

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD
MINUTES

20070319 AMB 03 2007 Minutes U

Business Development
Room 102 Bldg 1071

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

19 Mar 07

MEETING HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM MDPGA HQ WETHERSFIELD AT 13-00 HRS ON 12 MAR 07

Present:	CC S Love DCC D Ray QPM ACC R Chidley ACC G McAuley Mr S MacCormick Mr D Applegate Ch Supt G Branagh Ms K Denwood Mr S Farthing Mr P Nealon Mr D Farrow	Chief Executive (CE) – Chair Chief of Staff (COS) Director Personnel and Professional Development (DPD) Director Divisional Operations (DDO) Director Regional Operations (DRO) Director Resource and Planning (DRP) Representing Director of Operational Support (DOS) Head of Finance Head of CIS Head of Corporate Communications Secretary
Apologies	ACC J Bligh Det/Ch Supt G Nicholls Ch Supt R Hoblin	Director Operational Support (DOS) Head of CID Head of Business Development

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. None	
3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on	1. Minutes were agreed with one minor amendment – P3 para 13 should read “not guaranteed”. 2. Matters Arising – None.	
4 Review of RRA 20070227-AMB 03 Paper DPD Review of RRA U	1. DPD introduced the paper by reminding the meeting that there was a requirement to review RRA annually. 2. DRP suggested that it was possibly unique within the MOD that the MDPGA paid RRA at different rates for different grades at Wethersfield and that this should be addressed at the earliest possible opportunity and certainly by the same time next year along with a clear reasoning for the payment of the allowance. DPD	

	<p>explained that critical on-going PPPA tasks would prevent work to look into this disparity until later in the year but it was hoped that this work would commence in-year.</p> <p>3. The recommendations in the paper were approved by the Board.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>5 Agency Environmental Scanning Process 20070116-AMB 03 Paper DRP Environmental Scanning Process U</p>	<p>1. DRP presented the paper, emphasising the link between Environmental Scanning and risks and risk management. He explained that whilst some people had expressed concerns over the introduction of extra bureaucracy and any associated additional work involved this was justified because of the potential risks to the Agency if this work wasn't done.</p> <p>2. DDO raised the issue that although the proposed Legislation Action Group (LAG) would do a valuable job highlighting issues to be addressed, neither DDO nor DRO were staffed for leading on policy work and that this should be the responsibility of those departments that were, DOS, DPD and BD in particular although the relevant portfolio holder would be given the subject lead by COS as chair of the LAG.</p> <p>3. DPD warned of the potential of "creeping bureaucracy", although DRP countered this fear by once again explaining that the additional management of the potential risks to the Agency far out-weighed any extra work the process might involve.</p> <p>4. DDO reminded the Board that the extent of the Agency's Environmental Scanning must take account of all devolved bodies and organisations such as ACPOS and the Scottish and Welsh Assemblies.</p> <p>5. CE summed up by saying that none of the Board members had actually opposed the recommendations although some had "raised flags" over certain issues, particularly the worry over bureaucracy although he agreed with DRP's analysis of the potential threat. CE also suggested that it would improve the effectiveness of the LAG if a suitable representative from D Def Sy were included as a member. The LAG should also identify not only the portfolio holder but wherever possible the desk-level lead for the particular subject. COS would oversee the process which would evolve and become fine-tuned over time.</p> <p>6. The Board accepted the paper's recommendations with an action on DRP to implement them.</p>	<p>DRP</p>
---	--	-------------------

<p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Agency Performance Analysis 20070228-AMB 03 Paper DRP Agency Performance Analysis Jan 07 U</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CE introduced the paper by asking for comments round the table. 2. DDO stated that the MIF (Management Information Form) has significant flaws and some of the figures are still inaccurate. However, the overtime figures appear to be accurate and there seems to be a levelling out of sickness. He expressed a hope that the E333 would resolve some of the issues of inaccuracy with the MIF. DRP explained that currently there was an issue of a lack of direction and project management for E333 and CARM. However, CE stated that there was a specific approval in place for the limited extension of the CARM's trial in Scotland without a full-blown project being in place. The work was, however, being overseen by DDO and progress would be reported at the next Programme Review Board on April 16th 2007. 3. CE asked HRMS wasn't used for the police sickness figures and tasked DRP with including the HRMS attendance rota added to the Performance Pack, which would enable comparison with the MIF figures. 4. DPD felt that the figures were starting to show some erratic performance, for example crime solving and whether this indicated any trend for significant and non-significant crime. He also pointed out that the figures for MGS Region 5 looked unusual and wondered if there was an actual reason for this or whether it may be a statistical blip. 5. CE was pleased that overtime had come down significantly although taskings were only 1% off. DDO explained that some of this was due to less officers going off-station and thus allowing proportionately more tasks to be completed. 6. DRO saw a slight decline in the levels of tasking and a slight increase in the level of sickness. The averages for the regions showed a minor increase but were pretty stable. He also pointed out that one or two individual long-term sicknesses cases had a major impact on the overall figures. 7. DRO noted that there was an underlying issue with the under and over bearing figures without there being any actual hard evidence as to why that should be so for particular stations. Hd Fin asked what relation this had to the general state. 8. DRP was interested in the sickness figures and assumed that they were based on HRMS but this appeared not to be the case. He also stated that sickness targets would be part of the future Attendance 	
--	--	--

	<p>Management Strategy.</p> <p>9. COS wondered what the actual purpose of the pack was as it asked questions rather than answered any and that any explanations, if there were any to be had, would be dealt with at the relevant Director's bi-lateral. CE explained that some of the questions raised were perfectly appropriate for the AMB but wasn't sure if all of the divisional/regional data was relevant. DDO agreed that the divisional figures could come out and the overall Agency "big figures" were more appropriate. DRO agreed and therefore the figures and data presented should be by MGS and Directorate. He also requested that in future the document be referred to as the Agency Performance Pack.</p> <p>10. Hd Fin asked if the cost figures could be aligned to the tasks in future.</p> <p>11. Hd CIS questioned the tools being used for collecting and collating the figures as there seemed to be many inaccuracies. He also asked if the figures could be presented in a more regular format, possibly using Microsoft Word, as the current Excel Spreadsheets were both unwieldy and not uniform and he noted that different people printing the same document got it appearing in different formats, e.g. some people were getting one graph per page, some 3 plus other anomalies that made it impossible for cross-referencing. He also requested that there should be a brief description or note of the data source for each graph or table.</p> <p>12. Hd Corp Comms pointed out that the graphs, figures and tables were presented with absolutely no narrative or explanation which made them difficult to understand and interpret. He also asked if it would be possible for the pack to have some "headlines" for particular issues of note in the current pack.</p> <p>13. CE commenced his summing up by saying that the figures show the prioritisation on significant crime. On ethnicity targets there were still 424 MDP officers who had not yet self-declared. DPD explained that although there was technically a way of identifying these officers it would not be acceptable HR practice to do so.</p> <p>14. CE continued that the purpose of the pack was to forearm AMB discussion on performance itself and how to measure that performance. He also clarified the actions that had fallen out of the discussion:</p> <p>a) The requirement for information at Divisional and Regional level isn't necessary for this particular report, the pack only needs to show data for the overall totals</p>	<p>DRP/Hd BD</p> <p>DRP/Hd BD</p>
--	---	---

	<p>and by Directorates and the MGS.</p> <p>b) HRMS data should be used where available even if only to provide a comparison to the MIF figures.</p> <p>c) The whole pack should be produced in a much more straightforward and standard format, possibly using MS Word, so that there can be only one configuration of the document when printed to avoid confusion and wasted time and effort. The data source for each element of the pack (graph, table etc) should also be stated.</p> <p>d) Portfolio against forecast graphs from Hd Fin to be included.</p> <p>e) "Headlines", but not a detailed written analysis, to be included on the front/inner page of the pack possibly leading to Hd BD introducing the pack when it is presented to AMB.</p>	<p>DRP/Hd BD</p> <p>Hd Fin</p> <p>DRP/HD BD</p>
<p>7 Presentation on DMCS Report</p>	<p>1. A presentation by Lt Col Simon Bacon was followed by a Q & A session.</p> <p>2. CE expressed his thanks to Simon Bacon and his colleague Cdr Tim Churchill for their work in producing the report. He also explained that the report's recommendations would be discussed and decided upon at the next AMB.</p>	
<p>10 Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. None</p>	
<p>11 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The next AMB will now be on Tues 10 Apr 07 at 13-00 hours in the Conference Room, Building 1070 to consider:</p> <p>a) Consideration of the recommendations of the DMCS report.</p> <p>b) Agency Inspection Strategy</p> <p>c) Special Priority Payments 2006</p> <p>d) Superintendent's Performance Pay</p> <p>e) Communication's Strategy</p> <p>f) MGS IT Access</p> <p>g) Financial Performance Report</p>	<p>CE</p> <p>DRP</p> <p>DPD</p> <p>DPD</p> <p>DRP</p> <p>COS</p> <p>DRP</p>