

Title: COVID-19 FAQs on officer Terms and Conditions of service

Date: 20th April 2020

Prepared by: R+P, on behalf of National Secretary

[Correct at time of writing: updates to be issued as necessary throughout the COVID crisis.](#)

Updates since version 001:

New sections on: Changes to duty rosters; volunteering to work on a rest day or public holiday; lawful orders; payment to student officers required to undertake directed patrol; working from home tax relief; bonus payments.

Updated information on pregnant officers; rejoiners; deaths due to COVID-19.

COVID-19 Terms and Conditions FAQs

The following FAQs are aimed at keeping you updated regarding measures forces may take to increase the workforce and manage existing officers. We know that in the current crisis forces are having to find ways to ensure they have as many officers deployed as possible.

We have had a number of queries regarding whether measures that forces are taking with regard to terms and conditions are admissible under regulations. We have also had queries about the impact of new measures that simply are not explicitly provided for in regulations, but where guidance is rapidly being worked up.

The following is intended to help to flag up whether actions that forces are taking – even when these are unusual – are still within regulations. Where changes have been enacted that are subject to guidance, we have noted these too. In several cases we are seeking for the NPCC to clarify further give clarity: but as this hasn't happened yet, we have stated what we believe we should be stating as our position as a staff association, in the best interests of members.

If you have queries please send them to terms&conditions@polfed.org and please mark the email subject as COVID-19. We will answer all that we can, and where necessary will raise to the NPCC and Home Office.

As ever, further detail on existing regulations can be found at <https://www.polfed.org/about-us/police-regulations/>

The NPCC are aiming to publish guidance on a number of topics. Some of these are matters on which we have been engaging for some time. We have sought for the NPCC to ask all Chief Constables to act consistently, and to interpret Regulations in a manner that is as positive as possible. A letter outlining the specific positions that we have sought has been sent to Chief Constables at the same time as publication of these FAQs.

Updates since version 001:	1
COVID-19 Terms and Conditions FAQs	1
Structure and contents	3
Serving officers (beyond probation)	3
1. Officers planning to retire in 3-6 months asked to consider extending service	3
2. Buy-back of Annual Leave	4
3. Self-isolation and pay.....	4
4. Deaths due to COVID-19	5
5. Treatment of officers in unexpected change of circumstances: Officers with weddings / civil partnerships cancelled	6
6. Appeal to staff on career breaks, to return	6
7. Changes to duty rosters	6
8. Volunteering to work on a rest day or public holiday	7
9. Cancellation of leave.....	7
10. Carry over of annual leave	8
11. Dependents' leave.....	8
12. Parental bereavement and pay.....	9
13. Pregnant officers	9
14. Postponement of Sergeants' legal examination and National investigators' examination (NIE)	11
15. Lawful orders.....	11
16. Bonus payments.....	12
Probationers.....	12
17. Assessment and selection	12
18. Attestation.....	13
19. New recruits – training changes.....	13
20. Operational policing training	14
21. Initial training	14
22. Joint Related Fitness Testing	14
23. Payment to students required to undertake directed patrol	16

24. TOIL.....	17
Rejoiners	17
25. Officers being asked to rejoin, after retiring (or leaving early).	17
26. Rejoiners abatement of pension	18
27. HMRC tax charges – removal of requirement for 1-6 month break for rejoiners.....	19
28. Working from home – Claiming Tax Relief.....	20

Structure and contents

These FAQs cover 3 categories of officer: serving officers (existing members, beyond probation); probationers and trainees; rejoiners.

For each topic, we have sought to address, as appropriate:

- What forces are doing and why
- Can they do this under current regulations (or where appropriate broader UK legislation)? Are there any consequences members need to know?
- What is happening by way of agreements and guidance? (most recent versions are attached) What is PFEW position?

Serving officers (beyond probation)

1. Officers planning to retire in 3-6 months asked to consider extending service

Officers who have not yet completed their maximum pensionable service can continue membership of their current scheme under normal terms. If an officer has already completed their retirement paperwork (for a retirement date in the future) they should consider contacting their pension administrator as soon as possible if they no longer intend to retire. However, it may be that, considering the further information below that they decide to retire anyway and apply to immediately rejoin.

The situation for officers who have completed their maximum pensionable service and continue in employment is less clear. However, if as expected, the requirement for a gap in service to conserve Protected Pension Ages (PPA) is temporarily suspended, then it would

make more sense for such members to retire and rejoin immediately, especially as it also seems likely that Chief Constables will be exercising their discretion to not apply abatement during the current crisis. Adopting this approach and retiring would also allow officers to access their commuted lump sums. However the relaxation of the service gap requirement and changes to the use of the abatement provisions described above are yet to be officially confirmed. We will let you know as soon as we receive confirmation and update these FAQs accordingly.

Discussions within Government about the situation in respect of auto-enrolment requirements are ongoing. It appears that at least as a temporary measure rejoiners will be offered membership of NPPS 2006 but without the ability to accrue further benefits. However, we are led to understand that the intention is that rejoining officers will be offered retrospective membership of the 2015 CARE Scheme. This would provide members with death benefits, ill-health benefits and the opportunity to accrue further pension rights. We understand that discussions on this matter within Government are still ongoing so this is not yet confirmed.

As soon as we know what the official position is we will update you. In the meantime, members should consider very carefully any decision to opt out of membership.

2. Buy-back of Annual Leave

Although some forces are saying they will do this, it cannot currently be done under current Reg 33 (unless an officer is retiring or resigning).

We are seeking for the Home Office to issue a Determination allowing this. In the meantime officers should keep any email trails / communications from HR departments offering this.

3. Self-isolation and pay

Officers must be encouraged to do the right thing by self-isolating where necessary, without fear that their pay will be adversely affected, now or in the future.

Our position is that all periods of self-isolation should be treated as being separate from ordinary periods of sick leave, and should not be included for the purposes of calculating entitlement to sick pay. The mechanism to achieve this lies in Police Regulation 28 and Annex K – sick pay, and Regulation 33 (11) – leave and Annex P – sick leave, with additional

guidance set out in PNB circular 05/1 on the use of chief officer discretion. Time spent in isolation should be on full sick pay and it should not be included for the purposes of calculating future entitlement to sick pay.

Annex P provides for officers to self-certificate for up to seven days. If officers are self-isolating and cannot work for more than seven days, forces will need to make an exception to the normal requirement for medical evidence and officers themselves can obtain an isolation note through the [NHS website](#) or [NHS 111 online](#).

The NPCC have also stated the same position as ours at national level, but have not yet provided communication of this. We will send out any confirmation as soon as published.

4. Deaths due to COVID-19

Some forces are saying these should be treated as death as a result of injury on duty, for pension purposes. We believe this is possible in regulations, and we are seeking to have that applied consistently.

The dependents of officers who die from coronavirus will receive benefits payable under the Police (Injury Benefits) Regulations 2006 if they are treated as having died from an injury received without default in the execution of their duty. We believe that all officers with contact with the public who die of COVID-19 should be treated as having died as a result of such an injury on duty, as it is common sense that contact with the public is the most likely way that officers will contract the virus. Officers do not have the option of working from home or social distancing that all members of the public are being legally required to undertake, for reasons of safety. It is clear that at this time that performing public facing roles is putting them in harm's way.

We understand that the Force Medical Expert will be required to make an assessment, on each case. But we believe it is perverse to consider that the risk of contagion is so great that unprecedented laws are required to force distancing, (and for families of officers and other members of the public to remain at home), and yet to leave any doubt for officers' dependents that forces will treat deaths as anything other than a result of an injury on duty. We therefore seek for FMEs to be instructed to assume that any coronavirus death is a result on injury on duty unless there is unequivocal evidence to the contrary (e.g. that the officer performed no duties involving public contact).

We have written to both the Home Secretary and all Chief Constables on this matter. In the meantime, where officers die of COVID-19, local Federations should seek for the Chief

Constable to treat this as death as a result of injury on duty. Please also let us know of any COVID deaths at terms&conditions@polfed.org, and what the Chief Constable's decision is so that we can keep a record, and lobby on behalf of dependents.

5. Treatment of officers in unexpected change of circumstances: Officers with weddings / civil partnerships cancelled

Some officers had weddings / civil partnerships booked which have now been cancelled. Under the PPS 1987 the spouse or civil partner would have benefitted automatically for pension purposes, from that date. However, unmarried partners are not entitled to a pension on the death of a PPS 1987 member. Please also let us know of any such cases at terms&conditions@polfed.org.

We are raising this with the Home Office. In the meantime, officers should be reminded of the importance of ensuring that their nomination of beneficiary(ies) is up to date.

6. Appeal to staff on career breaks, to return

Police Regulation 33, Annex OO does not generally allow chief officers to require officers to return from their career break earlier than the agreed date without the officer's consent.

Some forces wish to ask officers currently on a career break to return to duty. Under these circumstances it would seem sensible to suspend the career break temporarily.

7. Changes to duty rosters

Police Regulation 22, Annex E provides that duty rosters must set out a members' rest days, free days, public holidays on which they are required to work and start and finish times for scheduled periods of duty for at least three months from when it comes into effect and must be published at least one month before it commences.

An officer's duty roster should only be changed due to exigencies of duty. PNB circular 86/9 states that the term "exigencies of duty" should be interpreted as relating to situations where:-

"a pressing demand, need or requirement is perceived but is not reasonably avoidable and necessitates a change of roster"

Changes to rosters should only be made after full consideration of welfare, operational and practical circumstances rather than purely on financial grounds. PFEW recognises that it may not always be possible to follow these guidelines but the aim should be to allow officers adequate time for rest and recuperation between duties. In particular, when it is necessary to alter a duty roster forces must endeavour, so far as practicable, to provide:

- an interval of not less than 11 hours between the end of one shift and the beginning of the next; and
- an interval between each rostered rest day not exceeding 7 days,

unless a Branch Board agrees otherwise. Where it is not possible to satisfy the above conditions, officers will be entitled to an equivalent period of compensatory rest.

This is separate to the provisions in regulation 22, Annex E covering the introduction of a new shift pattern – for further advice on this see BB circular 015/2019 and BB circular 009/2018.

8. Volunteering to work on a rest day or public holiday

As detailed in the Quick Reference Guide, if a member requests to work on a rostered rest day or public holiday the day shall be treated as a normal duty day and the member will be granted another day off in lieu, which shall be treated as a rest day or public holiday.

However, Home Office circular 39/1985 states that responding to a management request for volunteers should not be treated as a request by the officer concerned to perform duty on the day in question. Therefore, in these circumstances the normal compensation arrangements for rest days or public holiday working will apply.

For the purposes of calculating any entitlement to compensation for rest day or public holiday working, it is PFEW's view that a management request for volunteers would not generally amount to a notification of a requirement to do duty on a rest day or a public holiday and that instead it is merely an indication that an officer may be required to do duty. Instead, compensation should be calculated from the date that officers are notified of the requirement to work and the duty roster changed.

9. Cancellation of leave

We are aware that some officers have attempted to cancel leave that they had already booked. Some forces are allowing them to do so, but others are refusing to let officers cancel leave right now. This is presumably to maintain existing rotas, and in order to make officers take time out while they still can, in expectation of needing everyone at work over the coming period.

Legally, forces are able to refuse requests to cancel annual leave that has been booked.

See carry Over of Annual Leave, below.

10. Carry over of annual leave

The Government has amended the Working Time Regulations (WTR) 1998 to allow workers to carry over up to four weeks' annual leave into the next two holiday years, where it has not been reasonably practicable for them to take it as a result of the effects of coronavirus (this includes the effects on the worker, the employer, the wider economy or society).

It is likely that this would allow carry over if, for example, an employer did not allow leave to be taken during the crisis due to an increased workload. It is less likely that it would allow carry over of leave just because a worker was unable to go on holiday as planned due to travel restrictions. In that situation, it would arguably still be reasonably practicable for workers to take the annual leave within the leave year, even if they cannot use it to go away on holiday.

Police Regulation 33, Annex O – annual leave already gives chief officers discretion to allow more than five days' leave to be carried over in exceptional circumstances and when it is in the interests of efficiency to do so. Our position is that chief officers should use their discretion provided by Regulation 33, Annex O to enable officers who are prevented from taking their annual leave to carryover up to four weeks annual leave into the next two leave years.

11. Dependents' leave

As summarised in the Quick Reference Guide, Regulation 33, Annex T states that officers are entitled to reasonable paid time off in order to take action which is necessary:

- a) when a dependent falls ill, gives birth or is injured or assaulted;
- b) to arrange for care for an ill or injured dependent;
- c) where a dependent dies to arrange and attend funeral
- d) where care arrangements for a dependent are disrupted or terminated; or
- e) to deal with an unexpected incident involving an officer's child at school or nursery.

Dependent means a spouse, child, parent, someone who lives in the same house as the officer (but not a lodger etc) or, in relation to (a) (b) and (d) any person who reasonably relies on the officer for assistance for instance an elderly neighbour or relative.

There is no definition in Annex T of what is reasonable time off. Our position is that officers should be granted paid time off for as long as necessary to deal with any emergency arising out of this crisis.

12. Parental bereavement and pay

Parental bereavement leave is a new entitlement for bereaved parents to be absent from work, normally with pay at a statutory minimum rate, for up to two weeks. The new statutory right is available to the parents of a child who dies on or after 6 April 2020.

Our position is that officers should be granted up to two weeks leave and that such leave should be treated as a period of duty i.e. on full pay.

Agreement has been reached at the Police Consultative Forum that officers should benefit from parental bereavement leave and pay but this has not yet been translated into regulations and determinations. On 26 March 2020, the PCF asked the Home Office to issue a circular urgently.

13. Pregnant officers

The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 cover the health and safety of new and expectant mothers who work in the police service.

Government guidance during the coronavirus (COVID-19) crisis is that all employees should work from home unless this is not possible. Where an employee is pregnant, the guidance is

that they should be "particularly stringent" in following social distancing guidelines; they should work from home where possible and employers (this includes Forces) should support them to do so.

Where it is not possible for a pregnant employee to work from home, employers should consider their duties under health and safety legislation. The employer should carry out a risk assessment, taking into account the extent to which it is possible for the employee to follow the social distancing guidelines, for example by avoiding non-essential use of public transport and staying two metres away from others. Where a risk is identified, the employer must take steps to control, reduce or remove it, by:

- temporarily altering the employee's working conditions or hours of work; or (if that is not reasonable)
- offering them suitable alternative work; or (if none is available)
- suspending them from work on full pay for as long as necessary to avoid the risk.

For NHS staff, the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and the Royal College of Midwives have issued updated national guidance, based on the available evidence. As of 26th March 2020 "Covid-19 virus infection and pregnancy" states that all pregnant NHS staff should be able to opt out of direct patient contact, and those who are more than 28 weeks pregnant, or have underlying health conditions, have been told to avoid direct patient contact and it is recommended that they stay at home. We believe similar provision should be made for pregnant officers.

- <https://www.nursingtimes.net/news/policies-and-guidance/pregnant-nhs-staff-should-be-able-to-opt-out-of-patient-facing-roles-26-03-2020/>

All of the above reflects the guidance already issued to Forces on the management of maternity and related issues set out in PNB circular 10/05. This includes what action is needed to protect the health, safety and welfare of the woman and her child. Whilst the guidance to Forces is aimed primarily at managing women in the Service, it is also important that Forces are aware of and sympathetic to the needs of new and expectant fathers or partners, particularly at this time.

An officer's statutory maternity pay will be triggered if they are absent from work for a pregnancy-related reason, including a suspension on health and safety grounds, in the four-week period before their expected week of childbirth. To be clear, this does not mean that an officer's police maternity leave and pay will be triggered – this is explained in more detail in JBB circular 025-2017.

14. Postponement of Sergeants' legal examination and National investigators' examination (NIE)

The NIE, fixed for 2 June 2020 has been postponed, and candidates registered for this exam have automatically been transferred to the next available date, currently 8 September 2020.

The sergeants' legal examination, due in March 2020, was postponed last month. No date has yet been re-scheduled, but the College has confirmed that this will not take place before the end of June 2020. There is a meeting of the National Police Promotion Framework Board on 16 April at which consequential impacts on officers will be discussed, such as extensions to examination validity periods, possible extension of the step 4 (Temporary Promotion and Work-Based Assessment) period and when the next examination will be re-scheduled. In the meantime, the College has a web page (<https://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Pages/Sergeants-exam.aspx>) setting out the current position in more detail.

15. Lawful orders

Police Regulation 20 states that officers shall carry out all lawful orders. Failure to obey a lawful order exposes a member to a risk of misconduct proceedings (and in exceptional circumstances criminal proceedings).

Schedule 2 of the Conduct Regulations 2020 sets out the Standards of Professional Behaviour, which includes the following:

“Orders and instructions

Police officers only give and carry out lawful orders and instructions.

Police officers abide by police regulations, force policies and lawful orders.”

The Code of Ethics sets out the principles and expectations that underpin the Standards of Professional Behaviour. The Code notes that there may be instances when failure to follow an order or instruction does not amount to misconduct. For example, where an officer reasonably believes that an order is unlawful or has good and sufficient reason not to comply. The Code gives the following guidance on the use of an officer's discretion:

“Police discretion is necessary, but must be used wisely. When making decisions about using your discretion you must:

- use your training, skills and knowledge about policing
- consider what you are trying to achieve and the potential effects of your decisions
- take any relevant policing codes, guidance, policies and procedures into consideration
- ensure you are acting consistently with the principles and standards in this Code”

One of the principal considerations in determining what constitutes a good and sufficient reason are the health and safety implications of complying with an order. There may, for example, be circumstances in which it would be legitimate for an officer not to expose himself or herself to undue risk of injury. Under Health & Safety at Work legislation employers, including police forces, are required to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare of all its employees. However, it is also the case that all employees (and this includes officers) are required to take reasonable care of their own health and safety and that of those who may be affected by their acts and omissions at work. It is also the responsibility of all employees to co-operate with their employer to ensure they can fulfil their legal obligations.

Therefore, the general approach should be that an order is lawful unless it is clearly unlawful. While there are other considerations that need to be balanced ultimately much will come down to the individual circumstances of a particular situation and the overriding duty to carry out lawful orders. Any decision to not obey orders or follow instructions, policing policies and other guidance, must be able to withstand scrutiny.

16. Bonus payments

A bonus payment can be between £50 and £500 and it is paid for work of an outstandingly demanding, unpleasant or important nature. We believe that many of the tasks done by officers at this time could be considered to fall within this definition. In order to ensure the police service can continue to operate effectively (ie with as many officers as possible).

This provision is already in place, in Annex U and so could be paid straightaway.

Probationers

17. Assessment and selection

Currently, activity at Recruitment Assessment Centres has been postponed, and the College is working to provide an on-line alternative. They hope to do so within weeks. There is some uncertainty regarding the position of candidates who have completed the SEARCH process but not yet been offered a role; there are likely to be differences in approach between forces in terms of any accelerated approaches to this that they may introduce to deal with the current situation. Any concerns locally regarding fairness or safety should be raised with PFEW terms&conditions@polfed.org with the subject reference COVID-19 as above) to consider raising on a national level if appropriate.

18. Attestation

Some forces currently delay attestation for some weeks after appointment. Section 29 of the Police Act 1996 requires that every member of a police force or special constable shall be attested as a constable on appointment. Prior to attestation it is likely that a recruit is a member of the force but does not hold the office of constable. This raises questions regarding application of the statutory and regulatory provisions for individual recruits which come with that office, including injury benefits and awards, health and safety and equality legislation, and pension provisions. Lack of attestation carries potentially significant consequences for student officers in such forces who are also implementing the emergency deployment curriculum. Branch Board Circular 2 of 2019 refers. This has been raised with NPCC. PFEW consider NPCC must issue a circular reiterating the statutory requirement.

19. New recruits – training changes

A revised, temporary initial learning curriculum designed to lead to 'directed patrol' status has been developed by the College to support safe and legal frontline policing during the period of emergency provision. This is anticipated to comprise a 7-8 week programme to bring student officers to the level of directed patrol status currently set for Special constables. The curriculum specifically provides that such officers will always patrol with another officer who is to be confirmed in rank and that such students will be 'protected learners' so, as such will not be judged on their performance during this time. It is very likely that further amendments will need to be made, or Home Office/Police Consultative Forum (PCF) circulars issued to deal with issues as they arise, including pay issues, protection regarding disciplinary proceedings and implications for probation status on reversion to the original entry route programme.

20. Operational policing training

Most of the College's operational training courses have been postponed in light of the need to maintain social distancing. The College is looking to extend validity periods, for example in respect of firearms. PFEW has asked the College to engage with IOPC to ensure that they are content with any such arrangements.

21. Initial training

Forces are being encouraged to continue with the Uplift 20,000 programme. There are questions whether forces will have the infrastructure in place to fast-track the immediate induction of new recruits, such as sufficient equipment and tutors, and safety concerns. Many forces who have already introduced PEQF initial learning programmes are working with their partner Higher Education Institutions to provide learning other than in a face-to-face environment. However, any difficulties maintaining momentum on learning, including the new initial learning curriculum above, may have an impact on pay and probation arrangements and these issues are still to be considered and resolved. We are working to ensure that our members do not suffer any detrimental impact from the measures which are being taken.

22. Joint Related Fitness Testing

In-Service Fitness Testing: The NPCC and the College of Policing has advised forces to suspend all in-service fitness testing.

Fitness testing is not in Police Regulations: the College of Policing sets standards and provides guidance but decisions regarding the implementation of officer fitness testing sit with individual forces. Although the NPCC cannot require forces to comply with its advice, forces should be aware that there is a health and safety risk to officers of undertaking fitness testing during the COVID-19 pandemic given that social distancing rules cannot be followed due to the nature of the test.

Fitness Testing for New Recruits: The College of Policing has proposed that new recruit candidates should "self-declare" during the recruitment process that they can reach level

5:4 on the 15m Multi-Stage Fitness Test (MSFT). They advise that forces should re-test new recruits on entry (or as soon as practicable) and all new recruits must have undergone and been successful at the JRFT before they can undertake Personal Safety Training.

If a new recruit fails to reach the 5:4 standard upon taking the test they should have one further attempt three weeks from the first attempt. They will be subject to Regulation 13 should they not pass on their second attempt.

As for in service fitness testing, the College can only advise forces, and individual forces must decide whether or not to follow the College's advice on fitness testing for new recruits. However, the following issues are important to note:

- As with all other serving officers, there is a health and safety risk to probationers of undertaking the JRFT whilst social distancing restrictions are in place. Forces would therefore need to consider whether or not the health and safety risks associated with embarking on PST without having first passed the JRFT outweigh the health and safety risks associated with taking the JRFT.
- Under Regulation 13 a probationer's services may be dispensed with if the chief officer considers that s/he is not fit, physically or mentally, to perform the duties of the Office of Constable or is not likely to become an efficient or well conducted Constable. Failing the JRFT could be construed as evidence that the probationer is not physically fit to perform the duties of the office of Constable. However, there are significant concerns regarding the current validity of the JRFT, which have not yet been resolved by the College of Policing and NPCC. Because of the shortcomings of the current JRFT, the NPCC advised Chief Constables on 20th January 2020 that officers who fail the 15m MSFT should be given the opportunity to undertake additional testing (in the form of the Chester Treadmill Police Walking Test and gas exchange analysis testing) prior to any formal sanction.
- The College's advice to forces about the recommended number of retakes, and the recommended time between retakes, for probationers who join during the Covid-19 pandemic is widely different to the College's published guidance for implementing the JRFT. The published guidance says that forces must provide supportive action if an officer fails the JRFT on the first attempt and should be allow a series of at least two retakes before any performance management procedures are started, with intervals of at least 6 weeks between each attempt.
- In terms of broader consequences for members, we are still unsure of the implications for membership of life insurance and pensions schemes for new recruits who join the service without having first completed a fitness test (they will still have had their medical examination). We are seeking clarification.

Letter from Mike Cunningham's to Chief Constables dated 1 April 2020

[https://polfed.sharepoint.com/sites/pfewhqresearch/Shared%20Documents/Files/000%20COVID/JRFT/MC%20to%20CCs%20Re%20Uplift%20JRFT%20Final%20010420%20\(004\).docx](https://polfed.sharepoint.com/sites/pfewhqresearch/Shared%20Documents/Files/000%20COVID/JRFT/MC%20to%20CCs%20Re%20Uplift%20JRFT%20Final%20010420%20(004).docx)

23. Payment to students required to undertake directed patrol

The staff association position is that we have written to all Chief Constables asking that these officers should be moved up to pay point 1 on completion of the emergency training. Any lower payment would be inconsistent with the treatment of officers entering the service with the same experience as a Special, and doing the same tasks (directed patrol). This might bring discrimination claims in the future, dependent on the profile of such officers (eg age discrimination) but moreover would demonstrate unfairness and put students in harm's way for no extra remuneration, which we hope the NPCC would be keen to avoid.

The 2019 Annex F Determination, para 1(a)(ii)(2) states that the Chief Officer 'shall assign to Pay Point 1 (£24,177) any member who was prior to appointment serving as a Special Constable who has been assessed and has achieved 'safe and lawful' attainment to National Standards....'. The emergency curriculum is very closely aligned to the PEQF curriculum for Special Constables to enable them to achieve the qualified status: the guidance specifically states that it is designed to meet the minimum requirements for 'safe and lawful' accompanied patrol. The College have stated that the curriculum is heavily based on the new PEQF curriculum for specials. If a Special had achieved qualified status then becomes a PCDA officer they would immediately be placed on Pay Point 1 on commencement. We cannot see how it would be reasonable to say that an existing officer who has completed the (similar or identical) emergency curriculum should attract a salary for any less than that.

We believe that there is scope to pay £24,177 given the drafting in Annex F, part 12 which can be interpreted so that it gives chief officers power to pay 24,177 even if the officer is currently on pay point 0. Part 12, paragraph (1) says "subject to paragraph 2, the chief officer of police must determine the starting salary of any member of their police force who is appointed on a police constable degree apprenticeship scheme, and the starting salary of a PCDA constable must be an amount from £18,000 to [my emphasis] pay point 1 on the Constables' pay scale." Annex F, part 2 on the constables' pay scale for those who joined on or after 1 April 2013 sub paragraph (b) says that the salary paid to a member at pay point 0 shall be between £20, 370 and £23,585 (i.e. one pound less than pp 1 (23,586 in 2018/19). Based on the wording of paragraph (1) of part 12 forces can pay £24,177 while the officer was still on pp0. Officers would then move to pp1 on completion of year 1 curriculum but

would not see a change in salary - that would be their new increment date. If this approach were adopted, it would also mean that the pay was reckonable for pay and leave purposes & would avoid problem of officers being financially penalised because they have not completed academic requirements by 12 months service point. (This is another issue where we believe claims are likely, if it is not addressed now).

The NRT have stated that escalation to a higher pay point may present some regulatory and therefore logistical/ timescale challenges. We do not believe that to be correct. The NRT state that this is still a Work in Progress, and are seeking for a payment of £500. We have not been given the rationale for this level of payment. We are concerned that all the regulations have not been considered here.

All Branch Boards should seek for the overall PFEW position to be adopted.

24.TOIL

The Quick Reference Guide summarises the provisions of Police Regulations 25, Annex G – overtime and Regulation 26, Annex H – rest days and public holidays.

Our position is that Forces should allow days in lieu to be taken wherever possible, as soon as possible.

If an officer has chosen to take time off in lieu of an allowance and the chief officer is unable, due to the exigencies of duty, grant the time off in lieu of payment within three months, then our position is that the time off in lieu of payment falls away and a right to payment arises and the allowance paid.

The Police Consultative Forum is looking to increase the timeframe for taking monthly leave days for inspecting and superintending ranks. Our position is that Forces should exercise some discretion pending an amendment to regulations and determinations so that officers do not lose out.

Rejoiners

25.Officers being asked to rejoin, after retiring (or leaving early).

Regulations allow for this, but for officers who retired before age 55 (and therefore have a Protected Pension Age) there are tax penalties that may apply upon rejoining. In order to preserve the PPA and therefore avoid tax penalties, this requires a break in service of at

least one month, and in some instances six months. We have been told by the Home Office that the requirement for a gap in service in order to protect PPAs is to be suspended for rejoiners during the current crisis and that an announcement to this effect is imminent. However, as of 20th April this has not been confirmed.

26. Rejoiners abatement of pension

For those rejoining, pensions can be abated so that officers do not receive their pension in addition to a salary from the force. This is to ensure the rejoiner's pay does not exceed that received immediately prior to retirement. These means officers lose the pension payment.

Chief Constables already have the discretion not to apply abatement and we were expecting guidance from the Home Office to provide that this discretion not to abate is universally exercised on a temporary basis during the current crisis. This would allow members to continue to receive their pension and also receive their salary. This would obviously increase their income. The Home Office have not provided the expected information. Nonetheless, Chief Constables are not obliged to abate pensions.

We ask that all Chief Constables consistently exercise their discretion and do not abate pensions. Regulation K4 of the Police Pensions Regulations 1987 allows this.

Other rejoiner pension matters eg HMRC tax changes, autoenrolment, life cover

There are a number of issues pertaining to pensions that rejoiners will face. These may impact on the money they and their families receive should the worst happen. The NPCC and indeed the Home Office cannot amend these, and there is no immediate solution available. However, we believe it is crucial that all Chief Constables adequately inform officers rejoining of the financial risks they are personally having to absorb by rejoining before these matters are addressed.

It has yet to be officially confirmed that HMRC are temporarily waiving the requirement for a one month gap in service for re-joiners. If this relaxation is not subsequently confirmed and applied retrospectively then there are likely to be serious taxation consequences for those officers re-joining who retired prior to age 55.

In order to satisfy auto-enrolment legislation re-joiners will need to be offered membership of a pension scheme. At present this can only be the New Police Pension Scheme (NPPS) 2006 under which officers will be required to pay full rate contributions. This means they will benefit from life cover, but accrue no pension benefits. There is significant risk that officers will therefore opt out (and lose the life cover). We understand that subsequent and

retrospective membership of the 2015 CARE Scheme will be offered instead, but, the details of this and the timing of it are unclear.

There is a very real danger that returning officers will be volunteering to put themselves in potential harm's way without the comfort of doing so in the certain knowledge that there is adequate provision for their dependants should they pay the ultimate price. This is clearly inappropriate, and whilst we appreciate that the NPCC does not have the power to change this situation, we feel that it is important that Chief Constables are made aware of it, and rejoiners are made aware of it.

Branch Boards should discourage any rejoiners from opting out of the pension scheme, because of the life cover it brings.

Changes to scheme eligibility for rejoiners (whether retired or early leavers) will require regulatory change, and we also expect confirmation that the Injury Benefit regulations will apply to rejoiners.

Previous rejoiner schemes (30+ and 30++) are now closed, and whilst some forces have continued to operate a similar arrangement this is not currently formally backed up in regulations and guidance.

This has been raised with the NPCC and the Home Office and we understand that full and comprehensive guidance is due to be circulated as a matter of urgency.

27. HMRC tax charges – removal of requirement for 1-6 month break for rejoiners

Currently a retired rejoiner must adhere to the relevant break in service requirement to ensure that they do not attract additional taxation or penalties for breaching HMRC rules when they return to employment. This requirement is largely understood and implemented correctly by forces, though there have been instances where individuals have incurred additional tax liabilities and/or penalties by not adhering to the break in service requirement (whether by fault of the individual or force).

The Home Secretary announced on 26 March 2020 that the requirement for a break in service for those rejoining would be relaxed. However we still await details on how this relaxation will be implemented in order to ensure that retired rejoiners will not breach current HMRC rules and suffer tax penalties.

Guidance concerning the break in service requirement and the consideration of abatement is being compiled as part of the document that we understand the Home Office will be issuing regarding rejoiners. We will let you know as soon as we receive official confirmation.

28. Working from home – Claiming Tax Relief

The general rules of tax relief for WFH allow for a proportion of costs such as gas/electricity/additional necessary office furniture or equipment - wholly used for work and with no reimbursement received from employer - to be claimed as business expenses deducted from earnings. Individuals have to claim the relief themselves:

<https://www.gov.uk/tax-relief-for-employees/working-at-home>

There are a lot of restrictions on what can be claimed. Individuals take full responsibilities of understanding HMRC's requirements, keeping records and submitting the claims. Bear in mind this means submitting self-assessments which most officers will not normally do.

Alternatively, a force, if they wish, can pay up to £4/week until 5th April and £6/week from 6th April to cover some bills, which is tax-free. This is something that properly could be considered for officers and staff through expenses claims: however no employer has any obligation to pay this, it is discretionary.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alex Duncan'.

Alex Duncan, National Secretary, PFEW