



DP World EBA

Your life – Your fight

Your MUA national Part A negotiating committee met DPW from the 4-7 September in Sydney for the first round of negotiations for a new agreement to apply in your workplace. After extensive consultations in workplaces, culminating in a national MUA delegates meeting, the union log of claims was formulated and sent to the company. The DPW claims sheet was also sent to the union. In the main the first round of negotiations is largely about familiarising each other with what the claims actually mean.

This newsletter will endeavour to outline what the company claims mean for you and what occurred with our claims.

After four days of negotiations we have been able to thrash out the meaning behind the company claims.

Besides the fluffy principles which border on the paranoia about industrial action, there were six main points the company tabled as claims. Most points had multiple claims.

On the **agreement** itself the company claimed:

- a) 4-year term
- b) Agreement reached in principle by 28 Feb 2019
- c) One single simplified agreement with 4 appendices covering each site

The agreement term is self evident, for us the length of the agreement depends on the quality of the agreement. A single agreement presents problems and opportunities. A single vote across all ports is our main concern as we will not accept any port having an agreement forced on them.

On **cost** the company claimed

- (a) Cost neutrality – all claims paid for
- (b) Allowance frozen for the term of this agreement
- (c) Removal of Picnic Days
- (d) Removal of closed port days

While on face value these claims are clear, unacceptable, but clear, we must stress that cost-neutral means a pay cut.

It means if you get anything you've got to give back equal value to the company in some sort of productivity or efficiency trade-off.

Our view is Australia needs a pay rise, and workers deserve rewarding for the immense profits that flow to bosses. Especially on the waterfront with the enormous profit margins.

On **absence management** the company claimed:

- a) Removal of Appendix 1 and replace with absence management policy in line with Stevedoring Industry Award and NES

This is a claim aimed at reducing personal leave use. The 7-certificate free days is the target. Maybe the company want 5-free. Maybe as the claim suggests they want 0-free certificate days. Regardless we will be fighting to maintain and improve our conditions.

On **selection** the company claimed:

- a) Change to selection criteria

This selection claim according to the company is about 'getting the right people' into positions. We want to see fair selection with the removal of subjective scoring from people that don't know you or who have a grudge against you.

On **availability** the company claimed:

- a) Changes required to VSE availability limits and VSE days
- b) Days in lieu – substituting DIL for payment in lieu
- c) Union education and training leave – limits

This company claim is about curtailing trade union training, removing DILs and chaining VSEs to the job by limiting availability to 18 scratchings per month. None of these claims can be agreed to.

On **flexibility** the company claimed:

- a) Ability to use 4hr call ins for all tasks
- b) Advance /delay starts for all sites
- c) Introduction of cancelled shifts/paybacks to

address idle shifts in all sites and increase flexibility

- d) *Introduction of additional category of Supplementaries – “B” supps at all sites*
- e) *Consistent grievance process*
- f) *Outsourcing of non-core tasks*
- g) *Notification times—consistence and restrictive*
- h) *Labour reviews need to focus on forward planning not retrospective*

In seeking clarification, we can confirm that the company claim is for 4-hour shifts for all purposes.

This is alongside the ability to advance and retard your start time. By how much is not exactly known but it would seem to be over a four-hour span.

Payback roster in all ports is the ask as well as introducing another layer of labour in ‘b’ supps.

On grievances the claim is to limit the timeframe of a grievance. There is currently a 7-day limit for selection etc but a more general and open process open to members without a time limitation.

Outsourcing – exactly what was not stated but entirely unacceptable nevertheless.

Notification times to be lowered to lowest common denominator was the claim from DPW.

Labour reviews and forward planning is about not promoting VSEs to FSE rostered positions.

The MUA negotiating team unanimously rejected DPW’s proposals. Our rejection is not based on any initial hard line stance on matters but is fundamentally about rejecting an objective attack on worker’s wages and conditions.

It is clear the company want to address usage of personal leave as a major issue. We will talk to the company about the reasons why we believe this occurs and how we believe it can be fixed.

The MUA outlined all our claims to the company. For the most part the response was that the matter would be considered and DPW would report back to the next meeting with a more developed view of each of the MUA’s claims. We await this report.

All MUA member’s claims were dealt with and explained to the company by your Part A team. While it is fair to say the most common response from DPW was they would have to consider the claim there were

a number of areas which drew immediate and instant opposition.

Matters relating to outsourcing and coverage of jobs were rejected quickly by the company. Matters around notification were swiftly dealt with in the first instance but we will see what comes as negotiations progress.

It did become apparent that many of the main claims of MUA members were not considered by the company to be serious. On a number of occasions your Part A team stressed the importance of the bigger issues for wharfies at DPW.

The time for change has come. The days of outsourcing are over. Machines that allocate people have failed and taken our allocators jobs. We want them back. VSEs working massive hours in maintenance and work being outsourced must be addressed with permanent jobs and insourcing. VSEs must have a clear path to permanency and in many instances be promoted to FSE. The erosion of union jobs in terminals in a deliberate strategy to union bust must be resisted.

Fair pay rises and superannuation outcomes that mean we can retire in dignity must be on the agenda and delivered by DPW.

Predictability in our lives, rosters and notification and the abolition of precarious work are the things that can make our lives better and our workplaces fairer and more equitable.

Always going forward - not backward.

These are our goals.

Your National Part A Committee is:

Warren Smith – Assistant National Secretary
Jason Miners – QLD Deputy Secretary
Mick McLennan – Brisbane
Aaron Johnstone – Brisbane
Billy Ross – National Maintenance
Paul McAleer – Sydney Branch Secretary
Brad Dunn – Sydney
Clint Gaughan – Sydney
Naomi Cain – National women’s representative
Robert Patchett – Victorian Assistant Secretary
Peter Nadrez – Melbourne
Shane Stevens – Melbourne
Adrian Evans – WA Deputy Secretary
Shane Freeman – Fremantle
Chris Wilson – Fremantle