

Minutes of the Meeting of Amicus Goodmans Fields Branch Held on 23 January, 2007, Conference Room1, A/2 Core

Present: Suk Bryan (Membership Secretary), Andy Cole (Vice Chair), Hannah Davies, Devinder Dhir, Rema Diallo, Chris Friend, Graham Hay, Jan Koszuta (Chair), Bob Morton (Secretary), Mike Stewart .

Apologies: Gavin Blackmore (Treasurer), Harriet Culkin, Andrew Hall, Mike Lee, Louise Parker, Jennie Spill, Rob White, James Beazley, Sue Lawrence (London Regional Officer).

Minutes of the Meeting 30 November, 2006.

Speakers (a) The Secretary advised the meeting that Professor Phil Taylor had, unfortunately, been unable to combine business in London with speaking at Branch. He had been very happy to come to speak, his preference was for an evening meeting, and only charged expenses when speaking to a Trades Union audience.

The Secretary had indicated that he would contact him again clear of the Christmas and New Year period and in time to report to February Branch. The situation should be easier now that the Treasurer was in the process of obtaining a budget for the year. **(BM)**

(b) Agreed that Mandy Telford, who had unfortunately been ill when due to speak at Branch last year, should be re-invited to speak on 'Dignity at Work'. **(BM)**

(c) Agreed that Rob MacGregor be invited to give an overview of the merger with the T&G if the timing of the forthcoming ballot permitted. **(BM)**

Aldgate Union Comment was made on the focus of the LEF in respect that staff had been told they would be allowed to take a 'keepsake' of their time in Goodmans Fields when they moved. There was a need to continue monitoring the move.

Facilities for Cyclists There would only be one additional space for cyclists following the move, which did not do anything to improve the Bank's environmental profile, and there appeared to be a larger demand than there were spaces. Additionally, spaces were not logically distributed. Mike Pesvner had now set up a Bike User Group (BUG) to coordinate activity. **JK** would see that the matters were raised in the LEF and **BM** would work up an article for the Newsletter.

Pensions / Severance Pay

Noted that age enhancement was not to be removed for government employees as a result of the age discrimination legislation introduced in October last year. The union, having achieved a six month delay from the Bank before it implements its changes, was continuing to challenge it on its interpretation of the new legislations and its intended action. **BM** would produce an article for the Newsletter, including a link to the 'opt out' letter which Branch had produced and first circulated in autumn last year.

Pay 2007

The GT Committee had received the Bank's final offer, but details were currently under embargo.

There was a fairly lengthy discussion and airing of views including the following points:

- There should be an across-the-board cost of living rise.
- 2006 had seen a buoyant IT employment market.
- The British Computing Society recorded an 18% rise in some IT salaries in the last year.
- A number of members, at the top of their scales, were working at a higher grade but would not receive any rise.
- The bank's use of the market anchor, which should have moved up.
- The lack of evidence as to exactly what the market movement was that the Bank has used
- Amicus should produce its own 'market movement' figure.
- There was a lack of transparency in respect of the operation of bonuses.

The GT Committee would take on board what Branch had had to say.

The amalgamating of London Allowance with basic salary was also discussed. If this was achieved for a wider range of staff, the understanding was that it would have a beneficial knock on effect on bonuses and profit sharing. However, this effect would be limited. Though RBS claims its profit sharing scheme is the best amongst all its competitors, the meeting wanted to see the percentage paid raised to ensure more meaningful value. However, this issue did not come under the umbrella of Pay 2007.

Any Other Business

Performance Ratings The meeting noted that changes in the wording of the criteria attached to each performance level were being discussed. In particular, these would make it noticeably more difficult for an individual to be assessed as Level 3 or Level 4 and effectively made a Level 2 assessment more important to avoid. *(At Branch Committee on 30 January, agreed that these changes should be the subject of a Newsletter article)*

Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday, 27 February, 2007 – A2 Core Conf Room 1.

_____ Chair

_____ Date