

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD
MINUTES

20070319 AMB 02 19 Feb 2007 Final
 Minutes U

Business Development
 Room 102 Bldg 1071

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

02 Mar 07

**MEETING HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM MDPGA HQ WETHERSFIELD AT 13-00 HRS
 ON 19 FEB 07**

Present:	CC S Love DCC D Ray QPM ACC J Bligh ACC R Chidley ACC G McAuley Mr S MacCormick Mr D Applegate Det/Ch Supt G Nicholls Ch Supt R Hoblin Ms K Denwood Mr S Taylor Mr S Farthing Mr P Nealon Mr D Farrow	Chief Executive (CE) – Chair Chief of Staff (COS) Director Operational Support (DOS) Director Personnel and Professional Development (DPD) Director Divisional Operations (DDO) Director Regional Operations (DRO) Director Resource and Planning (DRP) Head of CID Head of Business Development Head of Finance Head of Human Resources Head of CIS Head of Corporate Communications Secretary
Apologies	None	

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1. No apologies received as all members present. 2. CE pointed out that there had been a meeting of AMB members on the previous Monday, 12 Feb 07, to discuss the budgetary situation and implications, although this wasn't a formal AMB. Any outcomes from that meeting would come to the full AMB in due course.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. Governance Arrangements 2. Senior Manager's Seminar	CE Hd BD
3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on	1. Minutes were agreed with one minor amendment – an action wasn't allocated to the AMB member concerned in the "Action" column. 2. Matters Arising – None.	
4 Competence Related Threshold Payments	1. DPD introduced the paper, explaining that the AMB would need to decide on what was affordable and what specifications needed to be agreed for entitlement to the payment. Hd Fin explained that the £6m was bid for and	

20061027-AMB 02 Paper
DPD Competence Related
Threshold Payment

obtained for the payments as part of previous legislation and DPD further clarified that there was a parity agreement to align the MDP with Home Office forces.

2. DRP asked if the Competency Related Threshold Payments (CRTP) were mandatory or an optional payment made by the Agency. DPD explained that although the CRTP was not mandatory it was something that had become enshrined in the pay and conditions agreement.

3. CE asked if the Board considered that there was a debate to be had as to whether an alternative arrangement should be discussed but the consensus was that the scheme as it stood was a *fait accompli* but that the criteria for awarding the payment should be considered. CE suggested that the criteria should be: Conduct, Attendance and Performance (CAP).

4. Conduct: DPD felt that if there were conduct-related issues then they should be considered on a case by case basis and reviewed either by the disciplinary authority or as part of a post decision review.

5. COS outlined that if the payment were decided as part of any disciplinary action then it couldn't be considered that "double jeopardy" would apply as indicated by the DPF.

6. CE highlighted that there were dilemmas as to how conduct/misconduct could be included as a criterion: it needs to be seen as fair and unchallengeable as possible.

7. DOS said that he would be more comfortable if there were no CRTP if there was any form of disciplinary measure for misconduct.

8. CE summed up the discussion on this criterion. Nobody had put up a case for conduct not to be part of the awarding criteria as measured by discipline although as soon as it is then the CRTP is seen to be part of the disciplinary process. Inconsistencies need to be eliminated. CE felt that he would feel uncomfortable for a disciplinary officer to be the one to decide on payment as this would then re-enforce the belief that the award of CRTP was part of the disciplinary process. Having the award or disallowance linked to any disciplinary process based on a specified scale would be crystal clear even if not universally popular.

9. Attendance: CE explained that it is a norm in other forces for attendance to form part of the criteria for the award of CRTP. He added that the issue to be resolved

was the level at which undiscounted absence would impact on the award of CRTP and that it should reflect a high standard of attendance not just something better than level at which restoring efficiency would commence.

10. DDO suggested that a figure of between 5 and 7 days would be reasonable which DOS agreed with although he added that the number of individual absences and not just the number of days could be a considering factor. CE then floated the idea of introducing the scheme with a sliding scale, for example in the first year of the scheme 10 days or less undiscounted absence would qualify, in the second year it would be 9 and so on until it got down to 7 days, rather than go for a “big bang” approach and introduce the scheme at 7 days straight away.

11. After further discussion CE summed up by saying that on reflection the idea of the sliding scale in the introductory years wasn't the best option and that the criterion should be 7 days or less undiscounted absence in no more than 3 separate periods of absence, i.e. 7 individual days would not qualify but one absence of 3 days and one of 4 would despite this being the same number of days. It was felt that the number of periods of absence was important in determining what could be considered a “high” standard.

12. Performance: CE stated that there were 2 elements to the performance criterion that needed to be addressed, the PDR and specific job/role-related qualifications.

13. DPD laid out some of the difficulties involved by explaining that PDRs are not an exact science and that targets/objectives set by different people for different and even similar jobs/roles can cause at the very least a problem of perception of inequality in awarding CRTP based on this criterion. Currently the figure was 75% of objectives being met but the meeting felt that this was too low to reflect a “high standard” of performance. Hd Fin pointed out that for civil servants to even be considered for a bonus 100% of objectives had to be met and even then it was not guaranteed that a bonus would be paid. DDO and DOS both gave their reasons for believing that the setting of SMART targets was difficult especially when officers have what are thought to be “harder” jobs and tougher targets than some others. Hd BD suggested that a link to customer targets could be used but that was felt to be only of use to those in jobs delivering customer targets and who should be having their own targets/objectives set to reflect this already. Hd CID re-emphasised that achieving 75% of targets/objectives was far too low to be regarded as a

	<p>“high” standard” but COS reminded the meeting that a pragmatic approach may have to be taken even if this meant that the target figure might not seem as testing as they might be.</p> <p>14. With regard to qualifications, i.e. up to date on mandatory training required for the job/role held, CE asked the question if this should actually be included and there were major issues raised all round that many people don’t always keep their mandatory training up to date through no fault of their own and also that as it stands this would be a difficult criterion to track anyway.</p> <p>15. CE stated that he had misgivings about linking CRTP to PDRs as there were fears that this could lead to the setting of less challenging targets.</p> <p>16. <u>Conclusion:</u> In summing up, CE stated that CRTP was introduced to drive and reward high professional competence and standard. It is a well established scheme that must remain credible to defence or it will be lost. He also felt that the CAP (Conduct, Attendance, Performance) criteria should be used. The Conduct criteria should be laid out in tabular form so that it sets out the effect and duration of any sanction on CRTP. He reminded the Board that this was not “double jeopardy” but the correct application of policy. The attendance criterion should be set at 7 days or fewer undiscounted days absence in 3 or fewer separate periods of absence. The performance criterion would be 75% of PDR targets achieved to a “good” standard or above and the officer concerned must have achieved all of the mandatory training for the role or be able to prove that they have done everything reasonable in an attempt to reach the standard.</p> <p>17. DPD was actioned to draft a revised policy which would then be forwarded to the DPF for consultation.</p>	DPD
--	---	------------

<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CID Centralisation</p> <p>20070209-AMB 02 Paper DOS-CID Centralisation U</p>	<p>1. DOS presented an update on the CID Centralisation project and explained that the 3 issues raised from the previous paper had now been carried out.</p> <p>2. DDO said that there was still an issue regarding the funding of overtime but that the recommendations of this current paper were acceptable.</p> <p>3. CE thanked DOS and all of those involved with the project for their endeavours that had led to the progress so far achieved. All three recommendations a, b and c were approved.</p>	
--	--	--

<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Relieving Margin</p>	<p>1. COS introduced the paper by explaining that it dealt with 24 hour posts and was for use in working out the</p>	
--	--	--

20061215-AMB 02 COS
Relieving Margin for MDP
and MGS R

resource requirements needed to carry out taskings over the year. It is a basis for establishing how the Agency can staff its customer taskings and for the customer to identify how much of that tasking they are prepared to pay for: if that's less than 100% then the Agency can work out how much of the tasking it can then fulfil.

2. MGS: DRO stated that he was pretty much content with the figures outlined in the paper although there were major difficulties with singleton posts, for which he suggested that meal breaks would have to be agreed locally on a case by case basis. He also suggested that a more challenging target of 5 training days and 10 sick days would give a figure of 5.1 which he thought should be the recommended figure rather than the 5.2 identified in the paper. Other than that he accepted recommendations 2d, 2e and 2f of the paper.

3. DRO also stated that the gap that the MGS was trying to close was the aspirational target from 5.4 to 5.1 and that the "Closing The Gap" exercise would not distort the Relieving Margin but would harmonise the figures.

4. DRP asked about the margins set by commercial concerns and DRO replied that they used a Relieving Margin of around 4 although that didn't take into account certain legal requirements so the figure would in reality be higher although probably not as high as 5.1.

5. MDP: DDO stated that he was content with the paper and recognised why AWE was treated as a separate item, however, he pointed out that it must be remembered that this needs to be kept current. He then asked about what happens next, who will inform the customer and when will they do this and how is the decision going to be treated. It was a concern that with the new Relieving Margin the customer may not actually pay any additional amount which could lead to "The Gap" just getting wider.

6. Hd Fin explained that "Closing The Gap" is trying to get the customer to focus on the actual outputs and not individual numbers and so the Relieving Margins may well change or at least be proportionate to the task/output.

7. CE pointed out that the MDP were not presenting the customer with the £11m bill or any bill for that matter. Negotiations with the customer would focus on the amount of the task they want and are willing to pay for.

8. DRO raised the issue that the MDP debt appeared to be "discounted" whilst the MGS debt wasn't, i.e. that the "Gaps" weren't being treated or considered equally. He

	<p>felt that without the £11m being specified as an MDP “gap” then the MGS are seen, at least within the Agency, as the villain of the piece. Hd Fin explained how and why the “gap” was created and that the customers are aware that the “gap” is an Agency one and not specific to the MGS.</p> <p>8. <u>Recommendations</u>: Recommendations a, b, d and f were accepted acknowledging that the MGS Relieving Margin would actually be 5.1 rather than 5.2) and c and e were noted. DRP asked that the Relieving Margins be considered Baseline Planning Assumptions (BPA) and that every opportunity was sought with the customer to deliver below BPA – this was accepted by the meeting.</p> <p>9. CE would notify the “Closing The Gap” steering group and COS would lead on consultation with the customer.</p>	<p>CE COS</p>
<p>7 MGS IT Access</p>	<p>1. This paper was withdrawn by Hd CIS before the meeting due to further work being required and this will now be presented at the next AMB.</p>	<p>COS</p>
<p>8 Financial Performance AP10 20070214-AMB 02 Paper DRP AP10 Final U</p>	<p>1. The paper was endorsed by the AMB.</p>	
<p>9 CTLB Issues</p>	<p>1. CE explained that this wasn’t required to be discussed as the format and procedure for presenting issues to the CTLB had changed and was now by way of a quarterly report and nothing further was required to be discussed at the present time.</p>	
<p>10 Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. <u>Governance arrangements</u>: CE explained that the governance proposals from D DEF SY were presented to the AMB for information at this stage rather than for decision. All AMB members apart from DDO had already had the chance to comment before the meeting.</p> <p>2. DDO had some comments to make: the legislation referred to on Page 2 Para 9 should read “1987” and not “1897”, Page 2 Para 14 the conditions for the post holder in Scotland are different to those in England and Wales in that they must still be serving and not the most recently retired and Page 4 Para 22 CPOA should also be invited. No other comments were offered.</p> <p>3. <u>Senior Manager’s Seminar</u>: Hd BD asked CE if Senior Manager’s Seminars would be reinstated for FY 07/08. CE stated that this wasn’t a subject for AMB and that Hd BD should raise the issue through DRP to CE ex-</p>	

	committee.	Hd BD
--	------------	--------------

<p>11 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The next AMB will now be on 12 Mar 07 at 13-00 hours in the Conference Room, Building 1070 to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) RRA Review b) MGS IT Access c) Agency Environmental Scanning Process d) Agency Performance Analysis e) Briefing on DMCS report from Lt Col Simon Bacon 	<p>DPD COS DRP DRP CE</p>
----------------------------	---	--