



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

FOI Reference number: 31/2016

Date: 9 August 2016

Request:

I wish you to treat the following request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000:

1. How many Requested Reassessment Application Forms were submitted by Ex-Reserve RUC/PSNI officers (all ranks) in 2013, 2014 and 2015 and 2016 (up to 30 June 2016)? Please itemise each year separately.
2. How many Requested Reassessment Application Forms were submitted by Ex-Full Time RUC/PSNI officers (all ranks) in 2013, 2014 and 2015 and 2016 (up to 30 June 2016)? Please itemise each year separately.
3. How many of the officers in No.1 above, last had a previous Reassessment carried out 3 or more years previously regardless of the reason – not requested, delayed etc?
4. How many of the officers in No.2 above, last had a previous Reassessment carried out 3 or more years previously regardless of the reason – not requested, delayed etc?
5. How many of the officers in No.1 above, were medically discharged by the RUC/PSNI?
6. How many of the officers in No.2 above, were medically discharged by the RUC/PSNI?
7. How many of the officers in No.1 above, were classified as “disabled,” as I was, by the Medical Advisers from the Health Services Department?
8. How many of the officers in No.2 above, were classified as “disabled,” as I was, by the Medical Advisers from the Health Services Department?
9. How many of the officers in No.1 above, were originally awarded a percentage disablement of 27% (Band 2)?
10. How many of the officers in No.2 above, were originally awarded a percentage disablement of 27% (Band 2)?

11. How many of the officers in No.9 above, had their percentage disablement reduced from 27% (Band 2) to 24% (Band 1) post a Reassessment?
12. How many of the officers in No.10 above, had their percentage disablement reduced from 27% (Band 2) to 24% (Band 1) post a Reassessment?
13. How many of the officers in No.11 above, subsequently had their percentage disablement increased from 24% (Band 1) to 27% (Band 2) post a Reassessment?
14. How many of the officers in No.12 above, subsequently had their percentage disablement increased from 24% (Band 1) to 27% (Band 2) post a Reassessment?

Answer

1. Ex-Reserve RUC/PSNI officers (all ranks) submitted Requested Reassessment Application Forms for the years in question as follows:
 - 2013 – seven
 - 2014 – four
 - 2015 – two
 - 2016 (up to 30 June 2016) – one
2. Ex-Regular RUC/PSNI officers (all ranks) submitted Requested Reassessment Application Forms for the years in question as follows:
 - 2013 – twelve
 - 2014 – three
 - 2015 – six
 - 2016 (up to 30 June 2016) – zero
3. There were eight officers in No.1 above who last had a previous Reassessment carried out 3 or more years previously regardless of the reason.
4. There were eight officers in No.2 above who last had a previous Reassessment carried out 3 or more years previously regardless of the reason.
5. Nine of the officers in No.1 above, were medically discharged by the RUC/PSNI.
6. Ten of the officers in No.2 above, were medically discharged by the RUC/PSNI.
7. In order to provide a full response I would be grateful if you would clarify the term 'Health Services Department'. I can however confirm that all ex RUC/PSNI Reserve officers in receipt of an injury on duty award have been determined to be disabled by the Board's Selected Medical Practitioner.
8. In order to provide a full response I would be grateful if you would clarify the term 'Health Services Department'. I can confirm that all ex Regular RUC/PSNI officers in receipt of an injury on duty award have been determined to be disabled by the Board's Selected Medical Practitioner.

9. Two of the officers in No.1 above, **were originally** awarded an injury on duty award based on Band 2.
10. Five of the officers in No.2 above, **were originally** awarded an injury on duty award based on Band 2.
11. Two of the officers in No.9 above, had their percentage disablement reduced from Band 2 to Band 1 post a Reassessment.
12. One of the officers in No.10 above, had their percentage disablement reduced from Band 2 to Band 1 post a Reassessment.
13. It is not possible to answer this question at this juncture as the Reassessments of the officers in No.11 above have not been completed.
14. This revised response to question 14 was issued on 24.08.16.

One of the officer's in No 12 subsequently had their percentage disablement increased from Band 1 to Band 2 on the basis they fell within the over-65 category. The previous Chief Executive decided that in line with recommendations made in the Scofield Review – where a completed review has resulted in an officer having his banding reduced by virtue of his attainment of a particular age, the officer should have his original banding restored.

With respect to the zero you refer to in your question this covers ex-regular RUC/ PSNI officers for 2016 only. There have been reassessments requested in previous years as per our answer to your original question 2.

If you have queries about this request or the decision, please contact the Board quoting the reference number above. If you are unhappy with the service you have received and wish to make a complaint or request a review you should write to the Board's Chief Executive at the following address

Northern Ireland Policing Board
Waterside Tower
31 Clarendon Road
Clarendon Dock
Belfast BT1 3BG

email: foi@nipolicingboard.org.uk

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner. Generally, the Information Commissioner's Office cannot investigate or make a decision on a case unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by the Board. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:-

The Information Commissioner's Office – Northern Ireland
3rd Floor
14 Cromac Place
Ormeau Road
Belfast
BT7 2JB.

Telephone: - 0303 1231114
Email: - ni@ico.org.uk

Please be advised that Policing Board replies under Freedom of Information may be released into the public domain via our website @ www.nipolicingboard.org.uk.

Personal details in respect of your request have, where applicable, been removed to protect confidentiality.