

18th March 2015

I write following your FOI request dated 17th February 2015 in which you request;

The calculation of Police Injury on Duty Pensions

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 I wish to ask the following questions in relation to the calculation process of Police Injury On Duty Pension banding calculations. I ask this as there appears to be different ways of calculating this throughout the UK.

*a) Is a theoretical/notional earning figure (sometimes referred to as a Police Earnings Assessment Matrix **PEAM**) used in the calculation of Police Injury On Duty Pensions in Cleveland?*

b) Is this figure which is normally a monetary value utilised in a formula by the Selected Medical Practitioner to calculate a banding of the injury pension.

c) If this PEAM figure is used, at what part of the process is it used? Is it used in the initial (first) part of the injury on duty pension assessment to use as one of the multipliers or is this used when a review of an IOD pension is taking place?

I ask this as I am aware some Police Services throughout the UK use this theoretical earning figure at differing parts of the process of calculating IOD pension bandings, some use it during the very first part of the process at the very first IOD pension assessment and some only use it at the point of a review instigated by the IOD pensioner or by the Police Pension administrator.

It is clear that not using this theoretical earning figure at the very first assessment will possibly result in a higher banding with solely the SMP disablement percentage used for the banding i.e. 25% (band 1), 44% (band 2), 75% (band 3) & 90% (band 4).

I ask, at which point do Cleveland Police IOD pension administrator use this theoretical earning figure and could an example of the formula or examples of the formulas be given. Is the theoretical figure used during the very first part of the IOD calculation or is it only used during a review process?

Is the use of this theoretical earning figure in such calculations lawful and what law/ legislation/ guidance is used. If it is lawful what law/legislation/guidance is followed?

This request has been handled under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Regarding your request I can now inform you that I have completed my enquiries and that my reply on behalf of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland is as follows.

I can confirm that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland does not hold this information.

However s16 of the FOI Act 2000 requires me to provide advice and assistance where I can to you. In that vein I can inform you that Mouchel are the administrators of the Pension provision for Cleveland Police. I respectfully suggest that you consider contacting them to seek an answer to your query. They can be contacted at the following address;

Mouchel
Teesside Pension Fund
PO Box 340
Middlesbrough
TS1 2XP

I can confirm that the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland has a complaints procedure.

If you are unhappy with the way your request for information has been handled, you can request a review by writing to:

Simon Dennis, Solicitor
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Cleveland
Police Headquarters
Ladgate Lane
Middlesbrough
TS8 9EH

or you can follow the complaints procedure found on our website at: www.cleveland.pcc.police.uk

If you remain dissatisfied with the handling of your request or complaint, you have a right to appeal to the Information Commissioner at:

The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.

Telephone: 08456 30 60 60 or 01625 54 57 45 Website: www.ico.gov.uk

There is no charge for making an appeal.

John Bage
Office Manager