



**Professional Interpreters for Justice**  
**Report of the Steering Committee**

Date: Tuesday, 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013

Time: 2:00 pm to 3:45 pm

Venue: Unite House - Holborn - London

**Present at the meeting:** Keith Moffitt, Chair, CloL Council (presiding over the meeting); Magdy Abbas, Director, SOMI UK; Stephen Bishop (NRPSI); Geoffrey Buckingham, Chairman, APCI; Klasiena Slaney, Director, SOMI UK; Eileen Ford, Chair, NUPIT Branch; Paul Wilson, CEO, ITI; Penny Arbuthnot, Involvis.

**By telephone:** Tony Wilcox, WITS; John Podvoiskis, Director (PIA).

**Apologies:** Andrew Murray, Regional Officer, Unite; Amelia Naranjo, Secretary, NUPIT Branch; Aqil Minhas, Treasurer, APCI; Irina Norton, APCI; Eulalia (Lalia) Pessoa-White, Director, NRPSI.

\*\*\*

The meeting opened at 2pm.

The agenda was as follows:

- Approval of minutes of previous meeting;
- PI4J Survey;
- Future plans;
- Letters to new Minister of Justice and Sir Alan Beith.

## **Approval of minutes**

The report on the meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> September was approved.

## **PI4J Survey**

A large part of the time remaining was devoted to a presentation by PA of the partially analysed results of the survey and a discussion of the implications of some of the findings.

This survey produced the second-largest response of the five surveys that Involvis has carried out on behalf of PI4J. The number of respondents was 1,127 although not all respondents answered all the questions.

It was clear from the survey results that interpreters are still extremely dissatisfied with the framework agreement and the way public service interpreting has been affected by it. Many continue to refuse to work under it because it has resulted in a lowering of professional standards and terms and conditions. What the survey tells us about the way forward will be discussed at future meetings when the Committee has had time to study all the responses.

## **Future plans**

The suggestion was made that in future surveys the questions could be differently arranged so that if selection of an option opens up sub-options respondents can see them even when selecting a different option.

Independently of the survey results, the committee had concluded that by itself PI4J was not substantial enough to become a service-providing body and could only play a role in partnership with a larger, already-established organization.

The Home Office's response to our submissions regarding the PACE review was felt to be disappointing, considering that several members of PI4J had received telephone calls from the Home Office representative on the last day of the consultation, indicating that mention of the MoJ's FWA as an example of language service provision would be

removed from PACE in view of the number of responses received in which this was recommended and the strength of feeling evinced on this subject by respondents. The reference was retained at the behest of the Ministry of Justice. However, as a result of the views expressed by interpreters, it has been acknowledged that there have been serious problems regarding provision of interpreter services and the Ministry of Justice's desire to give a monopoly to one organization. Changes were made to the PACE wording and under the new rules, chief officers are free to decide which individuals or organizations to employ. The reply received from the Home Office is copied in full below.

The possibility of PI4J becoming an advisory body was discussed.

## Letters

Letters had been written to the new Minister for Justice, Shailesh Vera and Sir A. Beith, Chair of the Justice Select Committee.

The meeting closed at 3.45pm, the date for the next meeting being 14<sup>th</sup> November at 12 noon.

## Report by Eileen Ford (NUPIT)

----- Forwarded message -----  
From: **Roberts Brian** <[Brian.Roberts21@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Brian.Roberts21@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)>  
Date: 21 October 2013 13:57  
Subject: PACE Code C Consultation - Note for Guidance 13A  
To: Pace Review <[pacereview@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:pacereview@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)>

Thank you for your response to the consultation concerning PACE Codes C and H. We have considered the responses from organisations and individuals which did not support the reference to the Ministry of Justice Framework Agreement being included in Note for Guidance 13A and we have decided to amend the Note so that it reads:

*“13A Chief officers have discretion when determining the individuals or organisations they use to provide interpretation and translation services for their forces provided that these services are compatible with the requirements of the Directive. One example which chief officers may wish to consider is the Ministry of Justice Framework Agreement for interpretation and translation services.”*

The purpose is to emphasise that the decision is an operational matter for the discretion of chief officers and that consequently they are free to decide whether or not they wish to use the MoJ Framework Agreement.

I can confirm that your response about the MoJ agreement has been forwarded for the information of the Ministry of Justice officials responsible for the MoJ Agreement.

A summary of all the responses and the Government's response will be published in due course on the Home Office web site.

---

*Brian Roberts*

**Science, Technology & Powers Team**  
**Police Transparency Unit (PTU)**

Fry Building (6th Floor SW)

2 Marsham Street

London SW1P 4DF

For the latest on the PACE Codes visit the Home Office [PACE Code Webpage](#)