around the following key principles...

- No compulsory redundancies or forced redeployments beyond RDT
- Implementation of a tax collection regime which supports both the new devolved tax arrangements as well as HMRC's wider obligations to UK taxpayers
- Local & national socioeconomic responsibility
- Development of an alternative vision of tax collection by using the skills and experience of tax workers for service design

Conference notes that in relation to the last point, PCS has taken advantage of monies made available through

the Scottish Union Modernisation Fund (UMF) to facilitate this work, which has increased PCS' ability to map out our alternative to BoF. UMF has allowed PCS to take direct feedback from members about the specific barriers and constraints they face in doing their jobs (with particular reference to BoF), as well as looking at solutions. In effect, this work allows PCS to put forward an alternative vision, based on the skills and experience of staff who actually understand the work, which lies in stark contrast to HMRC's discredited top-down approach.

Finally, conference notes extant PCS policy to support individual branches in the pursuit of industrial action, where this is possible. As such, conference instructs the GEC to fully support Scottish branches in the advancement of this campaign, as well as supporting any outcomes of UMF-related work where they can support the further development of the campaign against BoF in both Scotland and the wider UK.

200119 – R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & Valuation
(covered by and identical to motion 37)

Motion 108

That this conference supports the work of Scottish R&C branches over BoF. Conference notes that Dundee Branch has already won a great victory in ensuring that members facing redundancy in Caledonian House now have the option of transferring to Sidlaw House to avoid redundancy. Additionally, conference notes that Scottish branches have done a great deal of work to increase membership levels & the organising capacity of PCS within Scotland, as well as building up strong political links at both Westminster and Holyrood levels and using local authorities to produce detailed reports of the economic impact that closures will have within local communities.

Conference agrees that the hub model and organising strategy agreed by the GEC shortly after GDC 2016 has worked well for Scotland as it has allowed Scottish branches to organise collectively, taking into account the differences in the political situation in Scotland with the rest of the UK, especially in the context of devolution. Thus conference notes changes to the funding arrangements in the Scottish Government budget, whereby devolved tax-raising powers will now have a direct impact on the Scottish budget (including the ability to record a surplus or deficit against the comparative UK budget), which is a marked change from the block grant funding mechanism that has been in operation since the Scottish Parliament was first established.

Conference notes that whilst these tax raising powers have been devolved, this tax will still be collected by HMRC, which makes the Scottish Government a serious stakeholder in the BoF programme. Conference notes that very rough estimates of the Scottish share of the tax gap for the devolved taxes (per government figures) amount to around £700m, which if collected, could mitigate all local authority cuts across Scotland.

However, neither government (Westminster or Holyrood), nor HMRC have investigated the true extent of this figure. Similarly, conference notes a recent NAO report which highlighted HMRC's failure to identify 420,000 potential Scottish taxpayers. Conference agrees that this is error could have had huge implications for the Scottish Rate of Income Tax, given that this failure potentially affected around 13% of the Scottish Income Tax paying population. Conference agrees that with HMRC's BoF programme and digitalisation agenda, these errors are likely to get worse as time goes on.

Consequently, conference condemns the position taken by the Scottish Government's Finance Secretary, Derek Mackay MSP, who in response to questions about the BoF programme stated that he had been "informed that staff moves would not impact on the collection of Scottish

income tax," adding that "how HMRC deploys its resources is its own decision." Conference agrees that this position is dangerously negligent and calls on the Scottish Government to take seriously its duty to protect the Scottish economy by properly scrutinising the information being provided to it by HMRC and by doing everything in its power to support PCS' campaign against the damage that the BoF programme will do to the economy.

Conference also recognises the similarities faced by branches and members in Scotland when compared to the rest of the UK – including the negative impact that closures will have on local economies and serious concerns over the impact BoF will have on the diversity profile of HMRC offices – and agrees that a Scottish Campaign can best be supported by PCS in the context of a wider group campaign.

Conference notes that Scottish branches have structured campaigning activities around the following key principles...

- No compulsory redundancies or forced redeployments beyond RDT
- Implementation of a tax collection regime which supports both the new devolved tax arrangements as well as HMRC's wider obligations to UK taxpayers
- Local & national socioeconomic responsibility
- Development of an alternative vision of tax collection by using the skills and experience of tax workers for service design

Conference notes that in relation to the last point, PCS has taken advantage of monies made available through the Scottish Union Modernisation Fund (UMF) to facilitate this work, which has increased PCS' ability to map out our alternative to BoF. UMF has allowed PCS to take direct feedback from members about the specific barriers and constraints they face in doing their jobs (with particular reference to BoF), as well as looking at solutions. In effect, this work allows PCS to put forward an alternative vision, based on the skills and experience of staff who actually understand the work, which lies in stark contrast to HMRC's discredited top-down approach.

Finally, conference notes extant PCS policy to support individual branches in the pursuit of industrial action, where this is possible. As such, conference instructs the GEC to fully support Scottish branches in the advancement of this campaign, as well as supporting any outcomes of UMF-related work where they can support the further development of the campaign against BoF in both Scotland and the wider UK.

200029 – R&C Dundee
(covered by and identical to motion 37)

Motion 109

That this conference supports the work of Scottish R&C branches over BoF. Conference notes that Dundee Branch has already won a great victory in ensuring that members facing redundancy in Caledonian House now have the option of transferring to Sidlaw House to avoid redundancy. Additionally, conference notes that Scottish branches have done a great deal of work to increase membership levels & the organising capacity of PCS within Scotland, as well as building up strong political links at both Westminster and Holyrood levels and using local authorities to produce detailed reports of the economic impact that closures will have within local communities.

Conference agrees that the hub model and organising strategy agreed by the GEC shortly after GDC 2016 has worked well for Scotland as it has allowed Scottish branches to organise collectively, taking into account the differences in the political situation in Scotland with the rest of the UK, especially in the context of devolution. Thus conference notes changes to the funding arrangements in the Scottish Government budget, whereby devolved tax-raising powers will now have a direct impact on the Scottish budget

(including the ability to record a surplus or deficit against the comparative UK budget), which is a marked change from the block grant funding mechanism that has been in operation since the Scottish Parliament was first established.

Conference notes that whilst these tax raising powers have been devolved, this tax will still be collected by HMRC, which makes the Scottish Government a serious stakeholder in the BoF programme. Conference notes that very rough estimates of the Scottish share of the tax gap for the devolved taxes (per government figures) amount to around £700m, which if collected, could mitigate all local authority cuts across Scotland. However, neither government (Westminster or Holyrood), nor HMRC have investigated the true extent of this figure. Similarly, conference notes a recent NAO report which highlighted HMRC's failure to identify 420,000 potential Scottish taxpayers. Conference agrees that this is error could have had huge implications for the Scottish Rate of Income Tax, given that this failure potentially affected around 13% of the Scottish Income Tax paying population. Conference agrees that with HMRC's BoF programme and digitalisation agenda, these errors are likely to get worse as time goes on.

Consequently, conference condemns the position taken by the Scottish Government's Finance Secretary, Derek Mackay MSP, who in response to questions about the BoF programme stated that he had been "informed that staff moves would not impact on the collection of Scottish income tax," adding that "how HMRC deploys its resources is its own decision." Conference agrees that this position is dangerously negligent and calls on the Scottish Government to take seriously its duty to protect the Scottish economy by properly scrutinising the information being provided to it by HMRC and by doing everything in its power to support PCS' campaign against the damage that the BoF programme will do to the economy.

Conference also recognises the similarities faced by branches and members in Scotland when compared to the rest of the UK – including the negative impact that closures will have on local economies and serious concerns over the impact BoF will have on the diversity profile of HMRC offices – and agrees that a Scottish Campaign can best be supported by PCS in the context of a wider group campaign.

Conference notes that Scottish branches have structured campaigning activities around the following key principles...

- No compulsory redundancies or forced redeployments beyond RDT
- Implementation of a tax collection regime which supports both the new devolved tax arrangements as well as HMRC's wider obligations to UK taxpayers
- Local & national socioeconomic responsibility
- Development of an alternative vision of tax collection by using the skills and experience of tax workers for service design

Conference notes that in relation to the last point, PCS has taken advantage of monies made available through the Scottish Union Modernisation Fund (UMF) to facilitate this work, which has increased PCS' ability to map out our alternative to BoF. UMF has allowed PCS to take direct feedback from members about the specific barriers and constraints they face in doing their jobs (with particular reference to BoF), as well as looking at solutions. In effect, this work allows PCS to put forward an alternative vision, based on the skills and experience of staff who actually understand the work, which lies in stark contrast to HMRC's discredited top-down approach.

Finally, conference notes extant PCS policy to support individual branches in the pursuit of industrial action, where this is possible. As such, conference instructs the GEC to fully support Scottish branches in the advancement of this campaign, as well as supporting any outcomes of UMF-related work where they can support the further development of the campaign against BoF in both Scotland and the wider UK.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh
(covered by and identical to motion 37)

Motion 110

That this Conference notes the proposal from HMRC to carry on with its cuts & closure programme which should properly be named Building an Uncertain Future. The group executive committee is instructed to demand a pause on the employer's plans & a full review into the impact on staff, jobs & local communities, the findings of which should inform negotiations with PCS on the future organisation of HMRC.

200152 – R&C Sussex
(covered by motion 43)

Motion 111

That this Conference recognises that the Reasonable Adjustment Support Team(RAST) have been providing managers with advice regarding reasonable adjustments for staff with protected characteristics for several years. As personal caseworkers, reps often find that the advice given is done so informally ie not in writing, without any record of the details discussed between RAST and the manager. Given the proposed moves to the Regional Centres, ensuring reasonable adjustments are processed correctly and not in a mechanistic fashion will become even more important.

This Conference instructs the GEC to negotiate with RAST management to develop a more transparent process whereby staff and caseworkers can constructively challenge the advice given to managers by RAST and facilitate challenges to management about the information given to AST upon which any advice is then given and/or how the approach has been made to RAST.

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

Motion 112

The RAST (reasonable adjustment support team) have been available to provide HMRC managers with advice regarding reasonable adjustments for persons with protected characteristics for several years. As personal caseworkers, we often find that the advice given is given informally i.e. not in writing, nor with any record of the details of the conversation held between the RAST team and the manager. It is more often than not the manager will act on the advice using their own judgment and often mechanistically. When questioned many of these managers may not have the full and complete picture to the RAST team. The advice received therefore may be flawed and is open to interpretation by managers. Where managers are relying on this resource we need to have a process in place that is more transparent and available in a more robust form similar to the advice given by the OH process. This will allow for coherent challenges to be made.

This conference instructs the incoming GEC to negotiate with the RAST management to develop a transparent process whereby caseworkers/members can constructively challenge the advice given to managers by RAST and facilitate challenges to managers about the information given to RAST upon which the advice is given and/or how the approach has been made to RAST.

200149 – R&C West Mercia
(covered by motion 49)

Motion 113

In recent disciplinary cases the role of Civil Service HR (CSHR) Case Workers appears to have grown in significance. Whilst there needs to be advice given to Decision Makers (DM) the role seems to have become one where in the name of consistency DMs are frequently urged to increase the severity of their finding and penalty issued. There needs to be protection to prevent perverse decisions but it's the DM who are more familiar with the individual, the nuances of the case and therefore should be allowed the option to implement a less severe penalty. This is particularly disturbing in cases of alleged Gross Misconduct where an initial opinion by the DM short of dismissal is then talked up to dismissal on CSHR advice. DMs are frequently our members and need the freedom to be more lenient where they judge it to be the correct outcome.

Conference instructs GEC to negotiate that in cases of alleged Gross Misconduct the Caseworker attends the DM meeting to get a better understanding of the case and the individual they may be depriving of their livelihood.

Further instructs the GEC to ask the OS for figures to show where the DM has altered their initial opinion on the strength of CSHR advice.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(covered by motion 49)

Motion 114

This Conference recognises and appreciates the employer's support for those on

Maternity leave. Whilst the employer is very supportive when the employee is off on Maternity leave, this support seems to abruptly end as soon as the employee returns to work.

Good maternity conditions mean that new mothers can take time off without financial worry and can concentrate on being a mum rather than worrying about how the bills will be paid.

They mean that women can recover fully after the birth. The health and wellbeing of new mothers and babies is one of the most fundamental arguments for good maternity conditions.

Returning to work after 9 months, is a distressing time for anyone but for new mums returning to work after such a long absence this can be a very stressful and anxious time. Not only are new mums expected to return to work on their full contracted hours but usually are expected to be up to speed with all the changes that have happened in the previous months within just a few days. Often returning to work under a new manager / Team etc, all whilst coping with the disruption a new baby brings to the household.

This added pressure can often lead to depression and stress, causing the new mum to then be further absent from work.

Conference believes that HMRC should offer phased return to work for all those returning from Maternity leave. This would help relieve the pressure for new mums returning to work and may even encourage mums to return earlier if phased return to work hours were offered.

The benefits for the employer if they offer good maternity leave provisions will mean that women will be more positive and more committed to returning to work. This will have a positive impact on productivity, improved morale, lower stress and sickness levels.

This Conference therefore instructs the GEC to request a change in the Guidance surrounding Maternity leave to offer phased return to work hours for those returning from Maternity leave.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(covered by motion 50)

Motion 115

This Conference recognises the recent announcements that there will be changes to the PMR system from April 2017. We give credit to the many members and reps across the country who have fought tirelessly against this detested system since it was introduced.

The GEC must build on HMRC's willingness to address the PMR failings and ensure the following.

- All new initiatives are discussed with PCS.
- There are no discrimination and equality issues within the revised PMR system and a commitment to address these immediately when identified.
- A firm agreement that there will be no connection between PMR and potential loss of jobs or pay.
- Lines of Business will adhere to the HMRC policies without introducing their own variations.
- There will be no mirrored PMR system where guided distribution or any of the other worst aspects of the previous system are simply rebranded.
- No league tables to be used by Lines of Business to try and compete against each other.
- Maximise the use of the simplified PMR for all staff.
- Adequate training and consolidation is a mandatory requirement to enable members to do their job effectively.
- Removal of the "wider contribution" requirement as this is regularly used to negatively impact staff.

Given that HMRC seem keen to constructively consult with PCS on PMR, this Conference instructs the GEC to meet with HMRC representatives within 2 months of the end of this Conference and publish progress made to members after this meeting. The GEC shall also carry out a Branch consultation by 31st October 2017 to gather feedback on the impact of the changes and determine what further action may be necessary.

200037 – R&C Edinburgh
(covered by motion 70)

Motion 116

This Conference notes the ongoing reviews and pilots taking place across the Civil Service in relation to appraisal systems. This Conference instructs the GEC to use these reviews to argue for:

- Complete removal of subjective "behaviours" from any future appraisal system
- A break in the link between performance and pay.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes
(covered by motion 70)

Motion 117

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been giving no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark with little support or guidance whilst members are not provided any assistance. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular

- communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 121 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Ensure Memorandum's of Understanding are agreed at a national level with all civil servants Department's to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate for flexible working options for members including home and long distance working.
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- PCS to work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200029 – R&C Dundee
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 118

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been given no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark and are therefore able to offer limited support or guidance to affected staff. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local member's needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 1-2-1 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Press for Memorandums of Understanding to be agreed at a national level to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200144 – R&C South East Essex
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 119

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been given no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark and are therefore able to offer limited support or guidance to affected staff. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 1-2-1 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Press for Memorandums of Understanding to be agreed at a national level to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 120

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been given no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark and are therefore able to offer limited support or guidance to affected staff. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 1-2-1 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Press for Memorandums of Understanding to be agreed at a national level to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;

- Continue to advocate flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 121

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been giving no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their own guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management are often left in the dark with little support or guidance whilst members are not provided any assistance. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 121 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Ensure Memorandum's of Understanding are agreed at a national level with all civil servants Department's to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate for flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s
- PCS to work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200033 – R&C East Midlands
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 122

This Conference notes that members affected by Building Our Future have often been given no support or options by the employer. Senior management often ignore their guidance and Cabinet Office Protocols. Local management

are often left in the dark and are therefore able to offer limited support or guidance to affected staff. It is our responsibility as trade union reps to not only ensure that the employer follows its own advice but that members get the best deal and get the full support they require through what can often be a difficult and extremely stressful process.

The GEC are therefore instructed to:

- Establish protocols for any workplace at risk of closure;
- Allocate a GEC member with overall responsibility for each office closing to ensure there are regular communication to members and joined up negotiations;
- Produce 1-2-1 Guidance templates to be provided to all branches and encourage them to personalise to suit local members' needs;
- Provide training and support for members, reps and managers tasked with carrying out 1-2-1 and redeployment processes;
- Continue to fight for TU representation in 1-2-1s;
- Press for Memorandums of Understanding to be agreed at a national level to facilitate redeployment to other Departments;
- Continue to advocate flexible working options for members including home and long distance working;
- Argue for flexibility and additional Wellbeing support for members going through 1-2-1s;
- Work with the employer to provide a range of employability courses and training packages for members at sites of risk of closure;
- Ensure a GEC member makes contact with the local council(s) affected by the office closure to inform them of what is being planned by HMRC and provide a route for further discussions between the council and PCS at a local and/or Group level.

It must be noted that the above is not an alternative to building a genuine mass campaign against office closures and the principal of BoF but are measures needed now to support members. Only through campaigning at a local, regional and national level using political and industrial pressure can we achieve the best results for our members.

200149 – R&C West Mercia
(covered by and identical to motion 73)

Motion 123

Conference notes the impending moves of B&C staff to the DWP.

Conference notes that many members do not wish to make this transfer.

As such conference instructs the GEC to seek transfers to other PT directorates for any member identified as wishing to remain in HMRC.

200006 – R&C Bootle Taxes
(covered by motion 77)

Motion 124

That this conference reaffirms PCS' opposition to HMRC's Building our Future (BoF) programme and applauds the work carried out by both branches and the GEC, who have worked tirelessly over the past year to build the campaign against BoF through organising, bargaining and political campaigning.

Political Campaigning:

- Through political lobbying, including the parliamentary report, 'Building an Uncertain Future', conference notes that PCS has demanded the BoF plans be stopped so MPs can fully consider them and so the public can be properly consulted. The report included survey responses from

staff that showed 73% thought the closures would have a negative impact on HMRC's ability to collect tax and more than half said they would damage the department's efforts to clamp down on avoidance and evasion.

- Conference also notes PCS' input into the damning report published by the National Audit Office (NAO) on 10th January 2017.

Through its report, the NAO stated:

- HMRC's original plan was "unrealistic" as a higher proportion of staff would face losing their job as HMRC plans to cut 8,000 staff by 2020;
- Estimates the cost of the new estate over 10 years has risen by almost £600 million, an increase of 22%
- The estimated cost of redundancies and reimbursing staff for travel to the new offices has risen to a quarter of a million pounds, including estimates for travel costs more than trebling from £17 million to £54 million
- HMRC "has yet to demonstrate how in practise the regional centres will help its employees provide a better service" and tackle tax evasion and avoidance
- More than one year on from the plans being announced, with the contract signed for its first regional centre due to open this summer, HMRC "does not yet have an agreed programme business case"
- The timetable for closures has been driven by a troubled private finance deal HMRC has with contractor Mapeley, and more than 15 years on from this being signed "significant risks remain" in the handling of the contract

Conference notes that PCS has provided evidence to the Public Accounts Committee. In its most recent report, PAC chairwoman Meg Hillier criticised HMRC with the following statements:

- "If the public are to have faith in the tax system then it must be seen to have fairness at its heart. It also needs to work properly. In our view, HMRC is failing on both counts.
- "HMRC's claims about the success of its strategy to deal with the very wealthy just don't stack up."
- To re-build trust, HMRC must be far more transparent about its operations and dealings with the super-rich, said the PAC. And it should consider what further powers it needs.

Organising & Campaigning

Conference notes the following points:

- That group-wide organising and campaigning activity is being driven by branches with the support of GEC leads through the Organising & Campaigning (O&C) Hubs.
- That through the O&C Hub model, both branches and the GEC are working together to increase membership density levels and encourage ordinary members to get involved in the campaign
- There have been early successes in the campaign. Notably, Dundee Branch, who have successfully stopped around 130 proposed redundancies in Dundee and managed to secure jobs, within RDT, for all members who wish to stay within HMRC
- Both branches and the GEC have supported members facing redundancy by providing guidance & support

Bargaining

Conference agrees that a key part of the bargaining agenda since BoF was first announced was that it should be open to full scrutiny from PCS, HMRC staff, parliament and the general public. Thanks to the political and campaigning work done by branches and the GEC, there is now a growing recognition amongst politicians and the public that the BoF programme is seriously flawed, whilst HMRC's claims that digitalisation will make up for the huge cuts to

staff are seen as dangerously naive. Conference agrees with the importance of branches and the GEC keeping up this pressure as public and parliamentary support will continue to be vital to the success of this campaign.

It is vital that the GEC and branches continue to work together to increase membership density, recruit new activists and continue to improve our organisational structures to improve our industrial strength, drawing on the recent successes of the removal of guided distribution in the Performance Management system, the ISS cleaners dispute and bringing Tax Credit work back in house following the disastrous situation created by private sector company, Concentrix.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue to work with branches, to build on the work that has already been done and to campaign for:

- A fully resourced and extensive tax office network which meets the demands of taxpayers, as well as allowing HMRC to fulfil its obligation to close the tax gap;
- An extensive local compliance network, focusing on the indisputable fact that a withdrawal of compliance offices from huge areas of the UK will significantly increase tax avoidance and evasion in those areas;
- A similarly extensive geographical spread of staff within areas such as Field Force and Needs Enhanced Support;
- Home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case for that to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.
- Home working for all staff for which this would be a reasonable redundancy avoidance measure

The GEC is further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for all members, taking into account their personal circumstances. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC.

200108 – R&C Stockton and North Yorkshire
(covered by and identical to 85)

Motion 125

That this conference reaffirms PCS' opposition to HMRC's Building our Future (BoF) programme and applauds the work carried out by both branches and the GEC, who have worked tirelessly over the past year to build the campaign against BoF through organising, bargaining and political campaigning.

Political Campaigning:

- Through political lobbying, including the parliamentary report, 'Building an Uncertain Future', conference notes that PCS has demanded the BoF plans be stopped so MPs can fully consider them and so the public can be properly consulted. The report included survey responses from staff that showed 73% thought the closures would have a negative impact on HMRC's ability to collect tax and more than half said they would damage the department's efforts to clamp down on avoidance and evasion.

Conference also notes PCS' input into the damning report published by the National Audit Office (NAO) on 10th January 2017.

Through its report, the NAO stated:

- HMRC's original plan was "unrealistic" as a higher proportion of staff would face losing their job as HMRC plans to cut 8,000 staff by 2020;
- Estimates the cost of the new estate over 10 years has risen by almost £600 million, an increase of 22%
- The estimated cost of redundancies and reimbursing staff for travel to the new offices has risen to a quarter of a

million pounds, including estimates for travel costs more than trebling from £17 million to £54 million

- HMRC “has yet to demonstrate how in practise the regional centres will help its employees provide a better service” and tackle tax evasion and avoidance
- More than one year on from the plans being announced, with the contract signed for its first regional centre due to open this summer, HMRC “does not yet have an agreed programme business case”
- The timetable for closures has been driven by a troubled private finance deal HMRC has with contractor Mapeley, and more than 15 years on from this being signed “significant risks remain” in the handling of the contract

Conference notes that PCS has provided evidence to the Public Accounts Committee. In its most recent report, PAC chairwoman Meg Hillier criticised HMRC with the following statements:

- “If the public are to have faith in the tax system then it must be seen to have fairness at its heart. It also needs to work properly. In our view, HMRC is failing on both counts.
- “HMRC’s claims about the success of its strategy to deal with the very wealthy just don’t stack up.”
- To re-build trust, HMRC must be far more transparent about its operations and dealings with the super-rich, said the PAC. And it should consider what further powers it needs.

Organising & Campaigning

Conference notes the following points:

- That group-wide organising and campaigning activity is being driven by branches with the support of GEC leads through the Organising & Campaigning (O&C) Hubs.
- That through the O&C Hub model, both branches and the GEC are working together to increase membership density levels and encourage ordinary members to get involved in the campaign
- There have been early successes in the campaign. Notably, Dundee Branch, who have successfully stopped around 130 proposed redundancies in Dundee and managed to secure jobs, within RDT, for all members who wish to stay within HMRC
- Both branches and the GEC have supported members facing redundancy by providing guidance & support

Bargaining

Conference agrees that a key part of the bargaining agenda since BoF was first announced was that it should be open to full scrutiny from PCS, HMRC staff, parliament and the general public. Thanks to the political and campaigning work done by branches and the GEC, there is now a growing recognition amongst politicians and the public that the BoF programme is seriously flawed, whilst HMRC’s claims that digitalisation will make up for the huge cuts to staff are seen as dangerously naive. Conference agrees with the importance of branches and the GEC keeping up this pressure as public and parliamentary support will continue to be vital to the success of this campaign.

It is vital that the GEC and branches continue to work together to increase membership density, recruit new activists and continue to improve our organisational structures to improve our industrial strength, drawing on the recent successes of the removal of guided distribution in the Performance Management system, the ISS cleaners dispute and bringing Tax Credit work back in house following the disastrous situation created by private sector company, Concentrix.

Conference instructs the GEC to continue to work with branches, to build on the work that has already been done and to campaign for:

A fully resourced and extensive tax office network which meets the demands of taxpayers, as well as allowing HMRC

to fulfil its obligation to close the tax gap;

- An extensive local compliance network, focusing on the indisputable fact that a withdrawal of compliance offices from huge areas of the UK will significantly increase tax avoidance and evasion in those areas;
- A similarly extensive geographical spread of staff within areas such as Field Force and Needs Enhanced Support;
- Home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case for that to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.
- Home working for all staff for which this would be a reasonable redundancy avoidance measure

The GEC is further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for all members, taking into account their personal circumstances. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(covered by and identical to motion 85)

Motion 126

This Conference continues to oppose the HMRC Building our Future programme.

Conference welcomes the work of the GEC in the past year:

- Providing guidance and support for individual members and branches facing redundancies;
- Creating the PCS regional centre hubs to link together branches and engage with HMRC management about each regional centre;
- Lobbying politically, with the Parliamentary report, ‘Building an Uncertain Future’, input to the National Audit Office report which raised doubts about the viability of the BoF project, input to the Public Accounts Committee and contact with individual MPs and members of devolved administrations.

Conference instructs the GEC to campaign for:

- An increased number of regional centres and Specialist Sites that remain open permanently, with emphasis on the huge areas where HMRC plans to have no presence;
- A network of compliance offices where there are big distances between regional centres, so that national compliance coverage can be maintained;
- Using those locations to maintain contact with Field Force and Needs Enhanced support staff;
- Home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case for that to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.

The GEC are further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for members who want to remain in HMRC and members who want to leave. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC that will enable them to do so.

200033 – R&C East Midlands
(covered by motion 85)

Motion 127

This Conference continues to oppose the HMRC Building our Future programme. Conference welcomes the work of the GEC in the past year:

- Providing guidance and support for individual members and branches facing redundancies;
- Creating the PCS regional centre hubs to link together

branches and engage with

HMRC management about each regional centre;

- Lobbying politically, with the Parliamentary report, 'Building an Uncertain Future', input to the National Audit Office report which raised doubts about the viability of the BoF project, input to the Public Accounts Committee and contact with individual MPs and members of devolved administrations.

Conference instructs the GEC to campaign for:

- An increased number of regional centres and Specialist Sites that remain open permanently, with emphasis on the huge areas where HMRC plans to have no presence;
- A network of compliance offices where there are big distances between regional centres, so that national compliance coverage can be maintained;
- Using those locations to maintain contact with Field Force and Needs Enhanced support staff;
- Home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case for that to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.

The GEC are further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for members who want to remain in HMRC and members who want to leave. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC that will enable them to do so.

200136 – R&C Liverpool Branch
(covered by motion 85)

Motion 128

This Conference continues to oppose the HMRC Building our Future Programme.

Conference welcomes the work of the GEC in the past year:

- Providing guidance and support for individual members and branches facing redundancies;
- Creating the PCS regional centre hubs to link together branches and engage with HMRC management about each regional centre;
- Lobbying politically, with the Parliamentary report, 'Building an Uncertain Future', input to the National Audit Office report which raised doubts about the viability of the BoF project, input to the Public Accounts Committee and contact with individual MPs and members of devolved administrations.

Conference instructs the GEC to campaign for:

- An increased number of regional centres and Specialist Sites that remain open permanently, with emphasis on the huge areas where HMRC plans to have no presence
- A network of compliance offices where there are large distances between regional centres to maintain national compliance coverage
- Using these locations to maintain contact with Field Force and Needs Enhanced support staff
- Maintain home based mobile working for compliance staff, alongside Field Force and NES staff, where there is a case to retain skilled staff and provide national coverage.

The GEC are further instructed to continue to campaign for the best deal possible for members who wish to remain in HMRC and of those who wish to leave. This will include a no compulsory redundancy agreement and for a wider range of support measures for staff who wish to remain in HMRC that will enable them to do so.

200146 – R&C North West & Central Lancashire

(covered by motion 85)

Motion 129

This Conference understands that many of the future job cuts in HMRC are predicted on assumptions regarding the extent to which 'Making Tax Digital' (MTD) will deliver.

HMRC believes that they can in effect largely withdraw from a lot of their face to face location specific compliance work and do it all remotely.

The GEC are instructed to emphasise in our political campaign work that:

- MTD will not deliver to the extent that HMRC is assuming
- The cash economy is not going to cease to exist in the next three years
- That continued office closures and a retreat from face to face compliance work will completely undermine future tax compliance in the UK.

The GEC is further instructed to conduct research (either internal or external) and publish a report documenting evidence to back up the above political points.

200091 – R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis
(covered by motion 86)

Motion 130

This Conference understands that many of the future job cuts in HMRC are predicted on assumptions regarding the extent to which 'Making Tax Digital' (MTD) will deliver.

HMRC believes that they can in effect largely withdraw from a lot of their face to face location specific compliance work and do it all remotely.

The GEC are instructed to emphasise in our political campaigning work that:

- MTD will not deliver to the extent that HMRC is assuming
- The cash economy is not going to cease to exist in the next three years, with or without MTD
- That continued office closures and a retreat from face to face compliance work will completely undermine future tax compliance in the UK

200029 – R&C Dundee
(covered by motion 86)

Motion 131

This Conference understands that many of the future job cuts in HMRC are predicted on assumptions regarding the extent to which 'Making Tax Digital' (MTD) will deliver.

HMRC believes that they can in effect largely withdraw from a lot of their face to face location specific compliance work and do it all remotely.

The GEC are instructed to emphasise in our political campaign work that:

- MTD will not deliver to the extent that HMRC is assuming
- The cash economy is not going to cease to exist in the next three years
- That continued office closures and a retreat from face to face compliance work will completely undermine future tax compliance in the UK.

The GEC is further instructed to conduct research (either internal or external) and publish a report documenting evidence to back up the above political points.

200200 – R&C Five Shires
(covered by motion 86)

Motion 132

This Conference understands that many of the future job cuts in HMRC are predicted on assumptions regarding the extent to which 'Making Tax Digital' (MTD) will deliver.

HMRC believes that they can in effect largely withdraw from a lot of their face to face location specific compliance work and do it all remotely.

The GEC are instructed to emphasise in our political campaign work that:

- MTD will not deliver to the extent that HMRC is assuming
- The cash economy is not going to cease to exist in the next three years
- That continued office closures and a retreat from face to face compliance work will completely undermine future tax compliance in the UK.

The GEC is further instructed to conduct research (either internal or external) and publish a report documenting evidence to back up the above political points.

200039 – R&C Criminal Justice Branch
(covered by motion 86)

“X” MOTIONS – MOTIONS WHICH ARE OUT OF ORDER

Motion 133

This conference understands that many of the future job cuts in HMRC are predicted on assumptions regarding the extent to which 'Making Tax Digital' (MTD) will deliver. HMRC believes that they can in effect largely withdraw from a lot of their face to face location specific compliance work and do it all remotely.

The GEC are instructed to emphasise in our political campaign work that:

- MTD will not deliver to the extent that HMRC is assuming
- The cash economy is not going to cease to exist in the next three years
- That continued office closures and a retreat from face to face compliance work will completely undermine future tax compliance in the UK.

The GEC is further instructed to conduct research (either internal or external) and publish a report documenting evidence to back up the above political points.

E) Overtime in HMRC

Business Streams in HMRC continue to offer seemingly unlimited overtime at a time when office around the country are being closed with staff being forced to leave the department or travel unrealistically long distances to get into regional centre. The issue of overtime affects the PT Operations stream the most. This is a business stream within HMRC that knows it has no future in regional centres.

This Branch of PCS finds it unacceptable that the Union has no form of overtime ban in place.

The incoming GEC is instructed to ballot members across HMRC on the issue of an overtime ban.

200059 – R&C Leicester

(Not clear of intent as appears to be 2 motions in 1 statement & covered by 86)

Appendix Branches Guide to Motions submitted

Branch	Name	Motion Number
~~	SOC	19,70
~~	GEC	2,7,27,29,30,31,32,33,34,69,87,100
200006	R&C Bootle Taxes	5,17,49,65,68,70,74,79,80,83,84,92,93,94,116,123
200008	R&C Bradford & District	6,14
200013	R&C East Lancashire	91
200026	R&C South London	19,39,58,96
200027	R&C Cumbernauld	4,19,43,99
200029	R&C Dundee	77,104,108,117,130
200031	R&C East Kilbride	37,47,50,111
200033	R&C East Midlands	101,121,126
200037	R&C Edinburgh	1,16,38,66,70,71,76,109,115
200039	R&C Criminal Justice Branch	56,57,59,73,89,113,132
200040	R&C Euston Tower	9,42,45,53
200059	R&C Leicester	44,82,106,133
200075	R&C Northumberland & Durham	55
200078	R&C North Wales & North West	20,23,41
200082	R&C Northern Ireland Revenue	15,25,26
200090	R&C VOA South West Valuation	18
200091	R&C Portsmouth – Portsdown Vectis	19,97,120,125,129
200108	R&C Stockton & North Yorkshire	86,105,119,124
200114	R&C Telford	3,22,40,95
200119	R&C Glasgow & Clyde HMRC & VOA	10,12,24,35,107
200131	R&C Waterview Park	54
200133	R&C Salford Revenue	46,48
200136	R&C Liverpool	75,102,114,127
200141	R&C VOA Central Valuation	60,61,62,67,88,90
200144	R&C South East Essex	11, 21,72,118
200145	R&C HQ London	8, 63
200146	R&C North West & Central Lancashire	19,78,98,103,128
200149	R&C West Mercia	13,28,36,51,52,64,71,112,122
200152	R&C Sussex	110
20200	R&C Five Shires	85,131

Notes

Notes

