

Utilities Management EA Update 8-7-2022

UMPL ask SAPN workers to decide on the future of Enerven workers

UMPL have released an EA for vote, Enerven has not been included in this vote. In effect, by doing this, UMPL are asking SAPN workers to vote on whether Enerven has a separate EA or not. A separate EA for Enerven will have the most impact on the Enerven workers, yet they do not get a say on the issue. This is completely unfair and we ask ALL SAPN workers to vote No – because you are voting on someone else’s future.

This whole arrangement is extremely unfair and may not be legal. The situation that UMPL has put everyone in is another test of “legal principles” as the vote is not in line with the FWC scope order. The SBU has applied to the Fair Work Commission for Bargaining Orders, but if the vote goes ahead we ask all workers to vote **NO**.

All the workers have wanted from day 1 is fair negotiations and a reasonable offer in relation to the pay and conditions over the next 4 years. UMPL have refused all of that!

Our claim to fix or improve resourcing: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a review of resourcing to find labour shortfalls: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a fair pay rise in relation to CPI: **REJECTED**

Our claim for fairer rostering: **REJECTED**

Our claim to stop forced roster changes or forced implementation of new rosters: **REJECTED**

Our claim to help supp labour/fixed term workers gain permanency: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a yearly review of the use of Supp Labour in core roles within UMPL: **REJECTED**

Our claim to stop the use of re-occurring or rolling fixed term contracts: **REJECTED**

Our claim to improve gender equity in UMPL: **REJECTED**

Our claim to get the NOC/Dispatch equal pay on Saturdays: **REJECTED**

Our claim to get the NOC/Dispatch equal sick days: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a 10% loading for continuous shift workers on a ‘float’ shift: **REJECTED**

Our Claim to not lose any conditions: **REJECTED**

Our claim to maintain a 3 year term: **REJECTED**

Our claim to maintain a single enterprise Agreement: **REJECTED**

Our Claim to simplify Disability Payments: **REJECTED**

Our claim to reduce the use and flow on effects of Secondments: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a yearly review on the use of THCD: **REJECTED**

Our claim for Strengthening the Contractor Parity Clause: **REJECTED**

Our Claim for UMPL to report any underpayment of supp labour workers: **REJECTED**

Our claims for a defined process so supp labour/defined term contract workers can gain permanency: **REJECTED**

Our claim for a transparent process to better manage workload: **REJECTED**

Our claim to remove the cap on flexi-time: **REJECTED**

Our Claim for a new “working from home” clause: **REJECTED**

Our claim for an improved Consultation Clause: **REJECTED**

Our claim for better use of the current Union/Company Communication Forum: **REJECTED**

Our claim for increased annual leave for Availability Roster workers: **REJECTED**

Our claim for increased annual leave for Continuous Shift workers: **REJECTED**

Our claim for fair use of the Major Incident Allowance (link to force majeure): **REJECTED**

Our claim for workers who work Public Holidays to get a day back in the form of an annual leave day: **REJECTED**

Our claim for DUTY Officers to receive a full minimum instead of the current half minimum: **REJECTED**

Our Claim for an Inclement Weather Clause in the EA : **REJECTED**

Our Claim for toilets to be available for workers while at work: **REJECTED**

Our claim for minimum manning levels for each depot/department: **REJECTED**

There are many claims in this list that have been around for many EA's, *for good reason*. These claims are put forward by workers in an effort to make their workplace a fairer and happier place. The company's rejection of these claims illustrates what they want for our workplaces. The company is also asking you to vote for a wage increase that is below the rising cost of living, that brings in forced availability and removes the status quo protection in the dispute resolution process.

Even just taking into consideration the rejections that have been made in the negotiation process, the workers should vote NO.

On top of that, add the alienation of Enerven workers in this process, the NO should be the strongest we have seen so far.

What we are seeing here is a company weaponizing the EA process as much as they can against their workers. This process is supposed to be one of give and take, not take and take.

For the reasons above, we ask all workers to vote **NO** to the substandard and predatory offer that UMPL has put forward for partial voting.

SAME WORK, LESS PAY, WE SAY, NO WAY

For more information regarding the SAPN/Enerven enterprise agreement negotiations, contact your relevant union workplace delegate or your Union Organiser:

Ben Jewell CEPU 0422 339 699

BenjaminJ@cepusa.com.au

Daniel Spencer ASU 0447 147 524

dspencer@asu-sant.asn.au

Dominic Mugavin PA 0424 793 400

DMugavin@professionalsaustralia.org.au

PLEASE SHARE THIS UPDATE WITH YOUR WORKMATES