RE: 30+ review Page 1 of 4

Thanks for the below – very helpful. I had just wanted to be clear on the reasons for a few things, so I'mcontent to accept your points.

If you could let me know the roughtimetable for the review, I'd be grateful.

Regards,

Police Pensions and Retirement PolicySection

Police Finance and Pensions Unit

Home Office

6th Floor Fry

2 Marsham Street

London SW1P 4DF

Tel: 0207 035 1878

Subject: RE: 30+ review

Questionnaireattached

From: Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 20088:32 AM

Subject: RE: 30+ review

Louise,

RE: 30+ review Page 2 of 4

thanksso much for the comments.

- · agreed.
- that was not deliberate. It should be inserted where Q5 is blank I think there were just version problems. I've put the question (back) in.
- I think the distinctionis between what the force does to raise awareness of the scheme, i.e.
 whatofficers find out and have access to before having to contact their force(word of mouth?
 website? posters?) and then, once they have contacted them, what further information they are
 routinely supplied with (copy of theguidance, force's own leaflet?). I think both will help us identify
 potentialshort-comings, especially in light of the fact that one officer in an ET made'rumours' about
 the scheme part of his defence.
- agreed.
- The rational behind theswapped columns was chronological order, hence why 2002 came first inthis
 instance along the lines of 'before v after'. I don't mind swapping thoughand am happy to go with
 your advice if this seems more logical.
- · agreed.
- The reasoning behind theomission was that, regardless of when the scheme closed in that particularforce, they would all need a policy on phasing out officers on it. Ibelieve it is worthwhile knowing what forces did who already closed the scheme- did they terminate all at annual review, do they still have people on it, andif so, what are they doing with them? For those forces still operating thescheme the answer is hypothetical and a forward look, but for some this hasalready taken place, and I believe it is worth covering both.

I hopethis makes sense and helps understand the logic behind intentional changes.

I havestill heard nothing from Treasury but am still hoping for final comments by theend of this week.

Thanksagain for all your hard work on this, it is very much appreciated.

From: Sent: Monday, February 11, 20086:33 PM

To:

@hm-treasury.x.gsi.gov.uk; Morris Merielle

Subject: RE: 30+ review

Thanks forsending through the revised questionnaire. Ijusthave a few further comments that Ithoughtworth passing on.

- ulletQuestion4 shouldperhapsread "retained".
- •Intherevised version that you sent out, there is nothing against question 5, and our suggested insertion (please outline of the process by which officers apply for the 30+ scheme and by which your forceassesses applications and makes decisions etc) has been deleted. I just wondered whether this was an intentional deletion (and what the motivation I seem to remember from the discussions we had on $25^{\rm th}$ Janthat we were keen to discover whether forces

RE: 30+ review Page 3 of 4

were adhering to the appropriateprocessesor whether they were thingsthat did not correspond with the guidance. This might come out in the question about I'mnot 100% clear about the between question 7 and 8 wetrying to ask question 8 could be subsumed into the possible question 5 above, or do they essentially refer to the samething?

- •Question16 Irememberfrom our discussions on $25^{\rm th}$ thatwe were keen to see copies of paperwork from e.g. EmploymentTribunals (we got the paper copy of the one that you sent, many thanks forthat) could weask for relevant paperwork where appropriate?
- •Question17 could perhapsswapthe "2002" column and the "Last12 months" column around otherquestions ask for the last 12 months first, then the total, so for the sake ofconsistency it might read better and be easier to fill in (andanalyse) if this table were the same.
- •Questions19 and 20 we could possibly consolidate this into one question, to avoid duplication (if a force planning to keep the scheme open until 2010, then the answer to 20 will surely automatically be "no"). We could therefore askwhether a force is planning to keep the scheme open until 2010, and if not, give their reasoning and state when they anticipate it will take effect. I'm slightly thinking outloud on this one, so happy to hear any other views as I mighthave missed some that we need to keep.
- •Question22 thinkwe had suggested expanding on this question so thatitreads "if your force intends to keep operatingthe scheme, what plans do you have for phasing out those officers who arecurrently on the scheme" I hopeall the above comments make sense, and that they aren'ttoomajor happyofcourse to discuss further, as I'maware that I'veasked a few Regards,

Police Finance and PensionsUnit

6th Floor Fry

London SW1P 4DF

Cc: Morris Merielle Subject: 30+ review

circulate a final version toforces is quickly approaching. I have attached comments we have received sofar.

I amstill expecting your comments on the 30+

<<HHS104-0000-2008blank 30+ survey-v4.doc>>

Workforce Strategy

RE: 30+ review Page 4 of 4

Accordingly, the copying, dissemination or distribution of this message to any other person may constitute a breach of Civil or Criminal Law.

This email message has been swept for computerviruses.

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please return it to the address it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system.

This email message has been swept for computer viruses.
