



LONDON UNDERGROUND COMPANY COUNCIL (LUCC)
MEETING HELD ON 13 JULY 2017
WATERLOO ROOM, 7TH FLOOR PALESTRA
AT 10:00HRS TO 13:00HRS

MANAGEMENT ATTENDEES:

Brian Woodhead, Operations Director JNP (Chair)	BW
Nick Dent, General Manager Metropolitan Line	ND
Terry Deller, Senior Employee Relations Manager	TD
Peter Tollington, Senior Transformation Lead	PT

TRADE UNION ATTENDEES:

[REDACTED]	ASLEF
[REDACTED]	ASLEF
[REDACTED]	ASLEF
[REDACTED]	RMT
[REDACTED]	RMT
[REDACTED]	RMT
[REDACTED]	TSSA
[REDACTED]	TSSA
[REDACTED]	TSSA

In Attendance: Jennifer Sam, Employee Relations Advisor (Notes)
Rachel Kerry, Head of HR (Agenda item 4)
Chris Baitup, Senior Analysis Manager.(Agenda item 3)

No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
1.	Introductions and apologies for absence BW welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for round the table introductions. BW confirmed the agenda and introduced Rachel Kerry and Chris Baitup as guest speakers for agenda item 3 and 4.	M			
	Apologies were received from Jean Cockerill, Director of Employee Relations and	M			

	<p>UNITE, who were unable to attend the meeting.</p> <p>TSSA expressed disappointment that two of their requested agenda items 'TUPE' and 'Security Situation' were both rejected by LU. TSSA questioned if union agenda items were ever given any consideration before being rejected. They also stated that as the LU Company Council (LUCC) was a joint forum, items for the agenda should also be a joint matter. TD replied saying that a number of discussions had taken place with the unions and given that the transfer had now taken place, any issues they had with the TUPE, should now be raised with TfL. He explained that he was happy to have a conversation on lessons learned from the TUPE, but he did not consider that to be an emergency agenda item. In addition, the LU Machinery does not provide for emergency agenda items. TSSA asked that where items are rejected, a more detailed explanation is given.</p> <p>TD then referred to the item Security Situation and explained that this item was best discussed in a Health & Safety (H&S) arena only, and that discussing the same item in two different forums was not the best approach. TSSA responded saying discussing a matter in two separate forums was not new and had been done before. The issue was around ensuring those discussions were productive rather than whether they were being held in the appropriate forum. TSSA stated that they had made a number of requests to discuss issues on safety in a H&S forum, but that LU kept those discussions in the joint functional council. TSSA stated that they felt it was dangerous to segment discussion the issues on safety were a wider issue that could impact future industrial relation with LU.</p>	M			
Item 5	<p>Previous Minutes (27/04/2017) <i>Enhanced pay when under suspension</i> RMT requested that the minutes state that LU would respond to their letter, rather than RMT to follow up on this matter in writing.</p>	A	JS		
Item 7	<p><i>FTA: Appropriate forum for consultation on the proposed transfer of activities from LU to TfL.</i> RMT stated that although the related action was closed they felt the recent TUPE discussions had now set the tone for future industrial relations with LU. They explained that they felt they had been misled during consultation and that employees were transferred on what they believed to be inferior terms and conditions of employment. RMT stated that this discussion was not over and that they would be seeking redress.</p>	M			

<p>Item 5.2</p>	<p>TSSA stated that they had responded formally on their outstanding issues and would continue to pursue those in the TfL and LU Company Council.</p> <p>Matters Arising TD then stated that with the exception of the following actions all other actions were either closed or would be covered in the meeting under the appropriate agenda.</p> <p><i>Long Service Award (LSA)</i> TD stated that the action regarding the increase to LSA was now with LU to respond, following receipt of information from ASLEF. TD then referred to the second part of the action and confirmed that if a LSA scheme was part of an employee's terms and conditions of employment, this would transfer as part of a TUPE.</p>	<p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p>			
<p>Item 4</p>	<p><i>Grievance Procedure (Proposed new wording)</i> TD stated that the action to formally write to the unions regarding the proposed changes was still outstanding.</p>	<p>M</p>			
<p>2.</p>	<p>Business Update</p> <p>BW gave a business update which covered LU's Operational cost, Customer Accidents & Injuries, LCH, Excess Journey Times and Attendance.</p> <p>ASLEF asked for an update on the changes to the LU management structure. They explained that some employees were unsure where to raise issues at the senior level. RMT added that there was a perceived lack of leadership that needed to be addressed openly and transparently. In addition, the sudden departure of Steve Griffith, who was also the previous LUCG chair, had raised concerns.</p> <p>BW stated that consultation on the proposed new structure was still on-going. Until those discussions were concluded, the senior level structure consisting of Mark Wild, Lincoln Ofokansi and Peter McNaught etc, remained unchanged. BW added that Steve Griffith's previous role no longer exists in the LU structure.</p> <p>TSSA requested for information on LU's senior managers structure as part of Transformation.</p>	<p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>A</p>			

<p>2.</p>	<p>LU Performance CB talked through a presentation on the LU scorecard, (Appendix 1).</p> <p>TSSA asked if this level of information was being shared with operational employees. They also questioned the type of analysis that was carried out on the data. TSSA explained that one of the issues with the scorecard was around the way the information was interpreted and communicated. They felt that business decisions were being made without fully understanding the issues on the ground. They suggested developing a safety analysis tool, which was available to all employees, to allow line managers to interrogate the data for their particular area. CB replied saying that drop-in sessions were arranged to share more information about the scorecard with employees. Positive feedback was received from those who attended, which was taken on board.</p> <p>TSSA pointed out that Stations did not include the metric 'Workforce Injury'. They questioned why some areas had fewer metrics than others. CB explained that Stations were set different targets due to the nature of the work.</p> <p>TSSA stated that they felt issues highlighted by the scorecard were not always being addressed on the ground. They explained that although the metrics were being cascaded to the operational areas, they felt that; managers were not equipped with the right tools, resources and ability to deal with some the issues, and area managers were being set unrealistic targets which were out of their control. In addition LU had a culture of punitivism and being reactionary, particularly at the middle manager level.</p> <p>TSSA stated that they were keen to contribute to a more positive culture and industrial relations.</p> <p>BW acknowledged the points raised and stated this was still very early days and the work thus far should start to help LU improve for the future.</p>	<p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p>			
<p>3.</p>	<p>CCSG Update TD stated that a smaller sub-group had met to continue discussions on the joint initiatives arising from the pay deal. A number of meetings had taken place which were led by Peter McNaught. He stated that management anticipated a response from ASLEF and RMT following the most recent discussions.</p>	<p>M</p>			

	<p>ASLEF said that their general secretary had written to LU formally rejecting the management position and confirming that they would be contacting ACAS. ASLEF stated that the next steps were now with LU. TD replied saying that he had not received the letter or heard from ACAS, but once he had, LU would respond accordingly.</p> <p>RMT stated that ACAS served as a good purpose to assist with resolving issues and taking the heat out of a situation. If LU were to refuse to take this route then the unions would be left with no option.</p> <p>TSSA stated that refusing to seek the assistance of ACAS demonstrated that LU would rather be in a dispute than encourage positive industrial relations. They stated that they did not want to start assuming all union requests for ACAS assistance would be rejected, but they were noting when requests were being refused and would identify when a pattern started to immerge. .</p>	M M M			
4	<p>Diversity and Inclusion</p> <p>RK gave a high level update on the business goals for diversity and inclusion. She stated that it was early days but that the organisation was making good progress. She explained that there had been a real shift in focus for TfL, which was no around an inclusive culture rather than diversity and percentage targets. She said that Mark Wild had established a working group consisting pf representatives from across the organisation including the operational side, to focus on diversity and the culture piece.</p> <p>RK then talked through some of the initiatives in place for existing employees which included the Staff Network Groups and tailored career conversations. For new starters, targeting apprentices from deprived boroughs.</p> <p>TSSA asked for further details on the tailored career conversations and also stated that when targeting a particular group of individuals, the messaging and issues such as unbiased conscious also needed to be addressed.</p> <p>RMT stated that they had been trying for two years to have a conversation with LU on all matters related to Equality & Inclusion and that a ten minute update at Company Council was frustrating. They stated that not being involved in any of the initiatives set up by the organisation, particularly the group set up by Mark Wilk was unacceptable. RMT also stated that they felt that LU only took matters seriously</p>	M M M M			

	<p>when the unions were involved. They referred to cases of sexual harassment involving women and stated that women involved in such cases did not always come forward for fear of not receiving the right support. In addition to this, FLEET no longer sponsored college courses which undermined what LU were trying to achieve.</p> <p>BW responded saying that this agenda item was requested at the last LUCC and is also now a standing agenda item. This first update was to open the dialogue. If a further detailed discussion is needed to help shape the dialogue and take things forward he would be happy to arrange this.</p>	M			
5.	<p>Application of the Disciplinary Procedure ASLEF stated that they had concerns with what they felt was a peak in the number of CDIs being presented at the Trains Functional Council. ASLEF explained that the message from HR to line managers was that HR and the not the business, needed to decide the outcome of the CDI to ensure consistency. ASLEF added that this often led to employees being stood down for months at a time, which was both stressful to the employee and the business. ASLEF stated that the process should be applied correctly and not automatically assumed that a case would reach a CDI, until the investigation was concluded.</p> <p>TSSA stated that they were keen to avoid cases being prejudged before the investigation was carried out.</p> <p>BW replied saying that he acknowledged the concern around the increase in CDIs, due to the severity being disproportionate to the issue. He asked the unions to assume positive intent from LU regarding such cases. He stated that this issue would be looked into further.</p>	M M A		TD	

MEETING CLOSED 12:00 HRS