



Department
for Business
Innovation & Skills

Trade Union Bill

**Government Response to the
consultation on tackling
intimidation of non-striking
workers**

NOVEMBER 2015

Contents

Foreword	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Summary of Responses	6
Question 1	6
Question 2	9
Question 3	10
Question 4	11
Question 5	11
Question 6	12
Question 7	12
Question 8	13
Question 9	13
Question 10	14
3. Conclusion	15
Annex 1	16

Foreword

One of the key aims of the Trade Union Bill is to balance and protect the rights of everyone in the workplace, whether they are union members taking part in lawful picketing, or non-strikers who simply want to go about their business free from threats and harassment.

While this Government recognises that picketing is a lawful activity, we are equally clear that it should never be used as an opportunity to intimidate others. Regrettably this is not always the case, and there are many examples of pickets resorting to unacceptable and aggressive behaviour towards non-strikers – actions that have no place in the modern workplace.

The requirement, set out in the Trade Union Bill, to appoint a picket supervisor is an appropriate and proportionate way to prevent intimidation occurring on the picket line and ensure picketing is consistent. That is not new. The appointment of a picket supervisor reflects the existing provision in the Code of Practice on Picketing which was last updated in 1992.

But it is important to determine whether other measures are needed to support this move, and how far such measures should go. That's why we asked people from all sides of the debate to make their voices and views heard, and almost 200 individuals and organisations have done just that. Their feedback, and the Government's response to it, is contained in this report.

While many agreed with our proposals, and some wanted us to go further, most respondents said that there was no need for further legislative change in addition to the measures already in the Bill. We will therefore not pursue such proposals.

However, the consultation did reveal growing concerns about the use of social media, including the online posting of photos of non-striking workers accompanied by derogatory comments.

It is clear that there is a need to update the Code of Practice on Picketing in order to set out clear advice on the rights and responsibilities of all parties involved in industrial dispute, particularly the use of social media. So that is what we will do.

We will work with others, including ACAS and the police, to ensure that existing rights are understood, including laws already in place to tackle intimidation.

The Government has also listened very carefully to the reactions of the unions and others to the picketing requirements in the Trade Union Bill. It is clear that there is a large amount of confusion and misunderstanding about how they will work in practice, much of it fuelled by opponents of the Bill who have wilfully misinterpreted its provisions.

The Government has no intention of making every individual on the picket line give their names to the authorities. Nor do we want to stop strikers using social media or require them to seek police approval for Tweets before they are posted. There is also nothing in the Bill that facilitates the illegal practice of blacklisting.

However, to remove all doubt we will table amendments to the picketing clause of the Bill that clarify our intentions.

We have asked for your feedback. We have listened to your concerns. And now we're taking steps to ensure the Trade Union Bill does the best possible job of protecting employees, employers and the general public alike.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nick Boles', written in a cursive style.

Nick Boles MP
Minister of State for Skills

1. Introduction

Background

1. The Government recognises picketing as a legal activity for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from work. Picketing, in Great Britain, is governed by a detailed framework of civil and criminal laws which includes protection against intimidation. A statutory [Code of Practice on Picketing](#) (“the Code”) explains these laws and provides guidance on how picketing should be conducted to ensure that this is peaceful.
2. Despite this, the Government was concerned by a number of reports to the [Carr Review](#) which highlighted a range of intimidatory tactics used during picketing or protests linked to industrial disputes. Aggressive behaviour displayed on the picket line included verbal abuse such as swearing and shouting; the frequent use of the word ‘scab’; and the filming of non-striking staff.
3. The Government wants to ensure that appropriate and effective safeguards are in place to address such unacceptable behaviour and ensure that non-striking workers can go about their business without fear of intimidation. A key safeguard is to require union supervision of picketing to ensure that picketing is conducted responsibly, consistently and peacefully. The Trade Union Bill, which was introduced in July 2015, therefore includes a provision to require a union to appoint a picket supervisor, the detail of which largely reflects the key aspects of Section F in the Code.
4. Due to issues specific to the Carr Review, it was unable to make recommendations in its published Report on how intimidatory behaviour could be addressed. The Government therefore considered it important that, in addition to the Bill measures, stakeholders should have a further opportunity to comment on what more should be done to address these problems.
5. That is why, in parallel with the introduction of the Trade Union Bill, the Government published an 8-week public consultation which asked whether other picketing related statutory requirements should be added to the Bill. It invited respondents to submit evidence of intimidatory behaviour experienced or observed and asked whether the legal framework could or should be strengthened. It sought views on proposals to improve union transparency and accountability by requiring the publication of union plans of intended action during picketing and protests and introduce a new annual reporting requirement on any such activities undertaken. It also proposed to widen the scope of the Code to protests linked to industrial disputes and make clearer the rights and responsibilities of all people involved in, or affected by, such activities.
6. Set out below is a summary of the consultation responses and the Government’s response.

2. Summary of Responses

Responses submitted

7. A total of 177 responses were submitted in answer to the questions put forward in the consultation. A list of the respondents is set out at Annex 1. Individual respondents have not been identified.
8. The government received a number of responses which did not follow the questions asked, but rather summarised respondents' overall opinion on the issue of intimidation of non-striking workers. Where respondents made comments that aligned to specific questions, we have sought to include these in the quantitative analysis of responses. Otherwise, the responses have been reflected as far as possible in the qualitative analysis of responses.
9. 69 (39%) responses came from individuals; 46 (26%) responses were submitted by trade unions; 15 (8%) from local government; 17 (10%) academic community; 10 (6%) from the legal community, 4 (2%) from business organisations and 6 (3%) from other representative or membership organisations. The remaining responses were submitted by political organisations (3), charities (3), research organisations (2), a health authority, and an online campaign.
10. The percentages set out below relate to the total number of responses received to each particular question.

Consultation Questions

Question 1

Most of this consultation focuses on specific proposals. Before turning to this detail, do you have any other evidence of intimidatory behaviour, directed either at non-striking or striking workers, that you believe should be considered as part of this consultation? If so, do you have any estimate of the economic impact of this?

11. A total of 143 respondents answered this question, with some providing multiple comments. The majority of respondents were individuals (38%) and trade unions (27%). A number of local government bodies (10%), academic community members (9%) and members of the legal community (6%) also responded.
12. Approximately 55% of respondents (mainly individuals, unions, local government and academics) indicated that they had neither experienced nor observed incidents of intimidatory behaviour during industrial disputes. These respondents generally felt that picketing tended to be peaceful events which afforded the union the opportunity to communicate the reasons for industrial action.
13. The remainder of respondents (45%) did report incidents of observed intimidatory behaviour either whilst on the picket line or more generally as a result of the strike action.

Responses showed a range of different intimidatory behaviour experienced by non-striking and striking union members, non-union members and others.

14. A number of incidents of intimidation against non-striking workers (union and non-union) and employers were highlighted. In each case, the intimidation was either by trade union members or striking individuals. One union which canvassed its membership found that over half of its members had experienced such intimidation of its non-striking union members. One non-striking union expressed concern about the intimidation of its members by another union when in dispute with the same, shared employer who failed to address complaints in the interest of maintaining good industrial relations.
15. Union responses and some individuals reported cases of intimidation by employers. Examples mainly related to alleged excessive docking of wages during industrial action, fear of reprisal (including damage to career prospects), threatened reductions in weekend and other work attracting additional payment.
16. Examples of intimidatory behaviour during picketing included the presence of dogs on a picket line outside a school; aggressive pickets verbally attacking or abusing non-striking workers; unwelcome 'banter'; an incident of teachers on a picket targeting pupils; consumption of alcohol on the picket line; and following staff from the picket line. Intimidation of non-striking workers was also conducted away from the picket line such as: aggressive language and behaviour on the day preceding and following picketing, repeated verbal taunts, strained relationships, whispering campaigns, aloofness, withholding cooperation, unfriendly body language. In addition to face-to-face attempts, e-mail was used to 'instruct' non-striking voters to strike, as well as attempts made to 'name and shame' non-striking workers by placing notices on notice boards.
17. Physical intimidation appeared less common. The few examples provided included: one union saying its members had faced physical intimidation and threatening behaviour from private security guards as well as one picket nearly being struck by heavy goods vehicle; a law firm reported that an employer client had experience of unions cutting lorry brakes to create blockages; an employer representative experiencing human or physical obstructions at entrances timed to coincide with official industrial action; and, one union in the fire sector reporting its members' breathing apparatus being interfered with by striking colleagues.
18. Whilst 15% of respondents stated that had experience of intimidatory behaviour, these did not provide examples of the type of behaviour experienced. A very small number also referred to incidents of intimidation by others, including the police, but were mainly in relation to incidents which occurred in the 1980's.
19. However, one clear and prominent concern throughout most of the responses is the growing use of social media as a modern tool which enables striking workers to show their feelings towards their non-striking colleagues. One respondent felt that social media was being utilised and perceived as an opportunity to identify non-striking employees on wider circulation. 16 respondents cited use of social media, largely to put pressure on non-striking workers and management though there were also reported incidents of social media being used against trade union members and activists. Examples of the use of social media to put pressure on non-striking workers and management included taking and posting of photos of non-striking workers on social media accompanied with derogatory comments or parodying staff with images and innuendo; alleged use of social media e.g. Facebook, twitter for harassment and

bullying/intimidation, also to bring management and the organisation into disrepute; and, use of cameras by unions to take images of people crossing picket lines. A law firm added that it is increasingly common for its employer clients to take disciplinary action against employees who have used social media to make inflammatory or intimidating remarks that have distressed others.

20. In terms of the economic impact, the majority of respondents did not, or were unable to, provide a quantitative estimate. Of those who did respond, the general concerns related to the indirect, wider costs of intimidation e.g. through stress, or lower future earnings. The social cost associated with constraining the power of trade unions was also mentioned.

Government response to Q1

21. The Government is clear that no form of intimidation on or away from the picket line is acceptable. It is clear this issue is complex with such behaviour taking a range of forms, in a range of different places and by a range of different people.
22. In respect of the examples of intimidatory behaviour during picketing, the Government considers the proposed requirement in the Trade Union Bill on union supervision of picketing to be an appropriate and proportionate approach to prevent such unacceptable behaviour from occurring. For the first time, there will be a legal requirement for a picket supervisor to be responsible for overseeing the conduct of the picket line to ensure that this is peaceful. The picket supervisor will be required to be familiar with the Code of Practice on Picketing which should address intimidatory behaviour taking place on the picket line.
23. However, the incidents of intimidatory behaviour that takes place away from the picket line paint a more complex picture. Examples of differing types of intimidatory behaviour have emerged by different parties and range from blatant to subtle types of intimidation, such as ostracisation in the workplace.
24. The Government will therefore update the Code to clarify the range of legal protections which already exist to protect striking and non-striking workers whether union members or not. This will include protections that address any unlawful treatment by employers but also address unions' unlawful disciplinary actions of its union members for not supporting strike action.
25. The Government is very concerned about the prevalence of intimidation online. The Code of Practice, last updated in 1992, predates the advent of social media and therefore more contemporary methods of communication. There are existing legal protections against the misuse of social media as set out in the Communication Act 2003 and the Malicious Communications Act 1998. We will therefore update the Code so that it will set out clearly the existing legal protections in this area and provide guidance for those people who wish to seek redress where they have suffered online intimidation as a result of industrial disputes. We will work with the police, the Home Office and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport to ensure that the Code provides clear and useful advice.

Question 2

The Government is interested in whether there are any further gaps in the legal framework (see Box 1 below) in relation to intimidation of non-striking workers and third parties. How could the framework be strengthened - for example, should there be new criminal sanctions such as an offence of intimidation on the picket line?

26. 140 respondents replied to this question.

27. Most (86%) of the respondents (including individuals, trade unions, members of the legal community and a business representative organisation) did not support the creation of a new criminal offence. Existing criminal and civil laws were considered sufficient for dealing with issues that could potentially arise during disputes. The Government was instead urged to focus on supporting better enforcement of current laws. A small number of respondents, particularly those with experience of subtle form of intimidation, expressed concern that the introduction of a new criminal offence could inadvertently lead to an escalation of different and less obvious forms of intimidation that may be harder to tackle.

28. Some respondents, whilst they did not support a new criminal offence, thought that any changes should relate to clarification and potentially strengthening the current Code or they should be balanced by strengthening striking workers' rights, for example by stopping excessive pay deductions and strengthen unfair dismissal protections for striking workers.

29. A small minority of respondents (14%) expressed support for a new criminal offence, with one individual adding that the Government should create a spectrum of offences, based on scale, level of intimidation and impact. Support for a new criminal offence came from a range of stakeholders, with trade unions suggestions any new offence should better worker rights, while businesses supported a new offence safeguarding non-striking workers.

Government response to Q2

30. As the main enforcement body dealing with picketing, the Government also engaged directly with police during this consultation. A small number of police forces responded separately and agreed that existing police powers were adequate in addressing most problems that can arise during picketing and protests related to industrial disputes.

31. Based on the views of respondents and the police, the Government concludes that there are no significant gaps in the current framework. However, much more could be done to raise awareness of existing protections and ensure that they are used to maximum effect. The Government will therefore work with the police, ACAS and other stakeholders to improve advice on the rights and responsibilities for all parties engaged in industrial disputes, in particular to build awareness of the full range of protections available to tackle issues of intimidation linked to industrial disputes.

32. As set out in the Government's response to Question 1, we will update the Code of Practice on Picketing so that this provides clear guidance on the responsible use of social media during industrial disputes.

Question 3

The Government is legislating to make a number of key aspects of the Code legally enforceable, such as the appointment of a picketing supervisor. Are there other practices that should be directly legally enforceable - for example, training or a requirement for all pickets to be properly identifiable in the same way as the supervisor? Please explain your views.

33. 134 respondents answered this question.

34. There was limited support from 20% of respondents for additional practices that could be added to the Trade Union Bill. 40% of respondents said 'no' on the basis of current laws being sufficient, the remaining respondents saying 'no' (40%) gave no further detail.

Government response to Q3

35. The purpose of clause 9 of the Trade Union Bill is to require the union to appoint a picket supervisor to ensure that picketing is peaceful for the purpose of furthering an industrial dispute. This reflects the existing provision of the Code of Practice on Picketing which was last updated in 1992. The union must issue that person with a letter of authorisation so that it is clear that the picketing is approved or endorsed by the union. The picket supervisor creates a single point of contact on the picket line able to act as a source of knowledge and advice to any other pickets. That person must either attend the picket line or be readily contactable by the union or the police in order to be able to return at short notice to ensure the picketing is lawful and should address any intimidatory behaviour that may take place during picketing.

36. In response to views, the Government will not add any further requirements to the existing provisions of Trade Union Bill that relate to the supervision of picketing.

37. Whilst not within the scope of this consultation, a number of respondents expressed views about the entitlement to see the letter of authorisation as set out in the Trade Union Bill. Their comments focussed on the entitlement to see the letter being too wide and that this could result in a general entitlement to see the letter of authorisation and, in turn, the picket supervisor's personal details. The Government is aware of the sensitivities of union membership and data protections laws. For that reason, the Trade Union Bill limits such entitlement to what is reasonable. In the Government's view, this could arguably and most reasonably be the employer at whose premises the picketing is taking place.

38. Speculation in the media and on social media has fuelled misconceptions about the intended effect of this measure. For clarity, the Trade Union Bill does not introduce a requirement for individual pickets to provide their personal details to the Police or for the picket supervisor's personal details to be set out in the letter of authorisation.

39. However, the Government has carefully considered respondents' views. It will therefore table an amendment to the Trade Union Bill to make clear the intended effect of this provision to address concerns about the perceived broader entitlement to see the letter and, most importantly, any Data Protection concerns.

Question 4

Do you have any figures that would enable us to estimate any costs to unions generated by making aspects of the Code legally enforceable.

40. 111 respondents answered this question.

41. The majority (92%) said that they had no figures to enable a cost estimate to be made. Amongst those answering 'yes', the responses were qualitative in nature. 7 unions responded with concerns around costs related to information provision, additional training, legal and litigation costs. However, one respondent noted that they envisaged a one-off cost for training of picket supervisors at around £1,000 per day for twelve members, based on previous experience of training provided by ACAS. Other respondents felt that, as most unions already adhere to the Code, additional costs would not expose trade unions to any significant expense.

Government response to Q4

42. As responses to the consultation suggested that the practices in the Code are already largely observed by most unions, the Government concludes that this approach should have low impact on most unions or police resource. It will provide consistency in the way that picketing is conducted.

Question 5

What are your views on the Government's proposal to require unions to publish their plans? What information should unions be required to provide? Please set out the reasons for your answer.

43. 154 respondents replied to this question. The Government's response combines the responses received to Q5 and Q6 which were issued in response to the proposal for unions to publish their plans on intended action during industrial disputes, for example plans for picketing, protests or a social media campaign.

44. A minority (14%) of respondents (the legal community, business organisations, local government, individuals, other representative or membership organisations and two unions) expressed support for this proposal, either wholly or in part. Some fully supported this proposal and agreed that it would improve transparency and accountability. Whilst others agreed with the principle of the proposal to inform the employer where, when and the number of people attending a protest or picket, they did not agree that such plans should include detail of unions' social media campaigns. These felt that, as such information was in the public domain and already accessible, the benefits of this were unclear. About 7% of respondents provided a neutral response to this question, stating that such a proposal would need to be balanced i.e. weighing equally on unions and employers.

45. Most respondents (79%) (mainly individuals, trade unions and members of the academic community, as well as some local government and legal community) did not support of the Government's proposal for unions to publish their intended plans for action during industrial disputes. The main view was that this proposal could result in significant costs due to the need for, and difficulties of, the close monitoring of activities and plans by their various branches to ensure a union's compliance. Particular concerns were raised in

respect of the prior notification of social media campaigns and the impact this could have on the right to freedom of expression. Views were also expressed in respect of difficulties in differentiating between social media accounts run by the union and individual members in a personal capacity. A number of individuals expressed concern that this would result in additional litigation costs.

46. A few respondents raised concerns in respect of its compliance with the right to freedom of assembly and freedom of expression under the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR). Concerns were also raised about the differing treatment of unions compared to other such campaign groups. Some respondents, including the police, indicated that though the publication of such plans could be useful for planning purposes, it was felt that such notification would be difficult to reflect up-to-date plans in practice and prove difficult to enforce.

Question 6

Do you have any figures that would enable us to improve the estimates in the Impact Assessment of the cost to unions of publishing their plans?

47. 106 respondents answered this question. Only one respondent said 'yes', referring to the additional time it would take to prepare a dispute but provided no figures for an estimate of this cost. In terms of the qualitative comments made, a small number of responses felt the cost would be significant though as yet difficult to quantify, in particular in the monitoring of activity at local level. A number of unions felt there would be a higher risk of legal challenge which could raise legal costs, in addition to administrative costs.

Government response to Q5 and Q6

48. In addition to the responses received, there has been widespread coverage and some confusion in the media that the Government wanted to limit the use of social media during industrial disputes. Although the Government consulted on a proposal to improve transparency and accountability, including a union's plans for a social media campaign, this did not extend to individuals having to provide prior notification of individual messages being posted on social media platforms.
49. Whilst there was some support for the benefits that this proposal sought to achieve, including greater transparency and accountability, support for the specific proposal was limited. The Government has carefully considered the views of respondents and will therefore not take this proposal forward.

Question 7

What are your views on the Government's proposal to strengthen accountability?

50. 141 respondents (unions, business, local Government, law firm, academics) answered this question on the proposal for an annual reporting requirement on picketing and/or protest activity undertaken during the reporting year. The Government's response combines Q7, Q8 and Q9 and is set out at paragraph 57.
51. Most respondents (78%) did not support this proposal. Unions felt that as democratic organisations, they are accountable to their members and therefore disagreed with the policy intention. Most felt that this could result in further administrative burdens on unions. This, it was felt, could divert union resources away from building and

maintaining constructive employment relations. 8% of respondents suggested that, if pursued, accountability for employers should also be introduced.

There was some support (11%) for the proposal for an annual reporting requirement on picketing and protest activities, however, the benefit to business was considered to be unclear. The remaining 3% of responses were either neutral or did not express a view.

Question 8

Do you have any other suggestions how union accountability and/or transparency could be improved?

52. 125 respondents answered this question.

53. Most respondents (66%) to this question did not provide suggestions on how accountability and/or transparency could be improved. About a third of these respondents considered current laws to be adequate and, as democratic organisations, unions to be accountable to their members only.

54. Of those that did have additional suggestions (34%), there was a wide range of suggestions in respect of improving the accountability or transparency of unions. These included:

- managerial identification and support for individuals at risk of intimidation during disputes e.g. isolated managers;
- unions to share their reporting information on their websites;
- 'hardship funds' set up by unions to be properly accounted for in their Annual Report to the Certification Officer; and
- unions to declare the percentage and numerical membership data to allow employers to understand union density across a workforce.

Question 9

Do you have any figures that would enable us to improve the estimates in the Impact Assessment of the cost to unions to report on industrial action in their annual reports?

55. 100 respondents answered this question

56. 87% of respondents said that they did not have any figures to improve the estimate of the impact of the proposals. A further 8% of respondents did not have figures but offered suggested that there would be an associated cost. 5% of respondents indicated that the impact would be unreasonably high.

Government response to questions 7 to 9

57. The Government has considered the views of respondents where provided and, due to the limited support for this proposal, will not take forward the proposal relating to an annual reporting requirement.

58. In response to suggestions where transparency could be improved, the Government will carefully consider the suggestions made and, where pertinent, will set out additional advice in the Code of Practice on Picketing.

Question 10

How should the Code be updated to be more useful for parties affected by industrial disputes? Please explain your answer.

59. 118 respondents replied to this question, of which 53% said that the code should remain unchanged and 4% said that it should be removed in its entirety.
60. 25% respondents felt that the code should be updated, with 3% supporting extending its scope to include advice on protests linked to industrial disputes.
61. The suggestions made by those that felt the code should be updated included that, whilst the Code contains good information, it should be clearer, more readable and user-friendly, and be updated to include guidance on all existing relevant legislation as set out in the consultation document. 15% respondents expressly wanted the Code to include advice on social media use during industrial disputes and that advice should be available to help those who are subjected to such forms of intimidation.

Government response to Q10

62. Whilst responses received direct to this question showed a mixed response, the number of issues raised collectively in the responses received to this consultation, has led the Government to conclude that the Code should be updated to improve awareness of the rights and responsibilities of those either directly involved in or those affected by industrial disputes.
63. We have already identified a number of ways by which the Code will be strengthened, including advice on the responsible use of social media on matters linked to industrial disputes. Whilst most respondents did not comment on widening the scope of the Code to include advice on protests linked to industrial disputes, the Government is of the view that such advice can only be helpful by setting out the rights and responsibilities of all parties involved in or impacted upon and will include this in the updated Code.

3. Conclusion

64. The Government would like to thank all respondents for taking the time to respond to this consultation.
65. Picketing has a wider impact that goes beyond the parties directly engaged in the industrial dispute. The Government is of the view that exercising the right to protest must be balanced against safeguarding the rights of the other individuals to go about their business unimpeded. The right to protest should not be used as an opportunity to intimidate others to support strike action.
66. As a result of this consultation and stakeholder engagement during the consultation and the responses received, the Government will take forward the following package of action:
- To amend the Trade Union Bill (clause 9) to clarify that the entitlement to see the letter of authorisation applies to the employer or his agent;
 - To amend the Trade Union Bill (clause 9) to clarify that the letter of authorisation applies to the picketing activity (and therefore not require the picket supervisor's name);
 - To strengthen the Code of Practice on Picketing to set out the rights and responsibilities of parties involved in, or affected by industrial disputes, including on the use of social media and protests linked to industrial disputes; and
 - Work with the police, ACAS and other stakeholders to ensure that guidance fully reflects the practical steps necessary to ensure that picketing remains peaceful.

Annex 1

List of respondents to the consultation, not including individuals:

Aslef
Association of Colleges
Association of Revenue and Customs
Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Bakers Food and Allied Workers Union
BALPA
BECTU
Belfast and District Trade Unions Council
Birmingham Law Society
British Pregnancy Advisory Service
Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Fire Authority
Building and Woodworkers International
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
CBI
CIPD
Communications Workers Union
Communications Workers Union, NI region
Community
DAC Beachcroft LLP
Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Service
Derry Trade Unions Council
East of England LGA
Employee Relations Institute
Equity
FDA
Fire Brigades Union
Fire Brigades Union, Northern Ireland
Fire Officers' Association
Gateshead Council
Going to Work campaign (1,266 user comments received)
Glasgow labour group
GMB
Hertfordshire County Council
IBOA, the Finance Union
Institute of Employment Rights
International Trade Union Confederation
IPA
Irish Congress of Trade Unions
ISU Independent Trade Union
Leeds City Council
Lewis Silkin LLP
Liberty
Local government association
Manchester City Council

Middlesbrough Council
NASUWT
National Union of Journalists
National Union of Teachers
Nautilus
New Economics Foundation
NHSBT
North Yorkshire fire and rescue service
Northern Ireland Public Service Alliance
Nottinghamshire Police
Pattinson and Brewer Solicitor
Pinsent Mason
Prospect
Retained Firefighters' Union
RMT
Royal College of Midwives
Royal College of Nursing
Scottish Socialist Party
Scottish Trades Union Congress
Sefton Labour Group of Councillors
Services Industrial Professional and Technical Union
Simpson Millar LLP
Skanska
Society of Chiropractors and Podiatrists
Society of radiographers
St Helens Council
Staffordshire fire and rescue
Tata steel UK
Thales UK Limited
The Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
The law society of Scotland
The Universities and Colleges Employers Association
Thompson Solicitors
Trafford Council
Transport for London
TSSA
TUC
UCATT
UNISON
Unite
USDAW
Voice
Weightmans LLP
West Midlands fire service
Women's Budget Group

Academics from the following:

Aston University
Birkbeck College
Brockenhurst College

Educational institute of Scotland
Lambeth College
NUI Galway
Queen Mary, University of London (x2)
University College London
University of Birmingham (x2)
University of East Anglia
University of Edinburgh
University of Leeds
University of Leicester
Westminster Academy

© Crown copyright 2015

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. Visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence, write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This publication is available from www.gov.uk/bis

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to:

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
1 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0ET

Tel: 020 7215 5000

If you require this publication in an alternative format, email enquiries@bis.gsi.gov.uk, or call 020 7215 5000.

BIS/15/ 621