

---

**From:** Hearn, Janine [mailto:Janine.Hearn@fire.org.nz]

**Sent:** Tuesday, 17 January 2012 08:07

**To:** 'NZPFU'

**Cc:** Baxter, Paul; Butt, Brian; Cocker, Larry; Gregory, Kerry; Nally, Brendan; Warwick, Brett

**Subject:** NZFS/NZPFU Collective Employment Agreement Negotiations

Derek

I am in receipt of your email, sent 12 January 2012, in which you advise that the NZPFU rejects the counter-proposal made by the NZFS in relation to current collective employment agreement negotiations.

Your rejection of the proposal, without any attempt to propose alternative wording that addresses your concerns, and NZFS's very genuine concerns regarding the commitment of the NZPFU to finding a mutually acceptable solution to the issue of additional relieving staff is very disappointing.

For fifteen months we have been discussing the issue and throughout this time the NZPFU has made no attempt whatsoever to propose any form of substantive solution to the issue, but has merely rejected every suggestion and compromise the NZFS has tabled. This is despite having been provided with a wealth of information and data on the issue and having been invited on many occasions to modify, adapt or provide alternative suggestions to those tabled by NZFS.

To state that Management gets "exactly what it is presently demanding" from the wording proposed by NZFS is completely misleading. The relieving workers clause drafted by NZFS was a result of comments, albeit lacking any detail or substance whatsoever, made by the NZPFU following rejection of the many proposals NZFS has tabled. In no way is a 12-month working party on an issue we have already been debating and discussing for 15 months anything close to what the NZFS is seeking from these negotiations.

If the NZPFU were genuinely committed to finding a workable solution that addressed both NZFS's and the NZPFU's concerns then the back-up position of the relieving workers clause, which has no impact whatsoever on your current membership unless they choose to go on to the relieving watch, would not be an issue as the parties have 12 months to develop alternatives. Much of the work you refer to as being required by the working party has been done or debated at length during these negotiations.

NZFS commenced these negotiations seeking detailed changes to the CEA to introduce a range of flexible rosters. It has now compromised significantly from that position in an attempt to address the many and changing concerns that the NZPFU continues to raise as alternatives are tabled and discussed, to the point of agreeing to a working party and another 12 month delay to any change that addresses these issues. It is not surprising that the NZFS seeks some certainty that there will be an outcome some 27 months after first commencing discussions with the NZPFU on this issue.

If you were genuinely committed to settling these negotiations, and to finding a solution to this issue, you would make the effort to provide a counter-proposal to that tabled by NZFS that deals with the concerns you state you

have in your email, and takes into account NZFS's genuine concern that at the end of another 12 months we will be no further towards agreeing a solution.

The New Zealand Fire Service is confident that it has not breached the bargaining process agreement in any of its actions to date.

Regards

**Janine Hearn** | Director of Human Resources

New Zealand Fire Service | PO Box 2133 | 80 The Terrace | Wellington |

📞 04-496 3718 | 📠 Fax: 04-472-5203 | ✉️ [janine.hearn@fire.org.nz](mailto:janine.hearn@fire.org.nz) <mailto:janine.hearn@fire.org.nz>