MEMBERS: Councillors Toby Simon (Chair), Sarah Doyle, Terence Neville OBE JP

OFFICERS: Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services) & Tony Gilling (Assistant Director – Human Resources, Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Principal Lawyer).

Also attending: Councillor Stafford (Cabinet member for Finance & Property)

AGENDA – PART 1

1. APPOINTMENT OF NEW CHAIR FOR MUNICIPAL YEAR 2015-16

2. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING  (Pages 1 - 6)

To agree the minutes of the meeting held on the 26th January 2015.

5. £95K CAP ON EXIT PAYMENTS  (Pages 7 - 30)

To receive the attached details of a public consultation by the Government, to agree a £95K cap on the total value of exit payments made to employees in the public sector.

6. JNC PAY RATES

To receive a verbal update on the JNC pay rates.
7. **DISMISSAL PROCESS FOR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE, SECTION 151 FINANCE OFFICER AND MONITORING OFFICER**

To receive a verbal update on the dismissal process for Head of Paid Service, Section 151 Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer.


To receive the attached report detailing PAR objectives for Directors and Assistant Directors achieved in 2014-15.

9. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To agree the following meeting dates:

- 3rd February 2016
- 5th April 2016

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

If necessary, to consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for any items of business moved to Part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act stated at the meeting (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

(There are currently no part 2 items)
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE REMUNERATION COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 26TH JANUARY, 2015

MEMBERS: Councillors Toby Simon, Sarah Doyle and Terence Neville OBE JP (Leader of the Opposition & the Conservative Group)

Officers:
Chief Executive, Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services and Assistant Director - Human Resources, Committee Secretary

370. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

AGREED to appoint Councillor Simon as Chair of the Remuneration Committee for the 2014/15 Municipal Year.

Councillor Doyle proposed and Councillor Neville seconded the proposal.

371. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for lateness were received by Councillor Neville.

372. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda.

373. EXERCISING DISCRETION UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME

RECEIVED the report (No.150) from the Assistant Director of Human Resources providing details on exercising discretion under the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS).

NOTED

1. Over the last 20 years there had been a number of changes to the LGPS. This was now an opportune time to look at the situation particularly given the financial challenges the Council was facing. At present, the Council did not have a co-ordinated approach. This report looks at the various discretions open to employers and provides recommendations as to how the Council will exercise these including the reviewing of discretions that had been available under previous regulations.
2. There are four areas to look at:
   a. Where an employee is leaving the organisation and there is discretion to either waive an actuarial reduction or increase the pension.
   b. Recruitment and retention initiatives eg: whereby the employer can pay extra into the employees pensions account.
   c. Waiving the 12 month notice requirement for employees to transfer their pension requirements.
   d. Allowing deferred members to access their pensions early on an unreduced basis.
3. It was agreed that the underlying principle governing decisions should be that discretion should only be exercised where it clearly serves the business interests of the council eg: where it minimises the number of compulsory redundancies.

AGREED to note the recommendations detailed in 3.2.1 to 3.5.1 (pages 2-5) of the report, coming into effect from 1 February 2015 and that the report goes to Full Council on the 25 February 2015.

374. JNC PAY AWARD

RECEIVED a verbal update from the Assistant Director of Human Resources on the Joint Negotiating Committee’s (JNC) pay award.

NOTED

1. The Assistant Director – Human Resources was still awaiting the information from National Employers. The JNC covered the Council’s HAY graded staff (£35K onwards) through to the Chief Executive; lower paid staff are covered by the National Joint Council (NJC)
2. The proposal on the table at present was a 2% increase on all salaries up to £99,999 with effect from 1 January 2015 through to 1 April 2016. This did have implications in terms of the Chief Executive, Directors and the top 3 points of the Assistant Directors’ salaries.
3. It was hoped that the notification would be received shortly.
4. The last JNC payment award was back in 2008 which equated to 0.05%. Staff on JNC pay rates have had their salaries frozen for 6 years. Staff on NJC have had a wage increase freeze for 3 years and pay awards over the last 2 years.
5. A discussion ensued on the potential for Enfield to fall significantly behind comparative senior leader pay rates in other London councils. It was agreed that the Assistant Director HR should report back to the committee at the end of the calendar year on potential options to address the situation.

375. COMPARATIVE PAY RATES IN LONDON 2013/2014

RECEIVED the report from the Assistant Director – Human Resources providing details of the comparative pay rates for Assistant Directors in London 2013/14.
376. REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF A STATUTORY PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Received the report (No.149) of the Assistant Director – Human Resources presenting details of the review and adoption of a statutory pay policy statement.

NOTED

1. The Council’s statutory pay policy statement is reviewed and adopted each financial year. The report proposed a number of amendments to the Council's policy, agreed in 2014 for adoption in 2015/16.
2. Adoption of the statutory pay policy must be reviewed each year and it comes to Remuneration Committee in terms of any changes. There were no proposals to radically change it this year but going forward the only changes proposed are as follows:
   - In terms of statistics
   - In terms of the number of retirements
   - Building in the 2% pay increase
   - The London living wage increase – operative from 1 March 2015.

   It was just detail that had changed in terms of the changes this year.
3. If the Committee were happy, then this report would go to Full Council in February.
4. Members made the following additional amendments to the policy: Paragraph 3.20 (page 26) of the pay policy regarding the public health team, to be expanded to record how many people the Council still had on public health pay and conditions and the approach that we will take in the future.

   The transfer of the NHS public health function in 2013 was TUPE like and did not have the full provisions of TUPE. The expectation was that there were 2 years grace only and steps would need to be taken after 31 March 2015 to review any anomalies and address any issues.

   AGREED to note the review and adoption of the Statutory Pay Policy statement and to refer the report to Full Council's February 2015 meeting.

377. PROTOCOLS FOR MEMBER APPOINTMENTS PANELS

RECEIVED a report from the Assistant Director – Human Resources providing details of protocols for Member Appointment Panels.

NOTED
1. This report had been presented as a result of issues arising from a recent appointments panel. It was though helpful to have a formal protocol for how the Council conducted the process. As detailed on page 27 of the report, this was a draft report for the purpose of discussion so as to move forward for future recruitment. This item had been bought to committee so as to hear members’ views on the matter in terms of practise, how members are selected and how decisions are made.

2. If members agreed the draft protocol process then it would be adopted. An end process would need to be devised to also include member recommendations. The process would begin with both political groups looking to agree a process.

3. It was noted that as this was a protocol it should be in the Constitution and would have to be referred to the Member & Democratic Services Group (MDSG).

4. The following points were noted following a discussion:
   a. Panel members should keep up to date with recruitment & selection training with a refresher session every 3 years.
   b. Councillor Neville expressed the view that panel members should also have some experience of interviewing of senior appointments as well as general training.
   c. The Chair felt that it was up to group leaders’ to make sure they put forward appropriate people, though the depth of training may reflect the professional backgrounds of the individuals. To try to constrain who could sit on these panels by their external employment would not be appropriate.
   d. The recruitment & selection training had been focussed on equal opportunities and not on other aspects of selection. More time would now be spent on the procedures the Council used at present which includes assessment centres and how to interpret results. Members agreed that training should be provided to members.
   e. The Chief Executive requested that a draft specification of what the training will be for members be bought to the next meeting.

   **ACTION: Tony Gilling (Assistant Director – HR)**

   f. Replacement/alternative members should be fully briefed by HR, undergone the training and then briefed by HR on the previous stages.
   g. As well as asking the agreed generic questions, panel members should also probe candidates with more searching questions relevant to each candidate. The Chief Executive and/or appropriate director would also be able to ask questions.
   h. The Chair suggested a further sentence be inserted regarding the scoring of candidates, to say that the scores were to assist members in making their judgement but was not determinative.
   i. Regarding the last point of the protocol, it was agreed that a reasonable attempt to be made to achieve consensus before a vote is proposed.
5. The Chair requested that the Assistant Director – Human Resources should circulate a revised draft of the protocol to members and then to the Member & Democratic Services Group (MDSG).

*ACTION – Tony Gilling (Assistant Director – HR).*

**AGREED** that the draft protocols for Member Appoint Panels be noted.

378. **DIRECTORS AND ASSISTANT DIRECTORS - PAR OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED 2013/14**

RECEIVED a report from the Assistant Director – Human Resources providing details of Directors and Assistant Directors PAR objectives achieved 213/14.

1. The PAR achievements are presented each year to the Audit Committee to look at performance.
2. The number of Assistant Directors achieving 100% of their objectives numbered 62% for 2013/14.
3. Two of five members of CMB had either forgone their non-consolidated payments since 2011 or had only received part of their payments.
4. The report also showed achievements each year from 2011 – 2014.

**AGREED** to note the Directors and Assistant Directors PAR objectives achieved 2013/14, as detailed on page 29 of the report.

379. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**NOTED**

1. Councillor Neville made enquiries regarding the Council’s management of staff flexi-time.
2. The Assistant Director HR replied that the approach to date is to ensure that managers manage the flexi leave provisions appropriately and that they were not detrimental to effective service delivery.
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Summary

1.1 The government announced on 23 May 2015 that it intended to end six-figure exit payments for public sector workers.

1.2 On 31 July 2015 the government published a consultation document asking for respondents’ views on the details of the policy. The consultation closed on 27 August 2015.

1.3 The core elements of the proposal were to:

- Apply a £95,000 cap on the total value of exit payments made to employees in the public sector
- Apply the cap to all forms of exit payment, including cash lump sums, early access to an unreduced pension, payments in lieu of notice and non-financial and other benefits
- Apply the cap to all types of arrangements for determining exit payments
- Establish a waiver process for exceptional circumstances
- Apply the policy to all public sector bodies, with a small number of bodies granted an exemption from the policy

1.4 The consultation document can be seen on Gov.uk.

1.5 Over 4,000 responses to the consultation were received. While a significant number were not in favour of a cap given other reforms to public sector terms and conditions, or had objections to the cap applying to the organisation they worked for, few representations set out a different proposition to address six-figure payouts in the public sector. A number of responses supported limiting the amount that individuals could receive on exit to under £100,000, and applying a cap across the public sector.

1.6 Having considered the responses to the consultation, the government proposes to continue to legislate to introduce a cap on exit payments.

1.7 The government will take forward these proposals by taking powers in primary legislation as part of the Enterprise Bill. The detail of the measure will be implemented through secondary legislation.

1.8 A number of respondents raised detailed technical issues connected with the implementation of the cap. These will inform the government’s thinking as it develops the legislation to deliver the cap.
## Outline of government proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is in Scope?</th>
<th>Current and future public sector employees and office holders. Ministers and Special Advisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodies in Scope</td>
<td>All entities classified within central and local government and non-financial public corporation sectors as determined by the Office for National Statistics for National Account purposes, with a small number of exemptions. The government is intending to exempt exit payments made by the following bodies from the cap: The following public financial corporations and subsidiaries: The Royal Bank of Scotland UK Asset Resolution Northern Rock Bradford and Bingley Pension Protection Fund The London Authorities Mutual Limited National Employment Savings Trust Corporation (NEST) Financial Conduct Authority Financial Ombudsman Service Ltd. First Rate Exchange Services Holdings Limited First Rate Exchange Services Limited Guaranteed Export Finance Corporation PLC (GEFCo) Northern Ireland Central Investment Fund for Charities Prudential Regulation Authority Armed Forces National Museums The Commissioners for Irish Lights Public broadcasters: BBC, Ch4 and S4C Bank of England The government’s strong expectation is that bodies that are proposed to be outside of the scope of the cap on exit payments will come forward with their own, commensurate cap on exit payments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How will it work? | Cap the total cost of exit payments available to individuals leaving employment to £95,000. Apply the cap to all types of arrangement for determining exit payments. |
| Payments in scope | The proposal is the cap will cover payments made in relation to leaving employment, including:  
|                  | o Voluntary and compulsory exits  
|                  | o Other voluntary exits with compensation packages  
|                  | o Ex gratia payments and special severance payments  
|                  | o Other benefits granted as part of the exit process that are not payments in relation to employment  
|                  | o Employer costs of providing early unreduced access to pension  
|                  | o Payments or compensation in lieu of notice and payments relating to the cashing up of outstanding entitlements  
|                  | Where a number of payments are made they will be aggregated together to be measured against the cap.  
| It is proposed the following will not be in scope: | Compensations payments in respect of death or injury attributable to the employment, serious ill health and ill health retirement and certain fitness-related requirements.  
|                  | Payments made following litigation for breach of contract or unfair dismissal. |
| Waiver process | The default position will be that any waiver of the cap would require consent from the relevant Minister, subject to Treasury controls and delegations to departments.  
|                  | The Full Council to take the decision whether to grant a waiver of the cap in cases involving Local Authorities and for local government bodies within their delegated powers.  
|                  | Public corporations will require Treasury approval in the same way as bodies covered by Managing Public Money. |
| Devolution | Policy extends to all of the bodies where employment and remuneration practices are the responsibility of the UK Government.  
|                  | Scottish government, Welsh government and Northern Ireland Executive to determine if and how they want to take forward similar arrangements in relation to devolved bodies and workforces. |
| Compliance and transparency | Require bodies to maintain records and publish annual details of all exit payments made within a financial year. |
3 Introduction

3.1 The government has committed to address six-figure exit payments in the public sector, and has consulted on the policy detail of a cap on exit payments that forms the basis of the legislation in the Enterprise Bill.

3.2 There were more than 4,000 responses to the consultation. Those organisations that responded are listed in Annex A. Officials also engaged with a range of stakeholders outside of the formal consultation process.

3.3 This document forms the government’s response to the consultation.

3.4 Section 1 of Chapter 4 addresses responses to Questions 2 and 5 in the consultation document on the level of a cap.

3.5 Section 2 of Chapter 4 looks at responses to consultation document questions 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 which covered relevant forms of exit costs within the scope of the cap, and sought respondents’ views on the proposed approach of limiting early retirement benefits with reference to the cost to the employer.

3.6 Section 3 of Chapter 4 explores responses to consultation questions 8-10, which asked for views on the scope of the policy, including how the cap will operate under TUPE rules, and the proposed waiver process and associated transparency arrangements.
An exit payment cap in the public sector

The government has set out its intention to end six-figure exit payments for public sector workers, implementing the manifesto commitment made in April 2015. While exit payments provide important support for employees as they find new employment, it is important these are proportionate and provide value for money to the taxpayer. Funding exit payments represents a substantial cost to the taxpayer, with £1.8 billion of exit payments made in 2013-14.

Section 1: Level of a cap

4.1 The consultation set out that the government was considering a cap set at £95,000 on exit payments made in event of redundancy that would apply both to existing and future employees of public sector organisations.

4.2 The cap of £95,000 would apply before tax and the level of the cap would be subject to review by government. The consultation noted that the cap at this level was intended to affect those individuals in receipt of the highest payouts, and leave employers with some flexibility to make small numbers of payments towards the cap limit where these were necessary for pursuing workforce reforms.

4.3 The consultation confirmed that the government would continue to expect employers to ensure exit payments provide value for money when a cap was in place.

Summary of responses

4.4 The majority of responses did not comment on the level of the cap, except to state that the sum presented appeared arbitrary.

4.5 A number of responses questioned the need for a blanket cap, citing a few high profile cases that they perceived this measure was designed to address. A significant number referenced reforms that had already taken place to limit exit payments and assurances that had been given on the longevity of these reforms without further change.

4.6 Other responses noted exit payments were usually determined based on salary, experience and length of service and a flat cap did not allow account to be made for different employee characteristics.

Government response

4.7 The government has consulted on a £95,000 level for the cap given the commitment to end six-figure payouts in the public sector. Given there were few responses suggesting an alternative cap level, the government will pursue a £95,000 cap on payouts in legislation as it believes this best meets the policy intention of ending six-figure exit payments in the public sector. Individual schemes will have the flexibility to set a lower limit where it is more appropriate to do so.
The government's intention is to keep the level of the cap under review and retain the flexibility to make changes in response to changing circumstances to ensure that the impacts of the cap remain proportionate.

Should the government decide to change the level of the cap, Regulations will be made following an affirmative procedure to allow for full parliamentary scrutiny of the potential impact.

The government's intention is to keep the level of the cap under review and retain the flexibility to make changes in response to changing circumstances to ensure that the impacts of the cap remain proportionate.

Section 2: Payments included in a cap

The consultation set out that the government considers the following payments should be within the scope of the cap:

- Payments related to voluntary and compulsory redundancies
- Payments related to other voluntary exits
- The cost to the employer of offering early access to unreduced pensions in place of, or in combination with, other exit payments
- Special severance payments and ex gratia payments related to exit from employment
- The monetary value of any extra leave, allowances or other benefits granted as part of the exit process which are not payments in relation to employment
- Payments or compensation in lieu of notice and payments relating to the cashing up of outstanding entitlements (such as outstanding leave or allowances that are cashed up and added to the value of the sum)

The consultation set out that where a number of different payments are made they would be aggregated together to be measured against the cap. Payments would be in scope of the cap whether they were paid as part of a standing compensation scheme, a one-off arrangement or under the terms of an individual contract of employment, whether open-ended or fixed-term.

Summary of responses

Respondents did not generally argue against the government list of exit payments available in the public sector, or propose other significant payments that should be in scope of the cap.

On the specific types of payment to be included in the cap, a significant number of responses argued that payments for untaken annual leave should not be included in the scope of the cap, arguing these payments represent pay for work carried out. There were also concerns that including them within the cap may result in an individual taking leave
before exiting, which may not be in the organisation’s interest. Some also argued that the proposal to include any additional paid leave granted as part of an exit package could limit employers’ flexibility.

4.16 Respondents made similar points with regard to payments in lieu of notice (PILON). Some respondents argued that it should not be included in the cap as it formed a contractual entitlement of employment and could be a useful tool for employers in managing exits.

4.17 Many respondents also expressed concerns about the inclusion of special severance payments within the proposed cap. They thought that this would limit the flexibility of employers to settle litigation claims early where this was judged to provide value for money.

4.18 A significant number of respondents disagreed with government’s intention to include early access to unreduced pensions within the scope of the cap. In particular they argued that this could mean the cap would affect those on more moderate salaries who have long service. Some argued that this would therefore be discriminatory towards older workers. Others argued that this represented a breach of the 25 year guarantee on pension reform made by the government in the last Parliament.

4.19 Respondents did not generally disagree with the government’s proposal that compensation payments in respect of death or injury attributable to employment, serious ill health and ill health retirement should be excluded from the scope of the cap.

Government response

4.20 The government believes that the cap should apply to the wide range of payments related to exit, including cash compensation payments, the cost to employers of early access to pensions and other payments. This approach will ensure the cap is fair and is not subject to avoidance through individuals taking early retirement or being offered other forms of payment. The government does not accept that this approach is contrary to the 25 year guarantee, and emphasises that these changes will have no impact on individuals’ accrued pension rights.

4.21 The government does however accept the arguments made by respondents that it would be disproportionate and potentially counter-productive to include payments for untaken annual leave within the scope of the cap. These will therefore be excluded from the cap.

4.22 However the government does not believe the same arguments apply where employers grant additional paid leave. The government believes it is necessary to include this in the cap to ensure that the granting of excessive additional leave cannot be used to circumvent the cap.

4.23 Similarly the government believes that it is necessary to include PILON to ensure that the cap is not circumvented by excessive notice periods which are then paid in addition to any exit payment. PILON can in some instances form a substantial part of the compensation paid to an individual leaving employment or office.

4.24 It is important to recognise that some employers, like the NHS, expect individuals to serve out their notice period and do not permit PILON as a matter of policy. However, the cap does not affect the existing flexibility employers have to agree PILON where it is justified and necessary for the normal operation of the organisation.

4.25 The government also believes it is necessary to include special severance payments to prevent these being used to avoid the cap. However the government believes (as some
respondents acknowledge) that the proposed waiver system will provide important flexibility in cases where it can be demonstrated that such severance payments will provide value for money.

Section 3: Public sector scope of the cap

4.26 The consultation set out that the government was minded for the cap to apply to entities that were classified as public sector, based on the ONS classification. A similar approach was taken for the clawback reforms in the Small Business, Enterprise and Employment Act 2015.

4.27 It also set down a small number of organisations that the government was minded to initially exempt from the measure, and the government’s intention to take powers to add and remove public bodies from those in scope, to respond to future changes to the public sector. The consultation noted the government’s strong expectation that bodies who were proposed to be exempt would introduce a commensurate cap on exit payments at least equivalent to the arrangements proposed.

4.28 The consultation confirmed the government would request Legislative Consent Motions from the Devolved Administrations where appropriate, however it would be for the Devolved Administrations to decide the approach they wish to take to this measure.

4.29 It also confirmed there would be the ability to waive the cap in exceptional circumstances for both individuals and public bodies, subject to Ministerial, Treasury or Full Council approval depending on the nature of the organisation.

Summary of responses

4.30 Few representations proposed an alternative to the ONS list for purposes of defining the public sector. The more substantial number of responses related to issues with the organisations in scope of the measure and proposed exemptions.

4.31 A number of responses noted the measure should apply across the public sector without exceptions, questioning why broadcasters, banks and MPs were out of scope. The more substantial number of representations related to cases for additional exemptions for particular bodies related to the government role in the organisation, or the contractual nature of the relationship between the individuals and their employers.

4.32 Those respondents who commented on the question on how to approach those individuals with TUPE terms that could lead to a future entitlement to an exit payment in excess of the cap, were in support of protecting existing TUPE terms rather than the legislation overriding them.

4.33 Respondents did not disagree with the principle of a waiver system, though some argued either against the principle of a cap in the first place, or expressed concerns that a waiver could result in widespread exemptions being made.

Government response

4.34 The government recognises that these reforms are wide ranging in their impact in the public sector. However, the government commitment made was to end six-figure payouts in the public sector, and for the measure to apply across the public sector with few exceptions.

4.35 The government does not believe there is a case for excluding individuals by the sole virtue that they work for organisations that are outside of central and local government. Nor that some public sector organisations should be exempt based on criteria relating to
the degree of day-to-day government involvement with these organisations (over statutory independence), which would lead to a set of public sector organisations exempt from this measure inconsistent with the manifesto commitment.

4.36 The government therefore intends to continue to legislate on the basis of the scope set down in the consultation, and to have powers to add and remove bodies from the scope on a case by case basis. The main set of secondary regulations that set down the detailed scope of this measure will be subject to affirmative procedure in Parliament.

4.37 The government wishes to reinforce its expectation that organisations proposed to be exempt will introduce a commensurate cap and introduce this no later than the exit payment cap. It will be engaging with these organisations on this basis, and the exemptions will be kept under review. The government is currently minded not to include those individuals with protected TUPE terms in scope of the cap.

4.38 IPSA is responsible for MPs pay and conditions, and the government does not intend to change this position in relation to exit payments. IPSA is now implementing reforms, including limits to the payments to MPs on exits, below the level of the cap.

4.39 There will be no change to the intention to have a waiver system in place to enable decisions to be taken on individual cases where there may be exceptional circumstances that justify that the cap should be relaxed, covering both individuals or public organisations. This would be subject, as proposed, to strong scrutiny and approval by the relevant Minister or responsible authority, supported by clear transparency requirements.
List of respondents

A.1 The following organisations submitted responses to the consultation:

- Association of Revenue and Customs
- FDA
- Northern Ireland Public Service Alliance
- Public and Commercial Services Union
- The Union for Borders, Immigration & Customs
- Trade Union Congress
- UNISON
- Unite

- Association of Policing and Crime Chief Executives
- Cumbria Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner
- Metropolitan Police Service
- National Police Chiefs’ Council
- Norfolk Constabulary
- North Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley
- Police and Crime Commissioners Treasurers’ Society
- Police Federation of England & Wales
- Police Superintendents’ Association of England & Wales
- Sussex Police & Crime Commissioner
- West Yorkshire Police

- British Dental Association
- British Medical Association
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
- NHS Joint Staff Council Trade Unions
- NHS Sandwell & West Birmingham
- North of England Commissioning Support Unit
- Public Health England
- Royal College of Midwives

- Association of Teachers and Lecturers
- National Association of Head Teachers
- National Association of Schoolmasters
- Union of Women Teachers
- National Union of Teachers

- North West Regional College
- Northern Ireland Further Education Colleges
- Universities & Colleges Employers Association

- Association of Principal Fire Officers
- Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire & Rescue Authority
- County Durham and Darlington Fire & Rescue Authority
- Derbyshire Fire & Rescue Service
- East Sussex Fire Authority
- Essex County Fire & Rescue Service
- Fire Brigades Union
- Kent Fire & Rescue Service
- Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service
- Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime
- North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority
- Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Authority
- Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Fire & Rescue Authority
- West Midlands Fire and Rescue Authority
- Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service

- Transport for London
- Network Rail

- Amey Services Limited
- Commonwealth War Graves Commission
- Hymans Robertson LLP
- Tees Active Limited
- Trust Development Authority
- Valuation Tribunal Service

- Association of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers
- East of England Local Government Association
- Local Government Association
- Sefton Labour Group of Councils
- Society of Local Authority Chief Executives and Senior Managers
- Welsh Local Government Association
Northern Ireland Local Government Officers’
Superannuation Committee
Local Government Staff Commission for NI
Greater Manchester Waste Disposal
Authority
Yorkshire & Humber Employers’ Association
arc21

Northern Ireland Library Authority
Lake District National Park
Yorkshire Dales National Park

Antrim and Newtonabbey Borough Council
Ashford Borough Council
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Bath and North East Somerset Council
Birmingham City Council
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
Blackpool Council
Borough of Poole Council
Braintree District Council
Bury Council
Canterbury City Council
Cheshire West and Chester Council
Cornwall Council
Cumbria County Council
Devon County Council
East Midlands Council
Edlington Town Council
Fareham Borough Council
Fife Council
Gedling Borough Council
Gravesham Borough Council
Gwynedd Council
Hampshire County Council
Hartlepool Borough Council
Kent County Council
Kettering Borough Council
Kirklees Council
Lambeth Council
Leeds City Council
LGSS Northamptonshire County Council
Lisburn and Castlereagh City Council
Liverpool City Council
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Hackney
London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham
London Borough of Kensington & Chelsea
Ludlow Town Council
Manchester City Council
Middlesbrough Council
Milton Keynes Council
Newcastle City Council
North Herts District Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council
North Yorkshire Country Council
Northumberland County Council
Oldham Council
Oxford City Council
Preston City Council
Royal Borough of Kingston
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Shropshire Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
Southampton City Council
Southend Borough Council
Staffordshire County Council
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Swale Borough Council
Tamworth Borough Council
Teignbridge District Council
Test Valley Borough Council
Thanet District Council
Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
Trafford Council
Wakefield Council
Warwickshire County Council
West Suffolk Council
West Sussex County Council
Wiltshire Council
Wyre Council
Wyre Forest District Council

Essex Pension Fund
Greater Manchester Pension Fund
Norfolk Pension Fund
North Yorkshire Pension Fund
South Yorkshire Pensions Authority
Wiltshire Pension Fund
HM Treasury contacts

This document can be downloaded from www.gov.uk

If you require this information in an alternative format or have general enquiries about HM Treasury and its work, contact:

Correspondence Team
HM Treasury
1 Horse Guards Road
London
SW1A 2HQ
Tel: 020 7270 5000
Email: public.enquiries@hmtreasury.gsi.gov.uk
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Directors and Assistant Directors – PAR Objectives Achieved 2014/15

Introduction

The points scores for the Directors and Assistant Directors detailed below have been achieved in the context of high and improving scores in the residents’ satisfaction survey, significant savings achieved with services on budget and a range of projects and initiatives delivered.

Number Achieving Objectives by % Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Range</th>
<th>Number 2012/13</th>
<th>% 2012/13</th>
<th>Number 2013/14</th>
<th>% 2013/14</th>
<th>Number 2014/15</th>
<th>% 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-99%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>23 *</td>
<td>21 *</td>
<td>20 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It should be noted that the points score for the Chief Executive is not recorded as he has chosen to forego all of his eligible performance payments for the past four years. However, information has been recorded on file to demonstrate highly satisfactory performance.
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