



LONDON UNDERGROUND COMPANY COUNCIL (LUCC)
MEETING HELD ON 23 FEBRUARY 2017
IN THE DISTRICT ROOM, 7TH FLOOR EAST WING, 55 BROADWAY AT 10:00HRS TO 11:00HRS

MANAGEMENT ATTENDEES:

Steve Griffiths, Chief Operating Officer (Chair)	SG
Jean Cockerill, Director – Employee Relations	JC
Nick Dent, General Manager Metropolitan Line	ND
Terry Deller, Senior Employee Relations Manager	TD
Trish Ashton, General Manager – Victoria Line	TA

TRADE UNION ATTENDEES:

Finn Brennan	ASLEF
Terry Wilkinson	ASLEF
Gary Comfort	ASLEF
John Leach	RMT
Neil Atkinson	RMT
Vaughan Thomas	RMT
Lorraine Ward	TSSA
Nigel Bruver	TSSA

In Attendance: Jennifer Sam, Employee Relations Advisor (Notes)

APOLOGIES: Hugh Roberts (UNITE), Paul Maybin (UNITE), Kevin Mason (UNITE) and Hemant Patel (TSSA)

No.	Item	Minute Action Decision	Who	Due Date	Status
1.	Introductions and apologies for absence SG welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received on behalf of UNITE and Hemant Patel from TSSA.	M			

	<p>Previous Minutes</p> <p>SG confirmed that comments for the 8 Dec LUCC meeting notes were received from ASLEF. The unions had no further comments on the notes, these were noted as agreed.</p> <p>Matters Arising</p>				
Item 4 29/09/16	<i>Pensions Working Group (PWG) Terms of Reference</i> – JC confirmed that the proposed wording had been sent to TSSA for comment.	M			
Item 7 04/02/16	<i>Reps at Fact Finding Investigation</i> – JC confirmed that the draft message had been sent to all unions for comments. Unions confirmed they would review and respond.	A	All unions		
Item 5 29/09/16	<i>Sick Pay for New Starters</i> – TSSA advised that their request, outlining their data requirements, would be submitted.	A	TSSA		
Item 6 29/09/16	<i>Rates of Pay for CSA2</i> – JC confirmed that this issue was resolved as part of the Stations dispute and was therefore now closed. JC also stated that employee's pay would be backdated and that she would confirm the date this would be paid.	A	JC		
Item 2 08/12/16	<i>A joint representation at the next LU CC, to provide an overview on Night Tube and its implementation.</i> – TA advised that this item would be deferred until the business review on Night Tube was completed, at which point they would be in better position to fully understand the impact of Night Tube.	A	TA		
Item 4 08/12/16	<i>Viewpoint presentation to be given at Functional Councils</i> – JC confirmed that Viewpoint was due to be discussed at the Stations Functional Council on 28 Feb. A date for the Trains Functional Council was currently being arranged as the scheduled 22 Feb meeting was cancelled due to the Central Line strike. JC also confirmed that a presentation would be given across all functional councils.	M			
Item 7.3 08/12/16	<i>TSSA requested figures on turnover for part-time staff on Night Tube</i> – JC confirmed that the figures on turnover would be shared with the meeting notes.	A	JS		

3.	<p>CCSG Update</p> <p>TA gave an update on Night Tube. She confirmed that five lines were now running, the four-day trial on the Jubilee line was due to start on 5 March and that the focus of discussions was now around the remaining parts of the pay deal.</p> <p>ASLEF expressed concern that a number of Night Tube Train Operators (NTTO) at Arnos Grove were booked off to work on New Years Eve (NYE). ASLEF explained that their understanding of the default position was that NTTO would be booked on to work on NYE unless they requested, via a memo, to take annual leave. ASLEF explained that 16 NTTOs were booked off work on NYE and the managers have been unwilling to provide copies of their request to take annual leave. ASLEF added, employees have raised concerns that they were not given the opportunity to work and were forced to take annual leave. ASLEF also stated that they feel the launch was premature and had clear issues. Management should have been more open and honest to working with the unions on a joint solution to those issues.</p> <p>RMT added that they received a number of complaints from their members on the Piccadilly Line, on this issue. Members feel mislead and believe the real issue was around not having the right number of NTTO to provide the service. RMT also felt that issues on the Piccadilly Line had taken up a significant amount of time and that line managers needed to be advised, that this was not the best way to approach industrial relations.</p> <p>JC explained that if any employee or employees on the Piccadilly Line believed that they had been treated unfairly and had been forced to take annual leave on NYE against their will, then they had the opportunity to raise this as a grievance. Such complaints would be thoroughly investigated and appropriate action taken to address any issues. SG confirmed that the Piccadilly Line Night Tube launch was a challenging one. However, he would have supported delaying this if, there had been any suggestion that the service was not ready for a successful launch or that there was any doubt over job security.</p>	M			
		M			
		M			
		M			

4	<p>Underlying Medical Condition</p> <p>ASLEF felt that the LU Attendance at Work (AAW) Procedure was not being applied correctly where there was an underlying medical condition. ASLEF explained that employee's with a short period of absence due to what they believe to be an underlying medical condition, were being treated less favourable compared to employees who took longer periods of sickness absence. ASLEF also questioned, if an employee's General Practitioner (GP) confirms that an underlying medical condition exists and it's clear from the employee that their condition, such as a prolapsed disc, is an underlying medical condition, why the related absence would not be treated as a case conference.</p> <p>ASLEF believed this was a case of a local manager not correctly applying the AAW policy.</p> <p>JC replied saying that she would expect a line manager to seek advice from Occupation Health (OH) regarding whether or not there is an underlying medical condition. The line manager to then take appropriate action based on that advice. JC confirmed that OH provides independent and impartial medical advice, including reasons why they judge that an underlying medical condition does or does not exist.</p> <p>RMT stated that they had deep cynicism regarding the service OH provides and requested that OH be looked into, in addition to the AAW.</p> <p>JC stated, she felt that the AAW process could be improved, that there were issues raised about this at various forums on a regular basis and it had not been updated for some time. She suggested a separate session to focus solely on attendance matters and that this could include input from OH on their role and how they determine what is and isn't an underlying medical condition. JC stated she would develop a proposed agenda for such a meeting.</p> <p>RMT agreed to give some consideration to the suggested separate session to discuss the AAW.</p> <p>SG agreed to liaise with OH to understand the process for determining a an underlying medical condition.</p>	M			
		M			
		M			
		M			
		M			
		A	RMT		

5.	AOB				
5.1	<p>Agenda item request</p> <p>RMT requested for their item ‘Stations Attendance Meetings and Doctor Patient Confidentiality’ which was rejected for this meeting, to be discussed at the next LUCC. RMT explained that they were advised at the Stations Functional Council that a review of the format of Stations Attendance Meetings (SAM) was being carried out. They then raised there concerns in writing to JC, requesting that until the review was completed for all SAMs to be suspended. RMT stated that they felt the response from JC was unacceptable. RMT stated that proper consultation needed to take place before anything was implemented, as a result of the review.</p> <p>JC responded saying that line managers were obliged to ascertain the individuals fitness to attend work, and that OH were providing information to the line managers within the boundaries of their medical profession. She stated that she was satisfied that line managers were carrying out this activity correctly. She also confirmed that was being implemented was not outside any of LU policies. She agreed to include this item on the agenda for the next LUCC and suggested a representative from OH also attend the meeting</p>	M			
5.2	<p>Long Service Award (LSA)</p> <p>JC stated that due to the financial challenges the organisation was facing, the Executive Committee determined the reward for 40 years long service was to be reduced from £700 to £500. She confirmed this would take affect from 1 April 2017. She also confirmed that the reward for 25 years remained as £250 and the framed certificate would still be issued.</p> <p>ASLEF questioned the value of any savings that could be made from reducing the reward. They stated that money needed to be found from else where to pay employees. ASLEF also stated that they believed the last increase to LSA was part of a pay deal. JC asked ASLEF to provide written documentation confirming this.</p> <p>TSSA also questioned the savings that could be made, saying that any savings needed to be quantified and made in the right place. TSSA also stated that rather than being informed of savings on an ad hoc basis they would prefer to have early sight of an overall savings plan.</p>	<p>A</p> <p>M</p> <p>A</p> <p>M</p>	<p>JS</p> <p>ASLEF</p>		

	SG acknowledged the points raised by TSSA and ASLEF. He explained that whilst the savings from LSA were modest, these contributed to savings across the organisation in response to our financial challenges and made LSA sustainable.	M			
--	--	---	--	--	--

MEETING CLOSED 11:40 HRS