



Professional Interpreters for Justice Report of the Steering Committee

Date: Thursday, 6th June 2013

Time: 3.00 pm

Venue: Unite House - Holborn - London

Present at the meeting: Andrew Murray, Regional Officer of Unite, presiding over the meeting; Amelia Naranjo, Secretary, NUPIT Branch; Eileen Ford, Chair, NUPIT Branch; Keith Moffitt, Chair, CioL Council; Eulalia (Lalia) Pessoa-White, Director, NRPSI; Penny Arbuthnot, Involvis; Geoffrey Buckingham, Chairman, APCI; Aqil Minhas, Treasurer, APCI; Paul Wilson, CEO, ITI; Guillermo (Willie) Makin, Chairman, SPSI;

By telephone: John Podvoiskis, Director, PIA; Madeleine Lee, Director, PIA; Kasia Beresford, ITI;

Apologies: Klasiena Slaney, Director, SOMI UK; Maria Brown, Director, SOMI UK; Magdy Abbas, Director SOMI UK.

Meeting commenced at 3.00 pm

Agenda was as follows:

- Approval of Minutes
- Letter to PAC
- Westminster Hall Debate
- Meeting with NRPSI
- ATC complaint
- AITCI Conference
- SW Area Police
- Website
- Action Plan

The Minutes of the previous meeting The minutes were approved and it was agreed to post the report on the Website.

The Letter to the PAC Some members of the Committee had not yet seen the final version because it had not been circulated until that morning but those who had seen it found it satisfactory and it was agreed that any last-minute comments would be made by the end of the following day.

The forthcoming debate in Westminster Hall Everyone agreed that the debate was an important landmark and that members of the various associations needed to be encouraged to contact their MPs asking them to attend and call for cancellation of the framework agreement. At the time of the meeting, there was no information on the Government website about the time the debate would start or how much time was allotted to it. Involvis was drafting a briefing note which would be sent out to every single MP and this would be circulated to the SC members for approval some time over the weekend.

GM pointed out that the debate would not put the government under any obligations to change its policy or arrangements, but it would spotlight the inadequacy of the current arrangements and it was to be hoped that it would cause a stir which would attract the interest of the press which would give our campaign enough momentum to carry on for some time to come.

The meeting with NRPSI Following the NRPSI'S announcement that the enhanced CRB would no longer be a requirement for registration, reaction from interpreters had been such that the NRPSI had felt a meeting would be in order, similar to that held with representatives of interpreter organizations a year ago. Since KS was sadly away for family reasons, it was agreed that TW who had been working with KS on the matters giving rise to the meeting, would speak on the subject. Whilst carrying out research in connexion with the above decision, KS had become aware of a move by the NRPSI to alter the nature of the Register by admitting non-Public Service interpreters and changing the name of the Register to reflect this. The SC were strongly opposed to any such action and proposed it as an agenda point for the same meeting. The SC feels that the impending transposition of the EU Directive makes this a particularly bad time at which to do anything that alters the present status and rôle of the Register.

The ATC Complaint It appears that the ATC is waiting to hear from Capita before continuing to investigate the complaint. Capita for their part are simply declining to respond. It was felt that the ATC should be urged to proceed without further ado. Capita

had been given the opportunity to respond and has not done so; therefore the appropriate conclusion can be drawn.

The IAPTI Conference SC members were briefly put in the picture.

The South-West Police Forces GM reported that the advice he and TW had given at the meeting with SWP in March had not been fully heeded and the result was that a unilateral decision had been taken to alter terms and conditions; the interpreters had organized themselves to protest against the new arrangements and the decision had been re-thought and consultations were now taking place.

The Website The campaign page is now up to date; the newly-approved report of the last meeting will be posted shortly. At the same time the header where it still refers to 'six' organizations instead of 'ten' will be corrected. PI4J has been invited to send in a proposed page for the link to appear on and the specific weblink text.

Action Plan Some time was given to ways in which we could tie our campaigning in with the recent developments in the lawyers' campaign. It was felt that the lawyers had taken some leaves from our book but we were failing to use their campaign to promote ours. There is a lot to be gained from liaising with the legal profession.

It was felt at this stage an informal telephone call to the MoJ asking about when they were expecting the next meeting to be would be better than a formal letter.

A press release will be issued shortly after the debate. It will include links and information about how to see the debate if it is recorded or read about it in Hansard.

The topic of the EU Directive was touched upon. It was decided that the SC will make contact with those responsible for its transposition to see what progress has been made and also with people who can give us useful advice about monitoring how the MoJ implements it and what to do in the case of non-compliance.

The meeting finished at 4.50 pm, the date of the next meeting being set as 5th July at 2.30 pm.

Report by Eileen Ford (NUPIT)