



To: Public Services Sector Executive Committee

8 July 2025

2025/01007S

Dear Colleague

Public Services Sector 2025 Action Taken

Following Conference, we have laid out an Action Taken document that we will use to assess priorities and track work on motions passed and remitted. The intention is that this is used as a working document through the term of the PSSEC as well as for the annual report in 2026.

Yours sincerely

Steve Thomas

Deputy General Secretary

**PUBLIC SERVICES SECTOR – ACTION TAKEN 2025 to 2027–
WORKING DOCUMENT**

Section A – Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Composite Motions 1, 2

Motion 1: Support for Neurodiversity

There has recently been an increasing awareness of neurodiversity combined with an apparent increase in recognition and/or diagnosis which may come relatively late for some people after a lifetime of masking and coping. Times of change and/or pressure can be particularly difficult and might lead to staff who have unrecognised neurodivergence slipping into performance management processes which will be unhelpful and counterproductive if they do not include steps for delaying other processes to give time to consider reasonable adjustments.

Conference instructs PSSEC to:

Work with branches and employers to improve support for neurodivergent staff, and collate examples of good practice from across the sector or beyond.

Including:

- What reasonable adjustments might work well for neurodivergent people.
- Awareness training for staff and specifically the additional awareness that managers may need.
- Neurodiversity inclusive policies which are accessible by default.

Department of Health Branch

Carried

Motion 2: Proactive Support for Neurodivergent Colleagues

Conference notes and welcomes the increasing awareness and acceptance of neurodiversity in the workplace and in wider society. Due to this increased awareness, many people now recognise their neurodivergence (some examples being ADHD, autism & dyslexia), however, waiting times for formal diagnoses are long. A formal diagnosis is not needed to seek support from occupational health services, or reasonable adjustments. However, the current system works best when employees already know the adjustments they need. This clarity is often lacking for those without a formal diagnosis and/or for those who have realised their neurodivergence later in life.

Consequently, both employees and line managers can feel uncertain about how to identify and implement the most effective

Carried

<p>reasonable adjustments. A more proactive approach, wherein occupational health services recommend a range of potential reasonable adjustments for employees, would more effectively support those who are uncertain about their needs, or the options available to them. This goes hand-in-hand with employer training for staff on neurodiversity.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to raise this issue with Cabinet Office and empower branches to engage with employers to ensure that occupational health providers offer proactive advice on reasonable adjustments. Employers then can put these in place for neurodivergent employees, including those without formal diagnoses.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 3: Nuance on Office Attendance Mandates</p> <p>The directive from the Cabinet Office mandating 60% office attendance has caused confusion, frustration and stress among employees. Often, the breadth of roles that staff carry out, which might already include spending extensive periods of time working away from home, is not taken into consideration. Additionally, the 'one size fits all' approach lacks nuance and fails to consider the diverse working arrangements needed to ensure a truly inclusive and equitable approach to working, something that should be at the core of any equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) strategy.</p> <p>We recognise that not every role is suited to hybrid working, but where hybrid working is practicable, it provides numerous well-evidenced benefits for employees and employers. Additionally, some employers are monitoring office attendance on an individual level via means such as door-swipe data or Wi-Fi usage. We recognise the potential utility of employers understanding building-level occupancy, however, individual monitoring creates unnecessary pressure on employees to meet attendance quotas rather than focussing on productivity.</p> <p>Furthermore, digital attendance monitoring can create an inaccurate picture of office attendance, particularly where staff spend time at working at their non-contractual location, such as on fieldwork or visiting other sites. This creates an additional burden on employees and line managers who must justify apparent low attendance rates flagged from inappropriate use of these data.</p> <p>Our sister union, the FDA, has recently called for a comprehensive review of the 60% mandate in favour of truly flexible approach. Allowing fully flexible working arrangements, including remote working, offers numerous benefits. Many employees feel they have a better work-life balance since remote working has become the norm. Enabling staff to individually select their most efficient workspace can benefit both employee and organisation. Remote working is also more inclusive to those with caring responsibilities and/or disabilities and also has advantages for those using office sites, which then have reduced noise and become less overwhelmingly busy.</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office to advocate for a more nuanced approach to office attendance. Such an approach should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual needs of employees, including their work tasks, personal circumstances and any protected characteristics they may have; • The need for a robust Equality Impact Assessment on the 60% office attendance mandate, and any future office attendance policies; • The need for functional office spaces, including but not limited to, proper DSE setup and desk availability, meeting spaces, quiet rooms, and appropriate facilities such as restrooms and catering. <p>Additionally, conference instructs PSSEC to use any appropriate means to resist the use of digital tools to monitor individual office attendance of employees.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Section B: Organising and Communication</p>		
<p>Motion 4: Campaign on Academic Publishing Costs</p> <p>Prospect represents thousands of scientists working for many different employers, including a large number in the public services. Conference notes that increasing costs associated with academic publishing are becoming a significant burden on public sector research budgets. Contrary to popular belief, researchers are not paid by academic journals to publish their research; rather employers often have to pay for their research to be published and openly accessible.</p> <p>Disseminating research via publications in scientific journals is an essential part of the scientific process. Journal publications remain the primary “currency” for research scientists, including those in the public sector, and is essential to ensure research impact and career progression. However, the writing, reviewing, and editing of scientific papers is predominantly carried out on a voluntary basis by researchers who receive no additional compensation for these efforts.</p> <p>Publication fees do not go towards those conducting the majority of the labour, rather, publishing houses exploit this free labour to net huge profits of over \$19 billion USD annually and this industry has one of the biggest profit margins which can be up to 40%*.</p> <p>Conference recognises:</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That scientific publication is a vital step in the scientific process. <p>Conference believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the current model of academic publishing (which often requires substantial publishing fees) profits from the unpaid labour of researchers, including those in the public sector; • The exploitation of unpaid labour - and the charging of extortionate publication fees - diverts valuable resources away from actual research and innovation, which could otherwise be used to advance scientific knowledge and public welfare. <p>Conference therefore instructs PSSEC to seek the most effective ways to raise these issues of academic publishing and to lobby for improvements via suitable routes. Key points to consider should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness among public sector employees and the wider community about the issues surrounding academic publishing costs and their impact on research and innovation; • Engaging with stakeholders, including academic publishers, funding bodies and government agencies, to discuss alternative publishing models that do not impose financial barriers on researchers; • Collaborating with other branches, unions, academic institutions, and research organisations to build a coalition for change. * https://wordsrated.com/academic-publishers-statistics/ <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 5: Facility Time Agreements</p> <p>Many of the departmental level representatives within MOD are covering multiple roles on behalf of Prospect and struggling to balance this within their agreed facility time allocations. Their managers, whilst often sympathetic and supportive, do not have the means to release the representative for more than this time as they cannot cover that resource by other means.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office on the reinstatement of full-time representatives across the public service departments.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOD UKStratCom Branch</p>	Carried	

<p>Motion 6: The use of X/Twitter within the Civil Service</p> <p>Recent events in the news have highlighted the increasingly erratic and often controversial views displayed by the owner of X/Twitter, both generally and within posts on the platform itself; and the relaxation of content moderation rules have seen the platform become increasingly tolerant of, and a platform for, hate speech.</p> <p>Given the very direct personal connection between the owner and the platform itself, is it appropriate for the Civil Service to still use X/Twitter? The political leanings and very public statements of the owner do not feel at all compatible with the Civil Service values and Franks Principles such that it could be said to send entirely the wrong message for the Civil Service to be actively using the platform in any official capacity.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office to ensure that Government departments and arms-length bodies cease using the platform and instead move to alternative provisions which are better aligned with Civil Service standards and values.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">The Planning Inspectorate Branch</p>	<p>Remitted</p>	
<p>Motion 7: Communication with Branches</p> <p>It is noted that PSSEC engage with the Cabinet Office on behalf of all public service sector branches, however, it is noted that aside from pay meetings, branches rarely see any detail regarding what this engagement covers and any outcomes.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to review its engagement and communication mechanisms to provide greater clarity with the public service sector branches it serves.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOD UKStratCom Branch</p>	<p>Carried</p>	
<p>Motion 8: Branch Organisation</p> <p>This Conference notes that improving branch organisation, membership numbers and density is crucial in building Prospect influence and representation in public sector branches.</p> <p>Many of our branches organise themselves with success, using local knowledge and experience to develop strategies to reach out</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>to members and to recruit new members. However, there are others that require greater support and a Public Sector Organising strategy. The support of PSSEC would help this and could identify and help share best practice.</p> <p>Improvements to union access and rights of representatives and how union recognition is achieved through the Make Work Pay agenda have the scope to support greater union activity and opportunities. This makes the development of organising and communications plans even more of a priority for the Public Sector.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to develop and implement a Public Sector Organising plan to run across the next two years that can -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Map membership information to assess the health of branches - Identify where and what additional support is required - Assist in reps' development and with training needs - Develop and share good practice with and between branches - Improve how and when the union as a Sector communicates with members - Assess where Prospect may solidify or gain union recognition in the Public Sector <p style="text-align: center;">Public Services Sector Executive Committee</p>		
---	--	--

Section C: Wellbeing, Health and Safety

<p>Motion 9: Training on the Prevention of Suicide</p> <p>According to gov.uk (https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/near-to-real-time-suspected-suicide-surveillance-nrtss-for-england/statistical-report-near-to-real-time-suspected-suicide-surveillance-nrtss-for-england-for-the-15-months-to-august-2023), between August 2023 and October 2024 out of 5,464 deaths recorded as suicide across the UK: - 4,065 (74.4%) were in males and 1,399 (25.6%) in females - 571 (10.5%) were in people aged 10 to 24, 2,003 (36.7%) in people aged 25 to 44, 2,098 (38.4%) in people aged 45 to 64, and 792 (14.5%) in people aged 65 and over.</p> <p>Modern lives are busy and high stress. Across the public sector there have been significant loss of pay (14 years of pay restraint), increases in workload and a reduction in staff numbers (with more to come). These factors only exacerbate the problem. This is increasing the number and complexity of personal cases reps support with. Sadly, some members do mention that they are considering suicide. These situations are incredibly stressful for our reps, who don't always feel they have the confidence and training to be able to properly support members in these situations.</p>	<p>Remitted</p>	
---	-----------------	--

<p>There are many charities and organisations who can provide awareness, training and support for those who may meet people considering suicide. Current reps training focuses on how to manage and follow the process to resolve personal cases. However, it doesn't fully consider the wellbeing element. These charities could help to bridge that gap and be a place for reps to gain support themselves, and to direct members too for that specialist help. This motion is not calling for Reps to be trained as counsellors, but they should have awareness and a toolkit so that they feel more confident they are saying and doing the right things.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission a review of the level of suicide among public sector workers, and to compare this to other sectors (are public sector workers more or less prone to suicide); • Review suicide awareness / prevention training for Reps and include suicide awareness module as part of the Reps training programme, this will better support our vital Reps when they are helping members; • Produce a toolkit for Reps who are dealing with members considering suicide; • Report findings to Prospect NEC following a trial with the expectation that this could be rolled out across Prospect. <p style="text-align: right;">Environment Agency Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 10: Health and Safety Representatives</p> <p>A TU Health and Safety Representative plays a vital role in ensuring that staff work in a safe working environment. We know that the safest and healthiest places to work are those where they involve the trade union health and safety representatives and as such, they form an integral part of their department and business units safety culture. A H&S Rep is likely to cover multiple business units, sites and locations in the course of their duties. The duties of a H&S Representative are covered by regulations (Safety Representatives and Safety Committees Regulation 1977) and their duties are NOT and DO NOT fall under facility time. To fulfil their role their duties are treated as part of their normal paid job. Their managers, whilst often sympathetic and supportive, do not have the means to release them to conduct these duties as they cannot cover that resource by other means.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office on the reinstatement of full-time H&S representatives across the public service departments.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOD UKStratCom Branch</p>	<p>Lost</p>	

<p>Motion 11: Migraine Awareness Campaign</p> <p>Migraine is a serious neurological condition requiring support and understanding from employers. Migraine is not just a headache but a condition that can come with a variety of symptoms including: nausea; vomiting; extreme fatigue; visual disturbance; and stroke-like symptoms. Migraine is unpredictable, it can vary not just from person to person but from attack to attack. As yet there is no cure for migraine. Employers should seek to support employees who advise they experience migraine, creating a culture in which migraine is understood and talked about openly, meaning staff feel more comfortable to share that they have migraine and ask for the support they need. (https://www.britsafe.org/safety-management/2024/migraine-in-the-workplace-what-needs-to-change)</p> <p>Migraine affects 1 in 7 (https://migrainetrust.org/) of the population and is most common amongst adults of working age. It can severely impact working life for those who experience attacks. It is believed migraine costs the UK economy close to £9 billion per year, with an estimated 43 million days lost from work and education due to migraine attacks. In a survey by the Migraine Trust 29% of respondents reported having to move to part time work and 25% reported having to leave their job entirely due to their migraine. Over half of respondents living with migraine said their workplace had not made reasonable adjustments. (The Migraine Trust: https://migrainetrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/State-of-the-Migraine-Nation-impact-rapid-review.pdf)</p> <p>The impact on workers with migraine can be significantly reduced if people with migraine are supported better at work. Even a small amount of help from employers can be decisive in enabling people with migraine to work productively. Not receiving support from an employer or feeling stigmatised in the workplace due to the misguided belief that migraine is ‘just a headache’ can have profound consequences for employees. (https://migrainetrust.org/live-with-migraine/migraineandwork/managing-migraine-at-work)</p> <p>Where appropriate, specific actions employers can already take to support migraine sufferers including calling for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to absence management processes to avoid triggering absence-management sanctions that put employees at risk of being disproportionately impacted. Migraine attacks typically last between 4 to 72 hours meaning people with migraine are more likely to take short-term sickness absence due to their condition. • Flexible working arrangements, allowing people with migraine to better manage their workloads during periods of reduced symptoms. • Changes to the physical environment, which might include providing appropriate assistive technology or anti-glare screen protectors for staff working on computers. 	<p>Carried</p>	
---	----------------	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of working from home – for many people with migraine, the home environment is most easily tailored to their individual needs and for roles where work can be done remotely, this might be a suitable reasonable adjustment to consider. <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to campaign for the public sector to lead by example, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising awareness of the issues migraine sufferers face; • Supporting members living with migraine; • Working to ensure that the seriousness of their condition is recognised by their employers and work to prevent discrimination against staff in the workplace due to their migraine diagnosis; • Assess how Government Property Agency design standards for new and refurbished buildings can better support migraine sufferers; • Reviewing migraine (and migraine related) policies across the public sector; <p>and to identify best practice, for Branches to take back to their employers.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Environment Agency Branch</p>		
---	--	--

Section D: Pensions

<p>Motion 12: Gender Pension Gap</p> <p>The gender pension gap in the civil service is currently 44%, significantly larger than the gender pay gap. The reason for this is at least three-fold, the gender caring gap which causes about 1/3rd of the gender pension gap, the disproportionate burden on women with caring responsibilities often meaning they do not work or work part-time, and the gender pay gap itself. Even with current efforts to reduce the gender pay gap the gender pension gap will not be eliminated until 2088. A large proportion of the issue is historical, it was not until 1997 that it was outlawed to ban employees from joining occupational pension schemes because they worked part-time.</p> <p>This meeting notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extremely high gender pensions gaps in the civil service and other public service schemes has been reported in Prospect's 2024 Gender pension pay gap report; • The correspondence between the previous Deputy General Secretary and the last government which indicated that this 	Carried	
--	---------	--

<p>is not being treated anywhere near as seriously as it should be.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch a comprehensive campaign aimed at reducing the pension gap within the public sector and civil service, and advocating for broader market-wide changes; • Continue to highlight this issue with government, employer and members themselves; • Help branches understand the causes of the gender pension gap and what they can do to address it with their employer / members; • Consider what scheme design changes would be most likely to tackle the gap and campaign for them. <p style="text-align: right;">Met Office Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 13: Alpha Pension and State Pension Age Link</p> <p>The Alpha Pension Scheme benefits can be taken from your Alpha Normal Pension Age (NPA) without any early payment reduction. The NPA is the later of age 65 or your State Pension age. As the NPA is linked to the State Pension Age if the state Pension Age changes so will the NPA. If you claim your pension before its NPA it will be reduced for early payment. So, if the State Pension Age changes to 68 or higher during the time a member is a member of the Alpha Pension Scheme and that member chose to retire at 67 the pension paid would be reduced for early payment. This would have the effect of devaluing the contributions paid into the Alpha Pension Scheme prior to the increase in the State Pension Age to 68 or higher. The Pensions Act 2014 provides for a regular review of the State Pension age, at least once every 5 years. Currently anyone born after 6 March 1961 the State Pension Age is 67. Under the Pensions Act 2007 the State Pension age for men and women will increase from 67 to 68 between 2044 and 2046. There is a suggestion that the timetable for the increase in the State Pension age from 67 to 68 could change because of a future review. Before any future changes could become law Parliament would need to approve the plans. There has been a suggestion that the State Pension Age may be increased in the future. The effect of this on the contributions already paid into the Alpha pension scheme would in effect be to devalue the pension contributions as you would have to wait longer before being able to draw down unreduced benefits.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Government (Cabinet Office and DWP) to ensure that pension benefits already accrued in the Alpha pension scheme are not devalued by any subsequent increase in the State Pension Age.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">The Planning Inspectorate Branch</p>	Carried	

<p>Motion 14: Civil Service Pay and Pensions</p> <p>In recent months, there have been briefings to the press related to increasing public sector wages, such as Civil Servants, and lowering pensions in return. This has been backed by Lord O'Donnell, former Cabinet Secretary as a "win-win" reform that could save the exchequer money. To save money, this can only be seen as a deterioration of members pay and conditions.</p> <p>The favourable pension scheme is one reason that many Civil Servants continue to work within the sector. Any reductions in this could have unforeseen impacts related to retention of staff. This possible reform could be introduced with the full amount not transferred across under the cover of untransparent movement of funds between the pay and pension pots.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to resist all attempts to deteriorate members pensions in return for increases in salary</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Met Office Branch</p>	Carried	
<p>Common debate on motions 15, 16, 17</p>		
<p>Motion 15: Access to the Civil Service Pension Portal</p> <p>The UK Civil Service Pension Scheme is one of the largest public service pension schemes in the country. Understanding your pension is essential for financial planning as it helps you estimate your retirement income and make informed decisions about your savings and investments. Regularly reviewing your pension details ensures accurate benefits and prevents issues with payments. However, Civil Service pensions are now managed through the Civil Service Pension Portal, and annual benefit statements are no longer automatically sent out by post. Every webinar about Civil Service pensions, including those organised by Prospect, says that the first step to understanding your pension is to login to the Pension Portal. Unfortunately, this is not as simple as it seems. It is very easy to get locked out of the portal, and next to impossible to get back in. There is no automatic way to unlock your account, and emails and phone calls to the helpline often go unanswered. Members have reported waiting over an hour and a half on the phone helpline before giving up and waiting months for responses from the email helpline. These issues are leaving Prospect members unable to make informed financial decisions and plan for retirement. Given the impact of this, we cannot tolerate having a non-functional pension portal for a scheme affecting millions of civil servants.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office (and where appropriate the pensions administrators) to ensure that</p>	Carried	

<p>access to the portal, including user support, is improved to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>Conference additionally instructs PSSEC to canvas public sector members to determine priorities for the portal, given the provider is due to change in late 2025.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 16: Civil Service Pensions</p> <p>The support provided to the Civil Service Pension Scheme members is shockingly bad, and falls well short of expected standards. Members are dissatisfied with the service the current provider (MyCSP) provides to Civil Servants, and are very concerned that this will get even worse under the new provider Capita, from Sept' 25. This terrible service includes: not receiving Annual Benefit Statements (ABS), not receiving pension calculations prior to retirement, and the poor service when contacting them etc. This cannot continue and has to be resolved.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to address these concerns by all means possible, lodging complaints via the appropriate body in Government and elsewhere, and insisting on extensive improvements. Also to start a robust campaign to push for these improvements, including encouraging all Civil Servants to submit complaints about the provider, and all its inadequacies, to the appropriate Ombudsmen.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">DSTL Branch</p>	Carried	
<p>Motion 17: CSPA Administration</p> <p>This Conference is concerned about the risks associated with the upcoming change of administrator of the Civil Service Pension Scheme (CSPA) from MyCSP to Capita.</p> <p>The Cabinet Office awarded a 10 year contract to manage the CSPA from September 2025 to Capita in November 2023.</p> <p>The change from the current administrator will greatly add to the pressures on those running the scheme at a time when they are also struggling to implement the extremely complex McCloud Remedy to very tight statutory deadlines.</p> <p>Current and former civil servants, and other members of this scheme, rely on the scheme administrator in significant ways: from depending on the pensioner payroll process to receive income, to needing accurate and timely information to plan for retirement.</p> <p>Any problems with the complex project to switch administrator could have serious implications for members.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p>	Carried	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the relevant Minister is informed of members' concerns and of the potential risks involved with the change in scheme administrator; • Ensure that the relevant Minister has appropriate oversight of the project to switch pension scheme administrator; • Engage with Capita about the improvements they may be able to make to scheme members' experiences; • Engage with Public Sector branches to gather feedback on performance of the scheme administration and raise issues with relevant parties, including the Cabinet Office. <p style="text-align: center;">Public Services Sector Executive Committee</p>		
<p>Sector E: Pay</p> <p>Common debate on Motions 18, 19, 20, 21</p>		
<p>Motion 18: Support Specialists and End Pay Tourism</p> <p>Conference agrees that pay systems across the Public Services are broken. The chronic degradation of pay over more than a decade has resulted in wages at many grades being incompatible with normal life aspirations, such as buying a home, raising a family, and maintaining a decent standard of living. As a result, many staff have been forced to 'chase the money' by moving between ALBs, agencies, and other government departments simply to maximise their salaries rather than find suitable long-term posts. This chronic issue is now so well-accepted it even has its own term: 'pay tourism'.</p> <p>The constant flow of staff between posts simply to get more pay is likely to be damaging in any organisation, but in many departments and ALBs, it is especially pernicious. This is due to the technical, scientific, and specialist skills, along with experience time in post, which are so crucial to the department's delivery. It is time for Government to fully recognise the value in posts that require specialist knowledge and skills which can often only be acquired over time, and reduce the 'the only way to get on is to move on' consequence of our pay structures.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to explore all reasonable avenues, with the aim of achieving a career pathway for specialists which allows them to progress, while departments retain expertise and experience. In addition, we instruct PSSEC to lobby for a root and branch review of Civil Service pay with the aim of uplifting pay across equivalent grades in order to achieve equalisation and reduce inefficient 'pay tourism'.</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

EFRA Branch		
<p>Motion 19: Pay Award Timing</p> <p>This Conference notes that the College of Policing pay offer 2024 was not able to be made to Prospect until 30th January 2025 and still will not be paid to members until end of March 2025. The pay review date for the College of Policing is 1st July annually. Whilst members have unfortunately had to become used to waiting for their annual pay rises over recent years, as they are regularly not paid until November, this situation is now untenable.</p> <p>The Cabinet Office Guidance is required to frame the pay offer. This year the Guidance was not even issued until 29th July - it is accepted that this will have played a role in the delay. As the sponsoring body for the College, which is an ALB, is the Home Office, who have to sign off any pay offer before it can be made to the unions. The College itself acts quickly on receipt of the Cabinet Office Pay Guidance to prepare their pay offer, discuss this early with the trade unions and send to Home Office, but the Home Office consistently drags its feet over sign off, and was spectacularly slow this year, showing no consideration to College staff waiting for their pay rise at all.</p> <p>Prospect has made clear to the College that this year's pay delay was unacceptable and that they must make clear to the Home Office that they cannot continue to delay pay rises for the College year on year. Where there is no delay to the issuing of the Cabinet Office Guidance, CoP members expect their pay awards to be delivered as close to the annual review date as reasonably possible (allowing time for meaningful union negotiation).</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC negotiators to approach the Cabinet Office to ask them to ensure that the delegated departmental sign off is not unnecessarily and inexplicably delaying pay awards for smaller sponsored organisations at the end of the process</p> <p style="text-align: right;">College of Policing Branch</p>	Carried	
<p>Motion 20: Non-consolidated Pay and Civil Service Pay Remit</p> <p>The non-consolidated pay of different departments and organisations varies greatly, with some at 1% and others above 3%. The Civil Service Pay Remit makes it difficult to transfer non-consolidated pay to consolidated pay, requiring a targeted 'pay flex' case. Consolidated pay provides members with a steady, predictable salary each month that is pensionable, whereas non-consolidated payments are often subject to unfairness, opaque bonus schemes, or pay equality issues.</p> <p>The Met Office has a high non-consolidated pot of 2.9%, and the branch has been attempting to transfer this to consolidated pay which has been resisted by management. Other branches are in a similar position.</p>	Carried	

<p>Given that pay is a significant factor in recruitment and retention, it is crucial that all pay is directed towards consolidated pay to help retain and recruit staff. Therefore, all avenues should be explored to transfer non-consolidated pay to consolidated pay.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to work with the Cabinet Office to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance that facilitates the transfer from non-consolidated to consolidated pay pots, and encourages departments, organisations, and Arm's Length Bodies to do this without affecting the allowed percentage increase in pay bills, in the Civil Service Pay Remit; • Request that the pay remit instructs departments, organisations, and ALBs to reduce their non-consolidated pay pots to 1%, with any amount above 1% being linked to clear, demonstrable evidence that the payments will aid in recruiting and retaining staff. <p style="text-align: right;">Met Office Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 21: Delegated Pay</p> <p>This conference notes that for the purposes of annual delegated pay negotiations for delegated grades, the Cabinet Office produces comparative pay information for generalist grades for employers to use when constructing their pay offers to be competitive in an internal civil service 'market'. For certain specialist roles, such as chartered surveyors, vets, legal professionals, accountants, and procurement professionals, information on private sector salaries is also collated for employers to refer to in pay negotiations. In neither case are unions routinely provided with this key bargaining information by delegated employers.</p> <p>Regarding the specialist pay comparator information in particular, in the example of chartered surveyors private sector comparative pay levels shown to Prospect VOA pay negotiators, the private sector roles chosen as comparators were not comparable to chartered surveyor roles in VOA.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office Pay and Reward team to seek open provision of all key bargaining information to unions at the delegated level, and to seek that where civil service specialists' pay is being compared with private sector salaries, unions are consulted on the comparators that are being used.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Valuation Office Agency Branch</p>	Carried	
<p>Motion 22: Capability-based Pay</p> <p>This Conference supports the development of capability-based pay frameworks to enable members to move through pay scales. This</p>	Carried	

<p>Conference instructs PSSEC to work with employers to adopt the following principles when negotiating for such systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: Objectives must be clear and easily understood by everyone across all areas and pay bands • Fairness: Fairness across the board — providing equal opportunity for personal development for all • Consistency: Across the entirety of each employer. There can't be parts of it that separate themselves from the scheme • Transparency: Every part of the process should be open and can be scrutinized • Competencies are linked to training and development opportunities appropriate to the role and available to all • Competency criteria are regularly reviewed and revised • Non-competitive: not decided according to quotas or arbitrary percentages • Light-touch: paperwork and decision process should not put too great a workload on staff <p style="text-align: right;">UK Research & Innovation Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 23: Pay, Business Transformation and Employment Conditions.</p> <p>This Conference acknowledges the importance of fair and equitable pay and employment conditions in fostering a thriving workforce. As representatives of our respective public sector branches, we have a responsibility to advocate for policies that prioritise the well-being, development and progression of employees. Employee pay is a high priority item on the Trade Union agenda. However, increasingly the public sector, though the Cabinet Office pay remit (Transformational Pay Flexibility Business Cases), are connecting business “transformation” with pay, offering headcount reductions to pay for salary increases and refusing to pay appropriately for skills, knowledge, and experience.</p> <p>This Conference recognises a concerning trend where employers are linking changes in terms and conditions in pay discussions. However, we assert that pay should be primarily based on the responsibilities and duties associated with the job role. Changes to terms and conditions, such as job scope or responsibilities, should be treated separately from discussions on pay. This separation ensures transparency and fairness in remuneration practices.</p> <p>This Conference expresses concern over the practice of offsetting pay increases with headcount reductions. It is essential to emphasise that pay increases should not be used as a bargaining chip in negotiations where the consequence is a reduced workforce. Instead, Conference calls for increased government</p>	<p>Remitted</p>	

<p>funding to adequately support the public sector, recognising its vital role in serving all segments of society. If an organisation wants to change the duties and responsibilities of its employees to reflect modern practice and new technology, we remain ready to negotiate, but that is part of a decoupled conversation about terms and conditions of the role.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to ensure PSSEC recognises these issues, and highlights in its campaigning activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to de-couple business “transformation” and pay. • That fairness in remuneration needs to be prioritised over changes to terms and conditions. • The need to de-couple headcount reduction from any negotiations on pay. <p style="text-align: right;">Environment Agency Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 24: Pay Progression</p> <p>In a changing political landscape, PSSEC should continue to campaign for radical changes to fix broken pay systems in the Public Sector. One element of pay which many sectors benefit from is Annual Pay Progression, but this has been stripped from most pay systems within the Public Service. Currently, the only way of advancing within pay ranges is via individual applications based on ‘business cases’, which are at high risk of bias. A return to a system which rewards experience by moving staff up the range each year would be of great benefit, both for in-role retention and staff morale. Retaining staff in-role saves employers money on recruitment and training, and allows staff to become more efficient and resilient as they gain experience. The introduction of such a system would not be an immediate high cost to employers, as pay progression is spread over several years and when individuals leave organisations, the money can be recycled back into the pay system. We believe that calling for the introduction of annual pay progression in as many areas as possible is an achievable aim which can deliver a lot of benefits both to staff and employers. We recognise that some parts of the public sector may still have pay progression and some branches may not consider this a priority for their members.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with branches in the Public Sector to assess level of demand and if there is sufficient support, to start a dialogue with the Cabinet Office to allow for Annual Pay Progression to be allowed within relevant frameworks (e.g. the Civil Service Pay Remit). If such dialogues begin, we believe that the following elements should form part of discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The term ‘Annual’ as opposed to ‘Automatic’ - this is more accurate and less open to ambiguous interpretation; 	Carried	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An effective performance policy is key to ensuring annual progression is fair and unbiased; • Effective recruitment and retention policies are key to ensuring annual progression does not introduce bias. <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 25: Equal Pay</p> <p>This Conference believes that the on-going goal of pay equality should underpin the Sector’s bargaining and campaigning on pay.</p> <p>Prospect is rightly proud of the progress it has led in this field across the Sector from Cadman at the HSE, through the IPO and Met Office to most recently at Natural England - but there remains much work to be done.</p> <p>Both the long-term strategy and short-term bargaining positions should have as a key objective moving towards, and maintaining, equality-proofed pay systems. Whilst progress may be slow due to affordability issues or have other implications for some members, any pay offer made not achieving movement towards these aims fails to address fundamental issues of fairness and equality.</p> <p>This conference believes that the Public Services Sector Executive and branches across the Sector need to continue to show leadership and challenge pay inequality.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the development of tools and appropriate training for Branch Executive Committees and pay negotiation teams on equal pay; • Ensure that pay claims include a specific request for an equal pay audit; • Where a lack of pay progression is an impediment to equal pay, to campaign for the shortening of pay spans by for example increasing minima and movement within spans towards the rate for the job such that movement from min to max might be achieved in no more than 5 years; • Call for additional and potentially separate Government funding to be provided to enable employers to shorten pay span lengths to be no more than 5% of the maximum of the span within 5 years; • Press for the revision to the pay and grading systems used across the sector to enable specialisms to be scored in an equality-proofed manner in order for the reward of specialists to be moved from ad hoc allowances to a rigorous and defensible basis; and • Where pay offers do not advance these objectives, or worse exacerbate equal pay issues, support branches in 	Carried	

<p>the Sector in considering the prospects of pursuing an equal pay case</p> <p>Public Services Sector Executive Committee</p>		
<p>Section F: Terms and Conditions</p>		
<p>Motion 26: Protection of Existing Terms and Conditions</p> <p>This Conference notes that employees at the College are Public, not Civil, Servants. The College of Policing is an Arms-Length Body (ALB). Under the Guidance for Civil Service Transfers this means that all terms and conditions that have been accrued whilst employed at the College are not automatically protected on transfer to other 'Civil Service' employers – departments, agencies or other NDPBs and ALBs. These are terms and conditions such as continuity of service, equivalent pay on transfer, annual leave, paid sick leave and the requirement to undergo a probation period. The College has habitually used its own discretion to recognise previously accrued terms and service with other 'Civil Service' employers themselves, and so do some other government employers, sometimes, but this is not consistent.</p> <p>The use of automated recruitment systems by many government departments is now reducing the likelihood of discretion being used in allowing accrued terms and conditions to transfer for public servants. Not having guaranteed transfer rights is a detriment to the College in recruiting the best staff. Members in some cases have not understood their situation until they tried to move on to new 'Civil Service' roles, with distress caused. Jobs at the College are advertised on the Civil Service Jobs website, the College offers the Civil Service Pension and is forced to follow the Cabinet Office Civil Service Pay Guidance. Certain named ALBs and NDPBs are covered by the Transfer Guidance.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to raise the second-rate status of public servants and those in ALBs and NDPBs who do not have transfer rights with the Cabinet Office, who are responsible for the transfer rules. PSSEC is instructed to urge that there should be fairness of treatment on transfer for all staff who work for employers covered by the Cabinet Office Pay Guidance. i.e. guaranteed protection of accrued terms and conditions as is now enjoyed by Civil Servants who move between core-departments.</p> <p>College of Policing Branch</p>	<p>Carried</p>	
<p>Motion 27: Reduction in Working Hours with Same Pay</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>At the Prospect National Conference 2024, the union adopted a mandate to campaign for a four-day working week and pursue trials with employers, noting the benefits to employee health, wellbeing, productivity, and staff retention. In addition Prospect published a briefing (https://library.prospect.org.uk/download/2024/00380) in 2024 which provides information and context on the subject including the outcomes of a pilot involving 61 companies.</p> <p>Conference notes the four-day working week does not constitute a compression of working hours into a shorter week but is an actual reduction of hours with no loss in pay, to improve the pay rate and general wellbeing, and bring productivity benefits for workers and employers.</p> <p>Over recent decades public sector pay awards have been consistently below inflation (with 2024 being an exception) resulting in a devaluation of public sector pay. This real-terms pay cut means we are working the same hours for less pay, while simultaneously being told we must be more productive, with the rise of AI supposedly helping. The government regularly cites affordability as the reason for pay restrictions, yet we cannot afford to keep working the same hours for less. Now is the time to push on with this important aim across the public sector. This is especially relevant in light of comments made by the Labour government dismissing the benefits of a four day working week ('It's not the 1970s': Minister rejects call for civil servants to get four-day week). With heels being dug in, we must keep our resolve but take a pragmatic approach to making progress.</p> <p>Conference therefore instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage Branches across the Sector to determine membership appetite for a reduction in working time (e.g. four-day working week or similar concept) and build shared understanding on the practical implications for different roles; • With membership support, pursue a four-day working week or similar concept which achieves the same aim through pay negotiations via the separate bargaining units, which may involve trial periods, and to resist a trade-off in existing terms to fund uplifted pay rates, bearing in mind previous real term pay cuts; • Use this information to campaign nationally for the reduced working week within the civil service and public sector, showcasing the benefits for employees and businesses alike, to inform PSSEC's direct engagement with Cabinet Office and support Branches pursuing trials with employers to gather further evidence and best practice. <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 28: Subsistence</p> <p>Conference notes that a motion was carried at the Prospect National Conference in 2024 on the subject of subsistence rates</p>	<p>Existing Policy</p>	

<p>used in the Civil Service. This noted that the subsistence rates that are eligible for tax relief by HMRC have been unchanged since 1998. These are typically used as a limit for expense claims by civil and public service employers and, given increased prices, mean that many public servants are left out of pocket when claiming for necessary food and drink whilst travelling on business or carrying out duties away from base locations.</p> <p>To continue to seek change in such rates, Conference instructs PSSEC to lobby government to increase the subsistence rates to reflect the current cost-of-living and seek establishment of a mechanism to periodically assess and adjust the rates in line with inflation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">UK Health Security Agency Branch</p>		
---	--	--

Section G: Campaigns

Common debate on Motions 29 and 30

<p>Motion 29: Reasonable Regulation is Good for Society</p> <p>In the light of this government’s growth agenda, particularly in relation to development and the environment, it’s important to underline the critical importance of regulation in protecting health and environmental standards and the false economy of deregulation. We are starting to understand the astronomical costs resulting from the water companies’ failure to invest, the health and social costs of poor air quality, and we have countless examples of the human, environmental, and economic impacts of regulatory failure and deregulation, from the accumulation of “Forever Chemicals” (PFAS) in drinking water in the USA to the Volkswagen emissions fraud.</p> <p>The United National Environmental Programme has identified that the amount of environmental legislation has increased by a factor of 38 since 1972, but worsening critical climate, biodiversity, and ecotoxicological crises demonstrate vividly that there is little global appetite from governments to enforce the regulations we already have. No-one wants redundant regulation, and sustainable growth is a positive ambition, but the language used by the Prime Minister and others in reference to regulation is neither helpful nor recognises the important role it plays in ensuring that the costs of the damage caused by unregulated industry aren’t handed to future generations. Effective regulation, delivered in a timely fashion, requires regulators to be properly staffed and funded.</p> <p>The fact that public bodies are struggling to meet their regulatory performance due to under-funding is not justification to reduce their powers. This stance is dishonest and counter-productive both economically and environmentally. This conference agrees that effectively funded and staffed regulators are a vital element of the growth agenda.</p>	<p>Carried</p>	
---	----------------	--

<p>Conference instructs PSSEC to make clear to Cabinet Office in the strongest possible terms, the value and importance of effectively funded regulation delivered by the public service sector when it comes to sustainable economic growth.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 30: National Regulators Shake Up</p> <p>Conferences notes that the government are looking to bring down costs of regulation with an "active government" to attempt to improve accountability and cut costs. A recent and well publicised casualty of the regulatory cuts was NHS England. There is concern however that the cuts being made to regulators may lead to a detrimental effect on the primary role of regulators, for example in setting standards for social, environmental and health care.</p> <p>Effective regulation requires highly skilled people making important decisions quickly and with access to the right information. In some circumstances it requires robust action to prevent or minimise harm. Adequate staffing and regulatory action costs money, and if the aim is to reduce the cost to industry then the costs need to be borne by the taxpayer. As noted by Prospect's General Secretary "we cannot lose sight of the primary goals of regulators, be they protection of the environment or ensuring people are safe in their workplace". This should not contradict the vision of the UK regaining "its global competitive leadership" by cutting corners to offer a poor quality of service, but work hand in hand to support the government in its objectives by providing a high quality of leadership.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Branches to outline impacts of headcount reductions on the quality of regulatory services being offered. • Identify branches who are already struggling with resources cuts and look to oppose cuts that are likely to further impact on regulatory services. • Identify examples where cuts to regulatory services have already created a negative impact on services, such as HMRC (https://www.cityam.com/spending-watchdog-says-hmrc-in-declining-spiral-and-needs-to-rethink-unprecedented-job-cuts/). • Take opportunities to highlight the choice between costs to the taxpayer and costs to industry, particularly where regulators are already funded by fees on industry, and where opportunities exist to shift the burden further away from the taxpayer and onto industry." 	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>References:</p> <p>https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainer/regulation</p> <p>https://prospect.org.uk/news/we-cannot-lose-sight-of-the-primary-goals-of-regulators</p> <p>https://www.cityam.com/spending-watchdog-says-hmrc-in-declining-spiral-and-needs-to-rethink-unprecedented-job-cuts/</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Department of Health Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 31: Are we Ready for the Threat of Public Sector Redundancies?</p> <p>In the wake of this Labour government’s first budget settlement in Autumn 2024, amid the country’s continuing economic hardship, voluntary exit schemes have been launching across many government departments. Unprecedented geopolitical events in the last few months mean our government is diverting more funds to defence, and it is likely unprotected departments will suffer much harder than previously feared. The outlook for stability and job security in these areas is grim as the Phase 2 spending review approaches against this background. With our organisations already pared back from the efficiency savings of the previous years of austerity, and our public services barely holding together, it is surely likely our Sector will be facing the real prospect of redundancies. Conference stands ready to defend jobs across the Sector and to maintain the resilience and capability of the workforce and the public services we provide.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with Branches to assess the wider risk of redundancy across the civil service/public services sector, and be ready to plan for action against compulsory redundancies.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>	Carried	
Section H: Resources and Environment		
<p>Motion 32: Ethical Contracting</p> <p>Many of us work alongside contractors. Many of those, particularly those in the service delivery areas, are often on much poorer terms and conditions of service – for example, not receiving pay for sick absences.</p>	Remitted	

<p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage the Cabinet Office on setting minimum acceptable terms and conditions for personnel when placing contracts with an increased focus on values that align, and weighting granted for these conditions as opposed to going for the cheapest bidder.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOD UKStratCom Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 33: Making best use of the Public Services Estate</p> <p>Since the height of the Covid pandemic, public sector bodies have been ‘recruiting first and asking questions later’ about the location of new staff. This, coupled with the rush to fill posts to deliver the changes needed under EU Exit, has meant that many staff have been allocated official locations on a seemingly random basis and with scant regard to their home location or the location of their wider team. Now, under the ‘return to office’ initiative, staff are being asked to attend offices that often require a long commute but still do not bring teams together nor do they offer any particular operational benefits. Furthermore, despite the general shift to bring staff back to the office, attendance levels remain far below what they were pre-pandemic, and this is leading to departments consolidating estates to make cost savings, but not necessarily under any transparent strategy or consultation with the unions and staff. This is resulting in potentially conflicting aims of requiring staff back in the office but not necessarily providing sufficient office facilities needed for modern effective ways of working in this post-pandemic/hybrid working world.</p> <p>Conference recognises the benefits of staff attending an office environment to the personal well-being of staff, effectiveness of teams and in embedding a common Civil Service culture, especially for multi-agency offices. But these benefits will only be realised through transparent, pragmatic and appropriate strategies for estate, facilities, and flexible working practices for the modern workplace.</p> <p>Therefore, Conference instructs PSSEC to call on the Cabinet Office to instigate a review of the Government estate with an aim to identifying how it can best be utilised to serve staff and the public over the long term.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>	Carried	
<p>Motion 34: Enabling the use of e-bikes</p> <p>Conference notes the recent decision by the Government Property Agency to ban e-bikes from their managed estate. This move has been driven by concerns over the safety of some e-bikes, particularly cheap imported e-bikes with poor quality batteries, which have on occasion contributed to fires and explosions. Not only does an across the board ban on e-bikes, and /or battery</p>	Carried	

<p>charging on government estate fail to consider those that comply with appropriate manufacturing and safety standards, it also creates obstacles to the government's green agenda.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to lobby the Government Property Agency to seek a more sophisticated approach to e-bikes and battery charging arrangements across the government estate to ensure all of its offices are provided with safe and secure storage facilities to allow staff to continue to be able to ride e-bikes to work.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Health and Safety Executive Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 35: Helping the Public Sector to Lead the Charge on Tackling Climate Change.</p> <p>We're all seeing that there are changes to the climate. Warmer wetter winters, more flooding, heatwaves, droughts. The Public Sector is at the forefront of tackling these issues. Public Servants must commit to raising awareness of climate change across the public sector and taking proactive steps to address this critical issue. Together, we can make a positive impact and contribute to a more sustainable future for our organisations and the society we serve. We can lead the way for other organisations to follow.</p> <p>Climate scientists are getting increasingly nervous. The climate is changing faster than was predicted. The earth's temperature is the highest it has been for 100,000 years, and we have seen an acceleration of warming over the last 50 years. The decisions we make now will have implications for all generations to come.</p> <p>Impacts are already being seen in the global economy in many forms including flooding, droughts, heatwaves and storms. Climate change is a significant global challenge that affects all aspects of society, including the public sector. Public sector organisations have a critical role in mitigating climate change through policymaking, infrastructure development, community engagement and leading by example. Raising awareness and educating public sector employees about climate change can lead to more effective and sustainable practices.</p> <p>Conference recognises the issues faced by climate change and campaigns for public sector organisations to put effort into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change education and training: Propose that public sector organisations implement mandatory climate change awareness training for all employees – this may include carbon literacy. Include climate change education in professional development courses and workshops. • Policy Development for climate change: Encourage the development and implement policies that promote sustainable practices within public sector. Encourage the adoption of green technologies and energy-efficient solutions in public sector infrastructure projects. 	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>Conference instructs PSSEC to coordinate with the Prospect STEM and Environment Group (STEG) to support branches to monitor and evaluate the progress of climate change initiatives by their employers. For example, this may include Carbon Net-Zero, or zero waste to landfill.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Environment Agency Branch</p>		
<p>Section I: AI</p> <p>Common Debate on motions 36 and 37</p>		
<p>Motion 36: AI Concerns</p> <p>This motion seeks Prospect trade union support to address the growing concerns surrounding AI and automation, particularly their impact on jobs and civilian roles within the MOD organisations and public sector. The primary concern is the potential for widespread job losses and a reduction in available roles in MOD and Civil Service as a result of AI innovation and automation. Tasks currently performed by humans, are increasingly being amalgamated and codified into process workflows that can be done with very little human interaction. This is especially evident in repetitive, data-driven roles, such as those in analytical and IT driven roles.</p> <p>This will eventually lead to job displacement and economic instability for affected workers. These changes also raise critical questions about workforce retraining, retention and the need for societal support systems to manage this transition. Additionally, we face concerns over the potential for bias in AI algorithms, job security, worker anxiety, and the ethical considerations necessary to develop AI in a way that minimises harm to the workforce. The current Labour Government is seeking further job cuts to plug whole in government funding and AI and Automation will exacerbate more cuts in MOD jobs and roles.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to be cognisant of these issues when engaging across the departments.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">MOD UKStratCom Branch</p>	<p>Carried</p>	
<p>Motion 37: The Need to Fix Underlying Data Issues Before Starting AI Projects</p> <p>Conference notes the increasing influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies in the Public Sector, as referenced in the AI Opportunities Action Plan</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-opportunities-action-plan-government-response/ai-opportunities-action-plan-government-response . While AI holds the potential to drive</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

innovation and improve efficiency, it also raises significant concerns regarding data privacy, fairness, accountability, and transparency. Conference further notes that the effectiveness and fairness of AI systems depend heavily on the quality of the data used to train and operate them. Poor, biased, or incomplete data can lead to outcomes that are discriminatory, inaccurate, and harmful to workers, particularly marginalised groups. This is especially relevant in industries where workers' rights and job security could be affected by AI-driven decision-making processes.

Conference believes that the need to address these underlying data issues is paramount before embarking on AI projects in the Public Sector. Ensuring data quality, inclusivity, and fairness is essential for the ethical deployment of AI systems that serve the public and workers' interests, rather than exacerbate existing inequalities or create new challenges.

Therefore, conference instructs PSSEC to work with branches to:

- **Prioritise Data Governance:** Encourage employers, policymakers, and developers to implement robust data governance frameworks that ensure data is accurate, complete, and free from bias. This should include regular audits of data used for AI training and decision-making.
- **Ensure Data Transparency and Accessibility:** Advocate for transparency in how data is collected, processed, and used in AI projects. Workers must have access to the data that impacts their lives and workplaces, with mechanisms for challenging decisions based on faulty or biased data.
- **Foster Inclusive Data Practices:** Promote the use of data that reflects the diversity of the workforce and society, ensuring that AI systems are not based on homogenous or unrepresentative data sets that could lead to discriminatory outcomes.
- **Engage in Worker-led AI Initiatives:** Ensure that workers are included in discussions and decisions related to the development and implementation of AI systems. Workers should be consulted on how AI will be used, the data it will rely on, and its potential impact on their jobs.
- **Advocate for Data Literacy Training:** Call for investment in data literacy programs for workers so that they are equipped to understand, question, and challenge AI systems and the data they are based on, ensuring that all workers are active participants in the AI-driven future of their industries.
- **Oppose AI Projects That Ignore Data Integrity:** Challenge the rollout of AI projects in workplaces or industries where underlying data issues are not addressed. AI should only be deployed when data integrity has been assured, ensuring systems are trustworthy and beneficial to workers.

<p>Conference also instructs PSSEC to consider the feasibility of a wider campaign which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting collaboration with experts in data science, ethics, and AI to provide ongoing guidance to unions on best practices for engaging with AI technologies. • Advocating for legislative and regulatory action that ensures AI systems and data usage are transparent, fair, and accountable to the people they affect. <p style="text-align: right;">Department of Health Branch</p>		
--	--	--

Appendix – Out of Order Motions

<p>Motion 38: Paid Leave to Care for Sick Dependents – Out of Order – National Issue</p> <p>In the UK by law, anyone legally classed as an employee can take time off to help a dependant with an emergency. The law is the Employment Rights Act 1996. There is not a statutory right for this time off to be paid. In contrast, in other countries such as Norway and Sweden, staff are allowed up to 120 days of care leave a year at 80% of salary up to a maximum of around £95 a day. This leave can be taken in a combination of 1/8, 1/4, 1/2 or full days and can be shared between parents and carers.</p> <p>Parental Leave is an option for parents, but it is unpaid and not an option for all. Loss of earnings is significant for all employees, no matter what their pay grade. Using Annual Leave for these situations removes the option of taking annual leave for its actual purpose – to rest and recuperate, with knock on impacts on the employee’s wellbeing and productivity.</p> <p>Some employers offer a limited amount of Special Paid Leave or other paid leave to deal with emergency situations, such as a dependent waking up ill and being unable to go to their childcare or school setting, but the paid leave is for that day or a few hours only. Whilst this is better than nothing, it assumes that there is a feasible alternative for someone to look after their dependent for the duration of the issue, insinuating that if you have to look after them instead of working you have chosen to be in this situation. The reality is that many employees do not have any other option. This leads to behaviours such as sending a dependent back to childcare/school/care setting before they are fully better and/or before they are no longer infectious. This leads to more illnesses circulating and more incidents of needing to care for sick dependents.</p> <p>A change in the law so that all employees are entitled to take paid time off work to care for a dependant would benefit the wellbeing of</p>		
---	--	--

<p>employees, help them to feel valued and supported, prevent decreased productivity and most likely lead to fewer days off sick, all benefiting the economy. Depending on the type of work, some employees may be able to work partial days, so it would be beneficial for the paid leave to be available in partial day options, such as in the Nordic model.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to campaign nationally for a change in the law to provide paid leave for the duration of time when an employee is unable to work due to caring for sick dependents, separate from the employee's annual leave and own sick leave.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Met Office Branch</p>		
<p>Motion 39: Homeworking Allowance – Out of Order – National Issue</p> <p>Since its welcome introduction in March 2020, many people have been able offset a small part of their energy and internet costs whilst their employers asked them to work from home. Post-pandemic many employers have decided to downsize offices and reduce their own overheads, effectively passing these on to staff in an exchange for more flexible working arrangements. However, the cost-of-living crisis and removal of caps on energy pricing mean the current allowance has not kept pace with inflated household bills, which further impacts on working people's finances. We would like to see HMRC increase the allowance to meet these real terms costs, or at least keep pace with inflation, and would like Prospect to actively campaign for this change.</p> <p>This Conference instructs Prospect to lobby HMRC for an increase in the working from home tax relief allowance, which is currently £6 per week.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">The National Lottery Community Fund Branch</p>		
<p>Emergency Motions</p>		
<p>EM 1</p> <p>On 28th April 2025 it was announced that the Valuation Office Agency would lose its executive agency status and become a division of HMRC. This was disgracefully publicly announced by the Treasury as the 'scrapping' of VOA. Prospect members in VOA were insulted by the use of this inaccurate expression that implied the end of the Valuation Office entirely and gave the impression that the Agency was inefficient. The Agency is not failing and very efficiently raises tax for the government through Council Tax and</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<p>Non-domestic property rates and provides property advice to a range of government and public bodies.</p> <p>The decision was made by the Minister for the Treasury without any consultation with the recognised trade unions at local or national level under an obscure and secretive Treasury protocol that prevented the leadership of VOA being able to speak to anyone at all until the very day of the announcement.</p> <p>The decision was not part of the Review of ALBs where there would have been Trade Union engagement. The lack of respect for recognised Trade Unions was breathtaking.</p> <p>The declared reason for the integration of VOA into HMRC was the delivery of 10%-15% efficiency savings. In fact, there are very few roles which are duplicated between VOA and HMRC. VOA has very few roles that are not frontline operational surveying and is recruiting for more. Prospect is at a loss therefore to see where savings can be made without an impact on members jobs, pay, equipment or workplaces.</p> <p>The transfer of VOA staff to a new employer will take place under COSoP. Prospect is not a recognised union in HMRC. VOA have specialist pay arrangements for Surveyors that were hard won in 2019.</p> <p>VOA branch officers are committed to ensuring all VOA members do not suffer any detriment through this transfer and that VOA independence, identity and culture are preserved in the much larger department.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to continue to raise with the Cabinet Office that the lack of engagement with unions before making this dismaying decision was unacceptable; • to continue to raise the need for VOA to maintain independence of rates decision making, when incorporated into HMRC; • to support branches with recognition with an employer undergoing forced incorporation into an employer where Prospect lack a recognition agreement to reach such an agreement with the new employer at the earliest opportunity; • to support branches involved in COSoP transfers in recruitment activity; • to work with branches with 'niche' operational specialists, such as chartered surveyors in VOA, to highlight the importance of the work undertaken by our members; • to support branches with 'niche' specialists to protect and improve specialist pay. 		
---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To have dialogue with Cabinet Office to ensure that other ALBs where Prospect has members are not treated in such a deplorable manner. <p style="text-align: center;">Valuation Office Agency Branch</p>		
<p>EM 2: Impact of the withdrawal of Government Procurement Cards</p> <p>For many public servants, the Government's decision to severely restrict access to and use of Government Procurement Cards (GPCs) may have been of little or no consequence. However, it has caused major disruption for some government employers and their staff, and this appears to be getting overlooked and poorly understood. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The short notice with which GPCs were withdrawn, meaning that some government employers have not had time to find alternative ways to procure essential goods and services, and are still struggling to do so. In some areas work has needed to stop, disrupting delivery. HR and Finance staff in badly affected areas were put under severe pressure in the final quarter of last financial year. Employees are now being expected to pay significant sums of money up front for business expenses, with variable time until receiving reimbursement. Effectively, these individual workers are subsidising the Government by loaning the Government money. Often the impacts are being experienced most severely by the lowest paid staff members doing operational work (e.g. fieldwork and site visits), causing significant financial pressure and hardship for employees. Offers of advances in salary to employees to cover known business expenses disrupt home budgeting, particularly by low-paid workers and their families, and could potentially lead to difficulties with receiving Universal Credit payments. It is not clear that the full implications of this have been assessed. Legitimate claims for expenses are sometimes being challenged by Finance departments, leading to protracted delays or refused payments causing hardship. <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to engage with the Cabinet Office to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draw better attention to the considerable negative impact the perfunctory withdrawal of GPCs has caused for some government employers 	Carried	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek support with finding adequate solutions that enable affected government employers to continue to carry out their business on behalf of Government efficiently • Call for a limit to be placed on up-front expenses borne by government employees that is negotiated with unions, and for this to be clearly communicated to government employers to ensure compliance, so that employees are not put in the position of needing to challenge unreasonable management instructions. • Obtain assurances that future decisions of this nature will be assessed for their potential impacts before implementing them, and that government employers receive an adequate notice period. <p style="text-align: right;">Forestry Commission Branch</p>		
<p>EM3: Conference Time</p> <p>This Conference notes that 1 day is simply not enough time to properly hear and debate all 37 motions submitted to the Public Services Sector Conference, let alone any emergency motions submitted subsequently. This is especially so, when the start and end times are set before it is even known how many motions would be received. In the past the Public Services Sector Conference was held over 2 days which, while still tight to get through all of conference business, was much more satisfactory. To highlight the discrepancy, the recent TUC Disabled workers conference was held over 2 days, with the end time of 6pm on day 1 and 5:30 on day 2, to debate a total of 22 motions. This was considered a squeeze by the TUC organising committee, but did allow every motion to be heard and debated to some extent.</p> <p>Public Services Sector Conference only occurs once every 2 years. Conference is key for setting the objectives and direction of the union and is a chance for our members to be heard, get their views across and influence union policy. This Conference feels that the overly restrictive limiting of the time available is unfairly preventing branches from being able to move their motions, and severely limiting the proper debate that members expect from their union conferences, damaging union democracy.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to have sufficient time for breaks and allow the possibility of break out sessions. Rest breaks are essential for the health and wellbeing of attendees, and to enable participants to be able to engage fully in Conference.</p> <p>Therefore, Conference instructs PSSEC to schedule a minimum of 2 full days for the Public Services Sector Conference. Conference also instructs PSSEC to not set the start and end times BEFORE it is known how many motions will be received. Conference may be reduced to 1 day after the motion deadline, if there are too few motions received to justify the full 2 days.</p>	<p>Remitted</p>	

Met Office Branch		
<p>EM 4: Trans people must be able to use facilities which match their gender</p> <p>On the 16th April 2025, the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom ruled that “sex” in the Equality Act (2010) referred to “biological sex”¹. Based on this judgement, on the 25th April, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) gave interim guidance on the Supreme Court ruling. Despite the ruling being related only to the Equality Act, the EHRC interim guidance focussed on barring trans people from using facilities which matched their gender². On the 27th April, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Pat McFadden, stated that the government, as an employer, will stop trans people from using the changing rooms or bathrooms they wish to use³. This is of grave concern to members in the Public Sector.</p> <p>Firstly, being able to use a toilet in safety is a human right⁴. Forcing transgender people to use facilities of their sex assigned at birth forces them to out themselves, impacting their physical and psychological safety. Furthermore, while such a policy will embolden those with transphobic views to “police” access to facilities, it is impossible to enforce without intrusive, humiliating and degrading measures which will have serious consequences for all staff. In Defra Group, a survey conducted in 2023 indicated that transgender employees were avoiding using toilets in the workplace due to fear of harassment, to the extent of not drinking during the working day. This has clear health and safety implications and is likely to worsen following the Supreme Court judgment. Interim guidance from the Cabinet Office’s Inclusive Practices Team suggests transgender colleagues should work from home if they feel unsafe using the toilets at work. This is an abdication of the employer’s duty of care and will have the effect of further isolating these colleagues.</p> <p>Along with the impacts on transgender people, there are secondary impacts of the ruling on cisgender women (those who were assigned female at birth and who identify as women) and disabled people. Cisgender women who do not fit the societal expectations of femininity are at increased risk of harassment when using single-sex spaces. Furthermore, cisgender women who are happy to</p>	Carried	

¹ For Women Scotland Ltd (Appellant) v The Scottish Ministers (Respondent)

https://supremecourt.uk/uploads/uksc_2024_0042_judgment_aea6c48cee.pdf

² An interim update on the practical implications of the UK Supreme Court judgement

<https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/media-centre/interim-update-practical-implications-uk-supreme-court-judgment>

³ Trans people banned from toilets of gender they identify with, says UK minister

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2025/apr/27/trans-people-banned-from-toilets-of-gender-they-identify-with-says-uk-minister>

⁴ The right to sanitation is enshrined in Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (the right to an adequate standard of living).

<p>share spaces and resources with trans women will be forced to participate in segregation, which violates their rights to freedom of association. In some offices, transgender staff are being encouraged to use disabled toilets as other gender-neutral facilities are not available. This reduces the availability of toilets for colleagues with disabilities, many of whom may need to use toilets urgently.</p> <p>Transgender, non-binary and intersex colleagues must be able to use facilities which match their gender, without fear of discrimination or harassment. Therefore, we call on PSSEC, in collaboration with the National Executive Committee as appropriate, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaign for the provision of gender-neutral toilets as a priority across the government and wider public sector estate. • Write an open letter to employers across the public sector expressing solidarity with workers of all gender identities, and declaring that it should not fall to workers to police the “biological sex” of their colleagues. <p style="text-align: right;">EFRA Branch</p>		
<p>EM5: Spring Spending Review</p> <p>This Public Services Sector Conference notes the recent Spending Review that set out budgets for the next three years 2026-27, 2027-28 and 2028-29.</p> <p>While the overall spending plans saw a significant increase in public spending and are more generous than those pencilled in by the previous government at the March 2024 budget, much of the growth in current public spending has been allocated to the NHS and a few other priority areas, and a number of other critical areas of spending will face very tight and in some cases contracting real terms budgets in the years following 2025-26.</p> <p>While the Public Services Sector Conference welcomes increased and much needed investment, including in defence and energy where Prospect has not only public sector membership but wider industrial interest, we are concerned that the current budget and spending review will mean a real term cut in funding for some departments where Prospect has a strong union presence.</p> <p>In the DEFRA group, we are concerned that this amounts to a significant real terms cut to current budgets.</p> <p>This has not only a potential impact on our members and their job security but on the specialist services that they provide in maintaining the infrastructure of the UK, and safety and security of the public. Examples of risks of this were laid out in the June 2025 National Audit Office ‘Resilience to animal diseases’ report that highlighted -</p>	<p>Carried</p>	

<p><i>15 Defra and APHA would struggle to manage a more severe outbreak or concurrent serious outbreaks of exotic disease. Defra and APHA have repeatedly reported that they would struggle to respond effectively to severe or concurrent serious outbreaks of animal diseases. Their response would be limited by a lack of capacity (both in government and the private sector) and lack of skills and expertise in some areas, such as veterinary capacity for livestock. APHA's latest vet vacancy rate, in April 2025, was 20%. The highest rate reached during 2023-24 was 24%, compared with a sector-wide average rate of around 10% that year.</i></p> <p>This Public Services Sector instructs the PSSEC to –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research and build intelligence on the Spending Review and departmental budgets. 2. Support branches in developing their understanding of the impact of the review. 3. Engage with the Cabinet Office to seek to influence the development of the Government's Strategic Workforce plan and the review of Arm's Length Bodies 4. Work with branches to identify where job losses may be under consideration and engaging early on with organisations to support and mitigate over risks to job security and career development for specialists. 5. Campaign over the impact of cuts to the public, engaging with a variety of stakeholders and the media to bring to life the importance of the work our members do, contrasting that to the misconception that public sector workers are back-office workers who can be easily dispensed without an impact on the services the public expects. <p style="text-align: right;">Public Service Sector Executive Committee</p>		
<p>EM 6: Maintaining UK Research Funding</p> <p>HM Government has recently announced increases in the government R&D budget in the spending review. Investing over £80 billion into science and technology research across the remainder of the current parliament. However, HM Government has continued to maintain real terms cuts across UKRI, the UK's largest funder of research and funder of the UK's central scientific infrastructure.</p> <p>The real terms cuts imposed upon UKRI have continued to have detrimental impact on the UK's leadership as a hub of innovation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKRI facilities have cancelled runs in early 2026, leading to a significant loss of experimental time. • UKRI has instituted a voluntary exit scheme and significant restrictions on hiring, leading to a loss of experienced staff in STEM roles, without introduction of new talent. 	Carried	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UKRI funded facilities such as Diamond Light Source have suspended funded PhD programmes, leading to a loss of opportunities for early career researchers. <p>Overall, this reduces the ability of UK based researchers to undertake world leading research and threatens the UK's future as a research powerhouse.</p> <p>Conference calls on reversing these structural real terms cuts to UKRI and restoration of UKRI funding in-line with inflation.</p> <p>This Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby Government to restore funding to UKRI in real terms • Lobby Government to maintain UKRI funding in-line with inflation. <p style="text-align: right;">Diamond Light Source Ltd Branch</p>		
---	--	--

Appendix – Out of order motions

<p>EM 7: Protecting Our Transgender Colleagues – national issue</p> <p>In April, the Supreme Court ruled that “the concept of sex is binary”, and that trans people with gender recognition certificates are not entitled to the same sex-based protections as cis people. The EHRC then put out guidance that stated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A trans woman is a biological man • A trans man is a biological woman <p>The guidance makes further reference to the exclusion of trans men from ‘men only’ spaces and trans women from ‘women only’ spaces, such as toilets, hospital wards, sporting bodies, and associations and clubs with memberships of over 25 people.</p> <p>The ruling and guidance both also reference biological sex as being ‘binary’, which erases from the conversation both our intersex colleagues and our non-binary colleagues. Any act which removes agency from a group of people, or which may force our colleagues to ‘out’ themselves or reveal medical information, is deeply concerning. Safety in the workplace must include an inherent right to privacy and dignity, as well as automatic inclusion in all relevant conversations.</p> <p>Both the Supreme Court and the EHRC made it clear that distinct protections exist under the Equal Rights Act 2010 (EQA), however, these protections could be complicated or jeopardised by some of this guidance. Further, the consultation on the guidance put out by</p>		
--	--	--

<p>EHRC only lasted two weeks, where previous consultations have run for up to three months.</p> <p>Prior to the ruling, Stonewall UK's research shows that over a third of LGBTQ+ people hide their sexuality and/or gender identity in the workplace, while a third of LGBTQ+ people feel they could not report transphobic or homophobic bullying in the workplace. After the ruling, charities such as Switchboard LGBTQIA Support Line have reported increased calls from transgender, nonbinary, and intersex people, who are reporting feeling anxious and worried about being in public spaces.</p> <p>Regardless of the ruling and guidance, trans people do exist, and all people deserve to feel safe. Our trans colleagues in the civil and public services deserve to feel safe in the workplace, with the understanding that their union will actively work to keep their safety intact.</p> <p>Conference instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the Cabinet Office to ensure the EQA will be adhered to in every aspect in the public service sector, both for colleagues and members of the public engaging with services, including the provision of proper training and facilities for all; • Encourage Prospect to work with charities such as Stonewall UK and Not A Phase who are able to provide training and clarity on how best to interpret these new rules and guidelines without harming the trans+ community; • Commission a report on the experience of LGBTQIA+ members in the public services, the impact of transphobia and the implications of the Supreme Court ruling and EHRC guidance in the workplace, especially as they impact the provision of facilities equally to all staff; • Offer inclusivity and accommodation support to civil and public service bodies through Prospect officers and reps, for example through supporting officers and reps to actively connect and engage with leadership, and providing resources for developing, leading, or joining courses and open discussions <p style="text-align: right;">Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Branch</p>		
<p>EM 8: Supporting Trans, Non-Binary, and Gender-Diverse (Trans+) Workers in Light of the Recent Supreme Court Ruling– national issue</p> <p>Conference notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On April 16th, the Supreme Court (SC) ruled that sex in the Equality Act 2010 refers exclusively to sex assigned at birth ^[1]. 		

- The British Medical Association's Resident Doctors' conference condemned the SC ruling as “scientifically illiterate” [2].
- On the evening of Friday April 25th, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) released its Interim Guidance on the practical implications of the SC ruling [3].
- On May 20th, the EHRC opened its consultation on changes made to its code of practice for services, public functions and associations following the SC ruling [4].
- The obligation to protect the rights of trans+ members is intrinsic in the objects of Prospect (1, 2, 4, 5, and 8) [5].
- Some branches have already seen first-hand the significant negative impact that trans-exclusionary workplace policies have on employee morale and retention.
- There has been a massively disproportionate amount of media coverage on the topic of trans+ people, much of which has been negative, with a significant increase surrounding the SC ruling [6].
- The SC ruling does not mandate the exclusion of trans+ people from single-sex facilities aligning with their lived gender [7].

Conference believes:

- That it is important to reaffirm that we unequivocally recognise the identities of trans people and the existence of non-binary and intersex people.
- All workers should be free to go about their daily lives, as themselves, free from interference or harassment.
- The Supreme Court ruling and subsequent statements and guidance from the EHRC have facilitated an increase in harassment and discrimination towards trans+ workers.
- Support for trans+ rights from public sector organisations is particularly important given the government's disinclination for legislative reform and unquestioning support of the SC ruling and EHRC.
- Legislative reform is desperately needed to secure trans+ rights in the UK, as it is clear that explicit and undeniable trans-inclusion needs to be written into all relevant legislation.
- The EHRC interim guidance and changes to their code of practice fail to address key areas of concern and are

<p>notably lacking in information on providing trans-inclusive services (despite it still being legally possible).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unquestioning support/implementation of the SC ruling and EHRC guidance is not a neutral position on this matter and invites anti-trans behaviour. <p>Conference therefore instructs PSSEC to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage and support employers to introduce explicitly trans-inclusive policies and offer direct support to members in workplaces with exclusionary policies. • Release a public statement recognising that the interim guidance published by and the changes to its code of practice by the EHRC are unworkable and damaging, and in general not fit for purpose. • Call on the NEC to lobby the government for new legislation and/or amendments to existing legislation in this area with the intention of clearly enshrining existing trans+ rights, restoring rights erased by the SC ruling, as well as adding new legal rights (e.g., legal recognition for non-binary and intersex people, and introducing a self-ID system of legal gender recognition). • Coordinate with Prospect's LGBTQ+ network to survey members in our sector about the impact that the SC ruling and subsequent events have had on them and any issues they have faced relating to gender identity. • Collaborate with other unions, trans-led grassroots groups, and other trans+ advocacy organisations where possible to amplify the union's voice on this matter and facilitate the actions listed above. <p>References:</p> <p>[1] https://supremecourt.uk/uploads/uksc_2024_0042_judgment_updated_16f5d72e76.pdf</p> <p>[2] https://x.com/BMAResidents/status/1917186510526296384</p> <p>[3] https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/media-centre/interim-update-practical-implications-uk-supreme-court-judgment</p> <p>[4] https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/equality/equality-act-2010/codes-practice/code-practice-services-public-functions-and-associations</p> <p>[5] https://library.prospect.org.uk/id/2024/June/20/Rules-Prospect-Rule-Book-2024</p> <p>[6] https://bsky.app/profile/tacc.org.uk/post/3lriwr2xym32i</p>		
--	--	--

[7] <https://www.wearequeer.af/supreme-court-justice-says-ruling-doesnt-ban-trans-women-from-all-single-sex-toilets/>

Diamond Light Source Ltd Branch