



Professional Interpreters for Justice (PI4J)

Report of the Steering Committee

Date: Thursday, 5th November 2015

Time: 4:00 pm to 5:30 pm

Venue: Unite House - Holborn - London

Present at the meeting: A. Murray, Regional Officer of Unite, presiding over the meeting; A. Carlisle, CIoL; K. Moffitt, CIoL; A. Naranjo, NUPIT; E. Ford, NUPIT; K. Slaney, SOMI; A. Thompson, APCI.

On telephone: P. Wilson, ITI

Apologies: S. Bishop, NRPSI; L. White, RPSI; A. Minhas, APCI; G. Buckingham, EULITA

Agenda:

Approval of the reports on previous two meetings

Draft Manifesto,

Framework Agreements

Approval of reports

The reports for the meetings on 16th March 2015 and 21st September 2015 were approved for posting on the web-page. There was one amendment namely that KM's name, although mentioned in the body of the report of the meeting of 16th March, had been omitted from the list of those attending.

The Draft Manifesto

KM and AC had revised and updated the text of the Manifesto with a view to re-posting it on the website under a different title more appropriate to its current purpose. KM

said he and AC had deliberately made very few alterations, those which had been made being mainly for the purpose of making clear the current situation. Those present expressed satisfaction at the new version of the text although a few very slight amendments, typographical for the most part, were proposed and approved. As it was felt that the term Manifesto was no longer appropriate it was decided to re-name the document. There was a suggestion that the new name should be 'Statement of Objectives' but no firm decision was taken.

It was decided as action points that KM would circulate the new version of the re-named manifesto to all societies currently or formerly involved in the Campaign and at the same time the societies would be asked to say whether they still wished to be associated with the campaign by appearing on the list of participating bodies, and whether they were happy with the text of the revised manifesto. Only those societies which replied in the affirmative would be listed at the foot of the document.

It was recalled that a decision had been taken to alter the campaign url from PIJ to PI4J. If this has not already carried out the change will be made at the next opportunity.

The Framework Agreements

There was nothing to report on the CCS Framework agreement. It was noted that NUBSLI had had a certain amount of success with their insistence on registered interpreters being used for sign-language assignments and the need for a code of conduct for agencies.

AC reported that she had attended the MoJ bidders' conference, having previously registered an interest. She said that there had been no surprising developments but she now had a clearer understanding of the bidding process and the way the different lots were being treated. The service is expected to commence in November next year.

There was some speculation among the SC as to who were the potential bidders and also about whether there would be a transfer of undertaking situation whereby the staff currently running the service for Capita would be handed over to the successful bidder.

It was decided as an action point that a list of agencies, including the smaller ones which would not themselves be bidders but could potentially be sub-contracted by the successful bidders, along with their contact details, would be drawn up with a view to sending them the new statement of objectives with a link to the website and that an e-mail message would be drafted as a covering letter.

The SC are in agreement that terms and conditions are a key part of our position on the new contract and this must be made clear to the agencies. Not everybody thought that talking to agencies was a good thing but most felt it to be necessary.

As a further action point, thought will be given to drawing up a minimum recommended scale of charges similar to that issued by NUBSLI. Some felt that this would be more difficult for language interpreters than for deaf interpreters because the scenario for language interpreters is more complex but the majority thought that such a recommended scale would be a good idea. The recommended rates could be circulated to agencies at some point after the initial contact has been made.

In view of the EU's recent ruling about travel time being considered as working time, it was agreed as a further action point that a case study would be prepared to see what impact this ruling could have on an interpreter's income. The Union's legal department will be asked to comment on the case-study.

Those SC members who did not attend the meeting are urged to think about the action points and new version of the manifesto, and give their views in advance of the next meeting.

The meeting ended at 5.30 pm and the date for the next meeting was set at Tuesday, 8th December at 4 pm.

Report by E. Ford (NUPIT)