

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY

AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD

MINUTES

MDPGA/AMB/M/4/05

AMB Secretary
Business Development
Room 108/Bldg 1071

AMB Members and Advisers

21 Mar 05

MEETING HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM, BUILDING 1070, MDPGA WETHERSFIELD AT 1300 HRS ON 7 MAR 05

Present:	CC D L Clarke QPM ACC J Bligh QPM ACC G McAuley Mr S W Beedle ACC R Chidley Ms K de Bourcier	Chief Executive (CE) - Chair Director Operational Support (DOS) Director Divisional Operations (DDO) Director Resource and Planning (DRP) Director Professional and Personnel Development (DPD) Head of Personnel Services
	Ms K Denwood Ch Supt R Morrison Det/Ch Supt G Nicholls Mr S Farthing Mr P Nealon Mr M Gilbey Mr F J Connolly	Head of Finance Head of Business Development Head of CID Head of IT and Telecommunications Head of Corporate Communications Deputy Director Strategy MOD Guard Service AMB Secretary
In attendance	Mr D Taylor	Occupational Health and Health and Safety Adviser
Apologies	DCC D Ray QPM Mr S MacCormick	Chief of Staff (COS) Director Regional Operations (DRO)

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1. See above.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. Under Item 8, DOS would present the paper on Crime Investigation Policy, as agreed at the Ops Brief on 7 Mar 05.	

FINAL

	<p>bi-lateral with 2nd PUS on 3 Mar 05.</p> <p>2. It was agreed that the work was still required to clarify the MGS role in the SHEF process, which would be the subject of a separate paper to the AMB. There was also need to articulate clearly the Agency's corporate liability for SHEF at the interface between the MDPGA and its customers. It was proposed that the CSA's should be the document for setting out respective SHEF responsibilities.</p> <p><u>Wethersfield Site Report.</u></p> <p>3. DRP advised that the Site SHEF officer had been appointed in Jan 05 and a Site Action Plan was being developed to be presented to the AMB for endorsement. The Plan would cover the actions required to provide a safe and secure working environment and to ensure that all staff and management understood their SHEF responsibilities. Work had already commenced on reviewing the site to identify those issues that needed to be addressed urgently to mitigate the risks from hazardous substances, fire and waste.</p> <p>4. The AMB noted the good progress that had been made in implementing the MDPGA SHEF policy and CE wished to record his thanks to the staff that had been instrumental in its achievement.</p>	<p>DPD</p> <p>DPD Hd BD</p> <p>DRP</p>
<p>5 MDPGA Framework Document MDPGA/AMB/P/10/05 Dated 25 Feb 05</p>	<p>1. DRP advised that the current draft of the Framework Document (FD) had been based on comments received from Board Members. CE added that ample opportunity had been given to comment on the FD and any further comments should be sent to DRP by close of play on 8 Mar 05.</p> <p>2. Hd BD advised that the FD was a dynamic and living document and for future amendments the process had been simplified to take account of changes in the Agency's operations.</p>	<p>ALL</p>
<p>6 Senior Police Officers' Conference 16/17 Mar 05</p>	<p>1. The AMB approved the SPO's Conference programme, subject to adjustments to the running order of presentations.</p>	<p>Hd BD</p>
<p>7 CTLB Management Issues for AP11</p>	<p>1. No issues were proposed for inclusion in the monthly report to the CTLB, apart from the FOI Standing Item.</p>	<p>DRP Hd HD</p>

<p>8 Investigation of Crime Policy Version 4 (ACC)</p>	<p>1. CE stated that the Police Committee had endorsed the Key Target 2 (Crime Solving) rationale paper at its meeting on 3 Mar 05, but emphasised the need for a comprehensive policy and clarity in the guidance for Crime Managers. The paper now in front of the Board had to meet this aim, as the Police Committee would want to see the final outcome, not for approval, but to note.</p> <p>2. DOS stated the current version of the paper had evolved as a result of the discussions at the AMB on 14 Feb 05. In essence, policy had moved away from listing Primary and Secondary Crime to an evaluation of the crime, relative to its context, timing and environment, assessed against the MOD's Departmental targets to determine whether it impacted significantly against Defence capability.</p> <p>3. Hd CID advised that Divisions and crime managers had been consulted in drawing up the policy and guidance. There was a consensus that crime managers would be able to work within the policy and procedures framework in support of the revised Key Target 2.</p> <p>4. DDO stated that the Chairman of the Plans, Target and Performance Sub-Police Committee had been keen to ensure that officers on the ground were clear about what impact the policy had on their responsibilities for investigating and recording crime.</p> <p>5. DRP stated that the paper needed to be clearer on identifying what constituted Defence capability and how the impact was to be measured to determine its significance. DRP suggested that the paper should be underpinned by the MOD Departmental Plan targets, with the policy set out in the opening paragraphs. DRP added that the paper might benefit from drawing on military phraseology ie readiness states, a language that fitted in with the MOD targets and would be recognisable to our TLB customers.</p> <p>6. DPD stated that he felt that the paper required greater detail and clarity for crime managers and desks on the procedures for recording and investigation crime. It was agreed that the first 2 paragraphs on page 4 of the paper should be combined and brought forward in the paper to make it immediately evident that crime was to be recorded in the normal manner but the decision on its subsequent investigation would be subject to the revised policy. It was also agreed that the impact of the revised policy on the NIM process would need to be articulated.</p>	
--	--	--

FINAL

	<p>7. CE stated that the paper should include the policy rationale in the Police Committee paper set out at paragraph 8, and the Departmental targets listed at Annex A. CE emphasised that the move away from relying on crime lists would require judgements to be made on occasion, in consultation with TLBs. These must be documented to provide the audit trail for the rationale that led to the decision on whether or not the crime impacted significantly against Defence capability.</p> <p>8. CE stated that any further comments on the paper should be passed to DOS by close of play on 8 Mar 05. Following the paper's presentation and workshop at the SPO's Conference on 16/17 Mar 05, it should be referred back to the AMB for final endorsement on 21 Mar 05.</p>	<p>ALL DOS</p>
<p>9 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. Mon 21 Mar 05 at 1300 hours in the Conference Room, Building 1070 to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Audit Committee Annual Report to CE/MDPGA b. Financial Performance Report AP11. c. Staffing of papers to the AMB. d. Business Case for Restructuring Probationers' Training Programme. e. Crime Policy. 	<p>AMB Sec</p> <p>CE DRP DRP DPD</p> <p>DOS</p>