

24th February 2012

Alison Watson
Director of Customer Service
Thomas Cook Airlines
Hangar 1
Runger Lane
Western Maintenance Area
Manchester Airport
M90 5FL

Dear Alison,

Re: Collective Grievance – Non-Meaningful Consultation

Right from the outset of the collective consultation process it was apparent that the meetings to which Unite were invited to attend had a predetermined outcome. The decision to implement the “proposals” was made prior to the commencement of the discussions with Unite. Considered and relevant objections and observations raised by the elected representatives were dismissed out of hand, and not given due consideration.

An unfair selection process was applied, which did not have the endorsement or agreement of Unite. Furthermore during members’ individual consultation meetings, the points they raised were not received with an open mind. Generic and in some instances inaccurate responses were given. Individual consultation meetings were held without essential information being available. There was clearly no intent on behalf of the Company to treat those affected fairly and reasonably.

Redundancy outcome letters were sent prior to the consultation process being closed.

Requests to extend the consultation process by Unite and the elected representatives, in order to genuinely find agreement were disregarded by the Company.

The Company informed the Unite representatives that the proposal to remove the ACM rank was no longer a proposal, but was to be implemented, prior to the consultation process closing.

Terms of reference from meetings were not adhered to. Meeting notes were not provided, therefore no agreed actions and outcomes were recorded at the time. No accurate record exists

of the consultation meetings. The Company is also unable to provide meeting notes from at least two meetings.

Members have raised appeals and been told which points they may and may not discuss. This is unfair and potentially unlawful. We also believe that those appeals are merely a 'box ticking, lip service exercise' by the Company, in a futile attempt to give the whole consultation process a modicum of credibility, and to protect you from litigation. The managers, who on behalf of the Company were hearing the appeals, were not doing so with an open mind and again the outcome was a foregone conclusion. Members have also raised legitimate grievances which the Company has refused to hear; providing further evidence that the employer acted unfairly and potentially unlawfully.

There was a lack of transparency and honesty throughout the consultation and the Company has tried to mislead our members in relation to agreed and non-agreed items during the consultation.

There are clear discrepancies and anomalies between the reasons given for the redundancy consultation, and the redundancy selection pool and proposed job roles.

Throughout the consultation the Company was solely focused on a timeline, and not on fulfilling its obligation to meaningfully consult. Our belief is that the Company has not acted lawfully, responsibly or with integrity. The Company did not intend to seek agreement through negotiation during the consultation, but merely to inform and implement its own predetermined agenda and objectives.

In summary, the Company identified radical changes that they decided to implement unilaterally, and embarked upon an "information only exercise" with no intention to meaningfully consult with employees and their elected officials. In essence the entire process was a total sham.

These items are not exhaustive.

We would like to discuss the issues and how the Company has not met its lawful obligation to consult meaningfully. We request that this meeting takes place under the avoidance of disputes procedure, and would like the meeting to be convened within the appropriate time lines.

Yours sincerely

Martin Browne - Chairman
(on behalf of the JCNC Representatives)