

cc B/K/P
22

Ref. A086/1491

PRIME MINISTERReview Body Reports

As background to your meeting tomorrow, you may like to have:

- a. The draft letter which has been prepared for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to send to MPs.
- b. Question and Answer briefing prepared by the Treasury.

2. In the draft letter to MPs, lines 6 and 8 on page 3 are not quite correct, on the basis of the proposals discussed at your meeting last week. Strictly speaking, those sentences might read:

"Against the average increases recommended of 6.5 per cent, we have therefore awarded increases of 4.2 per cent, to be payable from 1 July: this will add about 3 per cent to the cost of the salaries of these groups in 1986-87. Of the total full-year cost of £777 million of the Government's decisions, only £3 million as accounted for by the TSRB groups."

3. I am sending copies of this minute and the annexes to all those Ministers attending your meeting tomorrow.

ReA

ROBERT ARMSTRONG

19 May 1986

CONFIDENTIAL

DRAFT LETTER FOR THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER TO SEND TO
MPs

REVIEW BODY REPORTS

The Government has today announced decisions on the Reports of the Review Bodies. I attach a summary.

Our policy is to accept such reports unless there are clear and compelling reasons to the contrary.

With the exception of TSRB we have agreed to implement all the recommendations in full, but as from 1 July. These pay awards give further increases, after allowing for inflation, for these groups; for example, nurses' basic pay has already increased in real terms by a third since 1979. These further increases, averaging 8.2% for Professions Ancillary to Medicine, 7.8% for nurses, and 7.6% for doctors and dentists have to be compared with a current inflation rate of only 3 per cent.

These increases reinforce a trend of improved real earnings for these groups, as compared with the position under the last Labour administration. For example, under Labour, the salaries of hospital doctors fell by 30 per cent, after allowing for inflation; with us, they have risen by the same

CONFIDENTIAL

amount. It is clear, as the Prime Minister has said, that we regard the NHS staff as its principal asset. Equally, we have honoured our manifesto commitment to maintain the levels of Armed Forces pay with that of outside occupations.

Pay increases of this size will create new pressures on both the health and defence budgets. Nevertheless, we have thought it right not to reduce the recommended pay levels. Their implementation will give confidence to the public, and the professions themselves, of the value the Government places on these groups.

But the implications of these pay awards in this financial year have to be faced. Our services have to live within their budgets. Implementation from 1 April would have severely curtailed the service improvements which we are planning this year. It would have cost an extra £200 million that is simply not available. [new sentence on new money]. A balance between accepting the pay award, and the effect on the service itself had to be struck. I believe this balance is the right one.

I mentioned that we have not accepted the TSRB recommendation. This group last year received very substantial increases, which were necessary to retain and motivate the limited number of key people involved. Having

CONFIDENTIAL

3773
3671

done this, we did not judge it necessary this year to go beyond the amount necessary to preserve the standard of living of these groups, while also further improving the link between pay and performance. Against the average increases recommended of 6.5%, we have therefore awarded increases of 3% from 1 July. Of the total full-year cost of £779 million of implementation of these recommendations, only £5 million is accounted for by the TSRB.

Lower inflation has dramatically increased the real value of pay increases. High increases are no longer needed to safeguard the purchasing power of pay packets. Pay awards should now reflect what can be afforded and is also necessary to recruit and retain the right people. It would be wrong, therefore, to look at these pay awards as in any way a guide for future settlements elsewhere. These awards largely reflect past trends for other groups.

In the public services, as in private firms, we have to be conscious of what can be afforded; if we are not, services and jobs will suffer.

There will be many in your constituency with an interest in these awards. I hope that this letter will help to explain the approach which we have taken.

1986 REVIEW BODY AWARDS

GENERAL BRIEFING BY HM TREASURY

A copy of the Prime Minister's statement is at Annex 1. General questions about the Review Bodies, and about public expenditure and pay should be referred to the Treasury. Detailed questions about the AFPRB report and armed forces officers covered by the TSRE should be referred to MOD; on the DDRE and NPRB report to DHSS; and on the judiciary to the Lord Chancellor's Department. The Treasury will deal with general TSRE issues and specific questions relating to the Civil Service.

1. What did the Review Bodies recommend, and what is being awarded?

<u>Review Body</u>	<u>Numbers</u>	<u>Average Percentage Increases</u>		
		<u>Recommended from</u> <u>1.4.86</u>	<u>Awarded from</u> <u>1.7.86</u>	<u>Average increase</u> <u>for '86-'87</u>
<u>Armed Forces</u>				
(up to Brigadier and equivalent)	330,000	7.46	7.46	5.6
<u>Doctors and Dentists</u>				
- In the Hospital & Community Service	53,300	7.6	7.6	5.7
- the Family Practitioner Service	48,000	7.0	7.0	5.25
<u>Nurses, Midwives, PAMs</u>				
- nurses, midwives health visitors	482,000	7.8	7.8	5.85
- professions allied to medicine	36,190	8.2	8.2	6.15
<u>TSRE</u>				
- judiciary	1,085	6.5	4.2	3.2
- senior armed forces	207	6.5	4.1	3.1
- higher civil service	659	6.5	4.1	3.1

What will the awards cost in 1986-87 and what is the saving from not implementing them in full from 1 April 1986?

<u>Review Body</u>	<u>Full Year Cost (£m) of Recommendations</u>	<u>1986-87 Cost (£m) (£m) of Awards</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Armed Forces	234	175	59
NPRB - Nurses, Midwives, Health Visitors	325	244	81
- Professions Allied to Medicine	30	22	8
DDRB	185	139	46
TSRB	5	2½	2½
TOTAL	779	582½	196½

3. How is the award to be financed?

TSRB award will be financed within running cost limits. AFPRB award will be financed out of the Defence Budget cash limit. [NPRB, DDRB to follow].

4. What does this imply for NHS service levels?

[To follow].

5. Further squeeze on already strained Defence Budget

Allowing for delayed increases in food and accommodation charges set by the AFPRB deferment saves MOD £54 million in 1986-87. Remaining cost of increases can be financed within existing Defence Budget without displacing equipment programme.

6. Recommendations should have been paid from 1 April and extra cost met from the £4½ billion Reserve

[To follow].

7. Does this mean the Reserve is in trouble?

No.

8. Why has implementation for DDRB, NPRB, AFPRB been deferred?

The recommended rates could not have been paid in full from 1 April without unacceptable implications for service levels in NHS and increasing pressures within the Defence Budget. The Government has to consider the interests of patients and wider aspects of the defence situation in judging how much can be afforded for pay increases.

9. Failure to implement reports fully is breach of faith with the groups concerned

No. All Governments, since establishment of Review Bodies, have reserved right not to implement Review Body recommendations in full if there are "clear and compelling" reasons for not doing so. Affordability is a clear and compelling reason and one that the Government, which has ultimate responsibility for public service pay, must decide upon in the light of fairness to the groups concerned but also the implications for service levels and the interests of taxpayers.

10. Review Body groups being treated less favourably than police, whose pay is tied to average earnings growth

Police pay is determined by the operation of a mechanical formula with no scope for judgement.

11. What is the point of Review Bodies if the Government does not accept their judgement?

The Government has, with the exception of the TSRB (see below) accepted the Review Bodies' judgements about the appropriate rates of pay for the groups. It has simply deferred their implementation for three months to protect service levels in the NHS and the Defence Budget. Government not the Review Bodies has ultimate responsibility for these matters and has to raise the taxes to pay them. The Review Bodies did not take sufficient account of the overall affordability position in their recommendations.

12. Does the Government consider all the Review Body awards to be excessive? In which case why didn't it implement lower increases?

The Review Bodies say that take a number of factors into account in reaching their recommendations and these are set out in the reports themselves. One of these factors is their affordability. The balance between the factors is a matter of judgement.

This year's recommendations cannot be afforded from 1 April. Government, in line with its responsibilities for services and national defence has therefore had to take action to reduce their first year cost.

13. Government hardly ever implements the reports in full. [TSRB report has never been implemented from due date, DDRB report has been staged for last 5 years, AFPRB was staged in 1984, NPRE staged last year.]

Government has to have regard to the implications for service levels and taxpayer of recommendations. This has often required staging/deferment. Previous Governments have done this also. See Annex 3 for details. Public money is limited. However, the recommended rates have nearly always been paid in full by the year end (except for TSRB) by this Government and (except for TSRB) will be in place by 1 July 1986.

14. These groups are being badly treated

Real pay of the Review Body groups has increased substantially under this Government, which has a much better record than last Labour administration (see Annex 2 for details).

15. Outrageous that nurses should have to wait 3 months for any increase

With inflation running at around 3 per cent the pay of qualified nurses will increase by 3 per cent more than inflation in 1986-87 as a whole and 5 per cent more than inflation by the year end. This is also against a background of a TPI increasing at an annual rate of 1 per cent, and on top of real pay increases to qualified nurses of nearly a third since 1979. [The TPI, Tax Price Index, measures the increase in gross taxable income needed to compensate taxpayers for any increase in retail prices. As well as changes in retail prices it takes account of changes to direct taxes (and employee's National Insurance contributions) facing a representative cross-section of taxpayers. It is thus a more comprehensive index than the RPI. The TPI increase is lower than the RPI increase in the 12 months to April because of the increase in personal tax allowances and reduction in the basic rate of income tax announced in the April 1986 Budget].

16. Groups with Review Bodies favoured compared with rest of the public services

No reason for treating all public service groups the same. Each has its own (and different) recruitment, retention and affordability situation. In fact Review Body groups (except TSRB) will be receiving increases within the current financial year of around 5½ per cent to 6 per cent, which is around or a little below Civil Service.

17. Implications for public service groups yet to settle eg NHS ancillaries

No automatic read-across. Each group considered in light of individual recruitment and retention situation.

18. Contrast with Civil Service 6 per cent

Review Bodies have done much better than Civil Service over last few years. And, by end of year the Review Body groups (except TSRB) will have received larger increases than Civil Service.

19. Effect on public expenditure in future years?

Matter for next public expenditure survey: wait for Autumn Statement and Public Expenditure White Paper. Government committed to sticking to overall totals for 1987-88 and 1988-89 published in last White Paper. Extra cost will need to be absorbed with that.

20. Will pay awards be backdated for pensions?

No. Rule is that pensions are based on salaries in payment. [Will AFPRB groups retiring between 1 April and 30 June get the pension increase paid to those retiring before 1 April? Ministers considering.]

21. Manifesto promise to Armed Forces broken

No. The Government's record is good. Staging in 1984 and deferment this year does not undermine the manifesto commitment. The full rates recommended by the AFPRB will be paid from 1 July.

TSRB

22. Why have the TSRB recommendations been reduced, alone of the Review Bodies

These groups received very substantial increases last year as a result of a full study of appropriate salary levels. The Government accepted these recommendations and implemented them in full from 1 March 1986. All that was needed this year was simple updating, implying an increase in line with price movements at most. TSRB

recommendations are for increases averaging $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, well beyond updating. Inflation running at 3 per cent. For that reason the Government thought it right to cut them back.

23. Government is picking on TSRB because they are well paid

No. Government implemented substantial increases last year for them and from 1 July is updating them.

24. Unfair to US's, who lost London Weighting last year and are now held down again

London Weighting was withdrawn in two stages on advice of TSRB. Government has reduced all TSRB rates by same percentage so the US's do better than rest of the Senior Civil Service as TSRB intended. And, introduction of additional discretionary increments will allow the best performers to receive further increases of up to £6,000 per year when fully implemented.

25. Why bother having Review Body if its advice is to be ignored

Government has to take all factors into account, including interests of taxpayer and fairness between groups. In light of last year's high awards it did not believe further increases averaging $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent were justified.

26. Decisions distort relativities

No. Government has reduced all increases by about one-third, keeping relativities established by TSRB. Relativities between TSRB/AFPRB groups are somewhat compressed but remain manageable.

27. When will discretionary pay be introduced?

As soon as criteria for awarding it is worked out.

28. Cost of discretionary pay?

The TSRB has estimated that it will add about 3 per cent to the salary bill for G2s and G3s when fully implemented (ie about $\frac{1}{2}$ million per year). But this will take some time. Cost will depend upon date of implementation and time it takes to become fully established.

29. What are the "rigorously defined criteria" that will merit discretionary pay?

Discretionary pay will depend on performance assessed within a formal appraisal system. The details are under consideration.

30. Why are performance bonuses being withdrawn for Grade 3's?

Introduction of discretionary pay makes them unnecessary.

31. Will the money saved from withdrawing these bonuses from Grade 3's be recycled to the other grades eligible for performance bonuses?

Yes.

32. Top of US scale (with maximum discretionary pay) is about the same as the bottom of DS pay [Differential is £175 per year].

Review Body proposed that G3 discretionary maximum should be identical to G2 minimum. Government proposes a slight lead. Maximum discretionary pay will probably be rare and a G3 may earn it for sustained high performance. If he is then promoted his pay on promotion will be the same as a G3 but it will be pensionable and he will have moved to an incremental scale with further discretionary pay points.

33. Does the move to discretionary pay indicate that the Government will be moving in this direction with lower grades as well?

The Government would like to strengthen the link between pay and performance generally within the Civil Service. The performance bonus scheme is a move in this direction. The Government intends to pursue further steps in the future but has no plans at present to extend discretionary pay beyond Grades 2 and 3 at present.

34. How will discretionary pay work?

Discretionary increments for Grades 2 and 3 will have two elements. Existing increments will not be automatic for new entrants to these grades but it is expected that these increments would normally be given although a positive decision based on performance will be required before the increment is awarded. There will also be additional increments above the present scales. These will be beyond the normally

attainable maximum and will be awarded to only a limited number of people in these grades. Sustained high performance measured against demanding standards will be required to receive these.

35. If discretionary pay is extended below G3 could civil servants lose existing increments?

No proposals at present to introduce discretionary pay below Grade 3. But, expectation is that existing increments would only become discretionary for new entrants to the grade. People already on the existing incremental scales could expect to continue to receive them, after any discretion was introduced for new entrants. Any extension of discretionary pay below G3 could also mean extra incremental points above the existing scales.

36. Discretionary pay for senior military

This is not recommended by TSRB. Discretionary pay is not considered suitable for the military.

37. Why does the President of England & Wales Land Tribunal receive 11.16 per cent and members of Land Tribunals 25.1 per cent

TSRB explains that they were allocated to the wrong tier of judicial remuneration in the 1985 Report on judicial relativities and their position is now being put right. The increases are therefore of a "regrading" nature.

38. Is the TSRB going to be abolished?

Nothing is immutable but no current plans to change present arrangements. If any substantive changes to present arrangements were envisaged there would be consultation with those affected.

39. What if TSRB resign in protest at rejection of their recommendations?

No reason for expecting this. TSRB recommendations have been set aside in previous years without leading to resignations.

ANNEX 2

This annex covers the record of the Labour and Conservative Governments on the real pay increases received by the groups covered by Review Bodies. The figures reflect increases actually implemented during the periods of office of the Governments. Thus the increases under Labour are calculated by comparing the increases in pay rates that took place between February 1974 and May 1979. [Thus any increases in pay that took effect from April 1979 after backdating are excluded if they were not implemented until after the May 1979 election. Similarly any increases from April 1979 implemented before the election are included.] Similarly the increases in pay under the Conservative Government compare present rates of pay with those in payment immediately before they took office. [Thus the increases that were implemented after the 1979 election but backdated to April 1979 are included in the Government's record]. The increases in pay are deflated by the actual changes in the retail price index between February 1974 and May 1979, and May 1979 and today respectively.

This presentation means that the Labour period covers five pay rounds (1974 to 1978 inclusive). During the Conservative period seven pay rounds have taken place (1979 to 1985). Hence annual averages are also given.

ARMED FORCES PAY REVIEW BODY

History. Established 1971. Effectively suspended in 1976 and 1977 and awards restricted to pay policy norms. Reported in 1978 but April 1978 award restricted to 13 per cent; remainder to be staged. Manifesto commitment of 1979 to restore fully comparable pay levels and to keep them there. Backlog from 1978 was implemented at once. Manifesto pledge re-affirmed in 1983. Since 1979 all AFPRB recommendations have been implemented, although implementation was staged in 1984. (Annex 3 for details).

Record of Different Administrations

MOD construct an index of military salaries for AFPRB grades. The average pay increases that took place in real terms during the last Labour and present Conservative Governments were as follows:

Labour

?

Conservative

?

Thus real pay for the grades covered by AFPRB changed by x per cent per year on average under Labour and by y per cent per year under Conservatives. Even with deferment of increases this year prospects are for a further increase in 1986-87 (with falling inflation) of 2 to 2½ per cent.

The above index covers all military salaries for AFPRB grades. The tables below set out the records of the two administrations for specific grades.

Real increases in salary scales (%)

	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
Private. Class 1, Band 2, Scale B (max)	38	-
Staff Sergeant. Band 6, Scale C (max)	10	5
Captain (max)	9	9
Brigadier (max)	(6)	17

The above looks impressive for Labour but it includes an increase averaging 24.2 per cent implemented just before the May 1979 election. Up to that point the record was of real falls as follows: Private (9 per cent), Staff Sergeant (15 per cent), Captain (14 per cent) and Brigadier (31 per cent).

Points to Make

- (a) Under last Government military salaries fell heavily until just before the election in real terms. Large falls for some grades, notably officers. Result: poor morale, recruitment and retention problems for Labour's period of office.
- (b) Present Government has honoured Manifesto commitments to maintain comparable salary levels for the Armed Forces with outside occupations.
- (c) Salaries have increased in real terms under present Government. Even with deferment of this year's increases salaries will increase on average by a further 2 to 2½ per cent in real terms this year.

DOCTORS AND DENTISTS REVIEW BODY

History. Established in 1971. Previous independent machinery for advising on pay (Kindersley Committee) collapsed just before June 1970 election when Labour Government tried to delay publication of the report, leading to the Committee's resignation. The DDRB's recommendations were staged in 1975 and it was effectively suspended in 1976 and 1977 when awards were limited to those allowed by pay policy norms. DDRB reported in 1978 but awards cutback to 10 per cent and remainder staged. The 1981 recommendations were abated by 3 per cent, but this was subsequently restored in 1983. The recommended rates have been paid since then although always with staging. (Annex 3 for details).

Record of different Administrations

The table below sets out the percentage increases in pay for doctors in the Hospital and Community Health Service under the last Labour and present Conservative Governments.

<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
(31)	30

Real pay for hospital doctors fell on average 6 per cent per year under Labour but rose by about 4 per cent per year under the Conservatives. After taking account of the deferment of the 1986 recommendations doctors pay will increase by a further 2 to 2½ per cent in 1986-87.

The above index covers only doctors in the Hospital and Community Services. The table below sets out the records of the two administrations for specific grades and also for GPs.

Real increases in salary scales (%)

	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
Consultant (max)	(33)	30
House Officer (max)	(21)	21
GP	(25)	36

Points to Make

- (a) Under Labour the salaries of hospital doctors fell 30 per cent in real terms; under the Conservatives they rose by that amount.
- (b) This year decisions imply a further real increase of 2 to 2½ per cent.

NURSES PAY REVIEW BODY

History. Established in 1983 because most nurses did not take part in industrial action in the Health Service in 1982. First report in 1984 was implemented in full. 1985 report staged but recommended rates in payment from 1 February 1986. (Annex 3 for details). Prior to 1984, pay set by collective bargaining. Two major reviews: Halsbury, implemented in 1974 by Labour; Clegg, staged awards completed in 1980.

Record of different Administrations

The index below shows the percentage real increases in the index of average nursing salaries prepared by DHSS and those received by professions allied to medicine during the Labour and Conservative Governments.

	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
Nurses	13½	26 (a)
PAMs	12	18

(a) Treats hours reduction in 1981 as pay rise

The real increase in pay during the Labour Administration reflects the implementation of the 1974 Halsbury Committee report which recommended increases of 40 per cent. However, from then on in its period of office real pay for nurses and PAMs fell.

The above is an index of all nursing salaries. The position varies from grade to grade. The table below sets out the records of the two administrations for specific grades.

Real increases in salary scales (%)

	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
Ward Sister (max)	4	32
Staff Nurse (max)	9	25
Nursing Auxiliary (max)	6	18

The pattern of increases above reflects the policy of improving the relative pay of qualified staff, implemented by this Government.

Points to Make

- (i) Under Labour nurses pay rose after implementation of Halsbury award but then fell in real terms. Labour were forced to set up another review - Clegg - to deal with this and this Government honoured it.
- (ii) Real pay of nurses under the Conservatives has risen by 26 per cent. Pay for qualified nurses by even more.
- (iii) Government gave the nurses and pams a Review Body in 1983 and has implemented the recommended rates, although staging was necessary last year.
- (iv) Recommended rates will be in payment by 1 July. Taking account of deferment nurses will receive a real pay increase of 2 to 2½ per cent this year.

TOP SALARIES REVIEW BODY

History. Established 1971. Staged in 1974. Suspended 1975 to 1977 during incomes policy. Reported in 1977 but recommendations cutback to 10 per cent and remainder staged. 1979 recommendations staged. 1980, 1981 and 1982 recommendations reduced. Staging 1983, 1984 and 1985. (Annex 3 for details).

Records of Different Administrations

The table below sets out the relative increases in real pay rates that took place during the previous Labour and present Conservative administrations for selected grades:

Real Increases in Salary Scales

	<u>Labour</u>	<u>Conservative</u>
High Court Judge	(39)	45
Circuit Court Judge	(33)	41
Major-General	(30)	31
General	(34)	48
Under Secretary (max)	(26)	31
Permanent Secretary	(39)	45

Even with the reduction and deferment of this year's TSRB recommendations the average increase in salaries in 1986-87 is worth just over 3 per cent, which is about the present inflation figure.

Points to Make

- (a) The previous Labour Government imposed massive real reductions in the pay of the judiciary, senior military and higher Civil Service through the operation of pay policies which discriminated against the public services and (because of the flatrate element of some of them) against these groups in particular;
- (b) The position has been put right by this Government and the grades concerned have received high real increases since the Government took office;

(c) This year's increases - although lower than recommended by the TSRB - are in line with inflation and will allow them to maintain their living standards. Indeed if account is taken of the Budget tax cuts which brought the annual increase in the Tax Price Index in April down to 1.2 per cent their living standards should improve.

ANNEX 3

REVIEW BODY RECOMMENDATIONS AND AWARDS 1971-85

	<u>AFPRE</u>	<u>DDRB</u>	<u>NPRE</u>		<u>TSRB</u>	<u>judiciary</u>
			<u>nurses</u>	<u>pams</u>	<u>senior civil service & senior military</u>	
<u>1971</u>						
Recommendation	-	8%	-	-	-	-
Implemented	-	8%	-	-	-	-
<u>1972</u>						
Recommendation	10%	7.5%	-	-	6.8%	6.8%
Implemented	10%	7.5%	-	-	6.8%	6.8%
<u>1973</u>						
Recommendation (a)	6.5%	4.5%	-	-	£250 pa	£250 pa
Implemented	6.5%	4.5%	-	-	£250 pa	£250 pa
<u>1974</u>						
Recommendation (a)		6.5%	-	-	£350 pa	£350 pa
Implemented		6.5%	-	-	£350 pa	£350 pa
<u>1975</u>						
Recommendation	29.5%	30% (b)	-	-	(c)	(c)
Implemented	29.5%	15%	-	-	(c)	(c)
<u>1976</u>						
Recommendation (a)	£6 pw	£6 pw	-	-	£6 pw	£6 pw
Implemented	£6 pw	£6 pw	-	-	£6 pw	£6 pw
<u>1977</u>						
Recommendation (a)	5%	5%	-	-	5%	5%
Implemented	5%	5%	-	-	5%	5%
<u>1978</u>						
Recommendation	32%	10%	-	-	35%	35%
Implemented	13% (d)	10%	-	-	10%	10%
<u>1979</u>						
Recommendation	32.5%	25.7%	-	-	23.2%	22.9%
Implemented	32.5% (e)	25.7% (f)	-	-	13.4% (f)	12.5% (f)

	<u>AFPRB</u>	<u>DDRB</u>	<u>NPRB</u>		<u>TSRB</u>	<u>Judiciary</u>
			<u>nurses</u>	<u>pams</u>	<u>senior civil service & senior military</u>	
<u>1980</u>						
Recommendation	16.8%	31.4%	-	-	38.2%	35.7%
Implemented	16.8%	31.4%	-	-	12.3%	12.1%
<u>1981</u>						
Recommendation	10.3%	9%	-	-	23.0%	21.1%
Implemented	10.3%	6%	-	-	7.0%	7.0%
<u>1982</u>						
Recommendation	6.1%	9%	-	-	19.4%	24.3%
Implemented	6.1%	6%	-	-	14.3%	18.6%
<u>1983</u>						
Recommendation	7.2%	9.7% (b)	-	-	11.7% (b)	11.7% (b)
Implemented	7.2%	7.7%	-	-	5.8%	5.9%
<u>1984</u>						
Recommendation	7.6% (b)	6.9% (b)	7.5%	7.8%	6.5% (b)	6.5% (b)
Implemented	4.9%	4.6%	7.5%	7.8%	4.5%	4.5%
<u>1985</u>						
Recommendation	7.3% (b)	6.3% (b)	8.6% (b)	12.1% (b)	12.2% (b)(g)	16.3% (b)
Implemented	7.3%	5.3%	5.6%	5.6%	5.1% (g)	7.1%

Notes

- (a) Review Body recommendations and awards restricted to those allowed under pay norms.
- (b) Staging reduces in-year cost. Full rates paid by year-end.
- (c) A second TSRB report in 1974 recommended increases of 28.8%. The Government implemented increases varying between 14.4% and 28.8% for individuals on 1.1.75 and announced an intention to pay the second stage on 1.1.1976. However, the second stage was not paid because of pay policy.
- (d) 10% pay policy norm plus 3% for introduction of the 'x' factor.
- (e) Labour Government implemented 24.2% increase just before May 1979 election. Incoming Conservative Government implemented a further 8.3% to restore fully comparable salaries.
- (f) Implemented by Conservative Government.
- (g) Figure is for senior civil service. Senior military recommendations were 17.6 per cent. Award was 7.3 per cent in-year.