

From: Simons, Darrin <dsimons@bos.bm>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 4:17:44 PM
Subject: Role of Appropriate Authority

Police Officer Service Wide distribution

Colleagues,

In the pursuit of transparency, I write to advise that a legal challenge to Supt. Murray's performance of the role of Appropriate Authority (AA) has led to the understanding, that while she holds the rank of superintendent, she is not a 'member of the Service'. 'Membership of the Service' is specifically required under the Conduct and Performance Orders and because she is seconded to the BPS and not employed by the BPS, she is not a 'member of the Service' in that regard. It's a relevant legal technicality for the role of AA.

For the avoidance of any doubt, this technicality in no way diminishes Supt. Murray's suitability to lead this key area, nor my confidence in her. She is competent, capable and deeply committed to doing what is right for members and the BPS as a whole and will remain the head of PSD. However, the letter of the law requires the AA to be a 'member of the Service'. As a consequence, I will revert to being the Appropriate Authority for all PSD matters and not just Gross Misconduct. This will appear in GOs.

Further, because the allegations made about officers do not arise out of her performance of the AA role, the allegations do not go away with the change. However, this will mean that I need to revisit those decisions Supt. Murray made as a result of her being appointed as AA, anew. This

process is already underway.