

**LONDON UNDERGROUND COMPANY COUNCIL (LUCC)  
MEETING HELD ON 7 DECEMBER 2017 AT PALESTRA  
AT 10:00HRS TO 12:00HRS**

**MANAGEMENT ATTENDEES:**

Peter McNaught, Director of Asset Operations (Chair)  
Nick Dent, Director of Line Operations  
Terry Deller, Senior Employee Relations Manager  
Claire O'Neill, HR Senior Consultant  
Stephen Capewell, Employee Relations Adviser (Notes)

**TRADE UNION ATTENDEES:**

██████████	ASLEF
██████████	ASLEF
██████████	ASLEF
██████████	RMT
██████████	RMT
██████████	RMT
██████████	TSSA
██████████	TSSA
██████████	TSSA
██████████	UNITE
██████████	UNITE

**Apologies:** Jean Cockerill, Director Employee Relations; Brian Woodhead, Director of Customer Service; ██████████  
██████████ UNITE.

No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
<b><u>Introductions and Apologies for Absence</u></b>					
	Peter welcomed everybody to the meeting and noted the introductions and apologies.	M			
<b><u>Governance</u></b>					
	ASLEF stated that they had submitted an item "Mobile Phones for Trains Functional Council Representatives" for the Agenda which had not been accepted. They would write again formally regarding this matter as they believe that the business is not complying with the original agreement. The trade unions raised the broader issue of acceptance of items on to the agenda and compliance with the relevant timescales. <b>Peter noted the comments and said that he would take on board both issues one regarding equal treatment for agenda submissions and provision of facilities and discuss them with Jean.</b>	M  D			
<b><u>Minutes of Previous Meeting</u></b>					
	ASLEF noted that [REDACTED] was not in attendance.	M			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Reps at Fact Finding Investigation</u></b>					
	RMT said they would be happy with the proposition if management clearly stated that the existing arrangements for both Metronet and Tube Lines remained. ASLEF agreed and said they were also supportive of the proposed words. TSSA and UNITE also supported the arrangement. <b>Terry agreed to recirculate the proposed wording and include them in the minutes before ensuring they were circulated to relevant management teams.</b>	M  M  A			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Application of the Disciplinary Procedure</u></b>					
	Terry confirmed that management were still investigating what information was available and what it was reasonable to provide. <b>An update would be provided before the next meeting.</b>	M  A			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Long Service Award (LSA)</u></b>					
	ASLEF confirmed receipt of Jean's most recent correspondence and stated that they were unhappy with the company's decision.	M			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Representational Issues – Tier 1 Safety Committees within Service Control</u></b>					

No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
	<p>RMT said they were having detailed discussions amongst the Trade Unions and their representatives and would be writing in the new year. ASLEF said that discussions should occur at Company Council where all represented Trade Unions could be involved.</p> <p>Peter confirmed that discussions were due at Directors level regarding this item. Terry added that previous discussions regarding representative's numbers had taken place at "functional" level with any agreement being ratified at Company Council.</p> <p><b>Nick suggested the Trade Union set out their proposed issues / concerns and suggested resolution then management would respond.</b></p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>A</b></p>			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Overtime payments during annual leave</u></b>					
	<p>Terry advised that the company was still reviewing the position given the complex calculations and system / processes required.</p> <p><b>An update would be provided as soon as possible.</b></p> <p>ASLEF said that all other TOC's had accepted their suggested pay formulae to address this issue.</p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p>			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Engineering Apprentice Training</u></b>					
	<p><b>Terry confirmed discussions were outstanding and would circulate a suggested date with a request that the Trade Unions reply with their detailed items for the agenda.</b></p>	<p><b>A</b></p>			
<b><u>Matters Arising: Night Canteen Facilities</u></b>					
	<p>UNITE suggested that management make a business case for those areas which had significant night workers (i.e. REW with 100+ employees).</p> <p><b>Peter said that Nigel would provide an update at the next meeting after taking all comments on board.</b></p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>A</b></p>			
<b><u>Business Update</u></b>					
	<p>Peter gave a business update regarding improvements on customer and staff safety, company performance and transformation.</p> <p>ASLEF asked if the drop in customers was directly linked to drop in revenue or where the reduction had taken place i.e. leisure, commuter.</p> <p>Peter confirmed that it was a change in Zone 1 / 2 and discretionary journeys.</p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p>			

No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
	<p>Nick added the change in customer / journeys had occurred across all TOCs.</p> <p>TSSA welcomed the opportunity to discuss ways in which this decline could be mitigated.</p> <p>TSSA requested an overview of transformation as the FTO had only received one briefing. They said productive discussions were underway.</p> <p>RMT said there may be a need to have discussions at Company Council on items which could not be agreed.</p> <p>Peter noted the comments and said if required an update could take place at Company Council (February 2018) but would be dictated following the meetings within the relevant consultative work streams.</p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>D</b></p>			
<b><u>Bullying and Harassment policy</u></b>					
	<p>ASLEF said the current policy needed reviewing as many cases took months to resolve. Better support was also required for both the instigator and receiver as there was a perception that the "first one" to raise an issue received support from the business and representation.</p> <p>RMT agreed and said that more support from the organisation was required for accredited managers and PMAs.</p> <p>TSSA said that they had received similar reports and comments from their local representatives and said increased use of informal resolution should be used.</p> <p>UNITE said that the time taken to resolve items / complaints was disproportionate.</p> <p><b>The Trade Unions said they would put a summary of their concerns, changes and ways to address them for review by management.</b></p> <p>Terry and Peter summarised it was a good first step for a summary / suggestion to be submitted regarding the specific areas of concern. The management team confirmed that upon receipt of any documentation management would provide a response within 4 weeks.</p>	<p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>M</b></p> <p><b>A</b></p> <p><b>D</b></p>			
<b><u>Secondment to CISA</u></b>					





No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
	<p><b>The management team undertook to raise the issues with TfLOH and report back, noting that this was a TfL-wide policy that LU did not have the ability to unilaterally amend.</b></p>	<b>A</b>			