

Final  
**MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY**  
**AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES**  
**23 JUNE 2008**

20080624-AMB Minutes Draft U

Secretariat  
 MDPGA HQ  
 24 June 2008

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

Present:	Mr R Hatfield  CC S Love DCC D Ray Mr D Applegate ACC G McAuley ACC R Chidley Mr S MacCormick  Ch Supt Branagh Mr R Clancy Mr J Oliver Mr P Taylor Ch Supt R Hoblin D/Supt R Allen D/Supt Dunlay Mrs J Rowley  Ms K Thompson	MOD Personnel Director and Agency Owner (Guest)  Chief Executive (CE) - Chair Chief of Staff (COS) Director Resources & Planning (DRP) Director Divisional Operations (DDO) Director Personnel & Professional Development (DPD) Director Regional Operations (DRO)  For DOS Hd Performance, Secretariat & Communications (PSC) Hd of Finance (Fin) Hd of HR (HR) Hd of Agency Business Services (ABS) D Def Sy CID/Fraud Squad Hd of HR Policy  Secretary
Apologies	ACC J Bligh	DOS

Item	Discussion and Decision	Action
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1. CE opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees and introducing Mr Richard Hatfield as both the MODs Personnel Director and as this Agency's Owner.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. None raised by board members but CE added an item to the agenda which would be provided by Richard Hatfield at the end of the meeting.	
3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on 27 May (20080528 AMB Minutes Final 05 2008)	1. One amendment was noted to the minutes of the May 08 meeting. Mr MacCormick was present and not absent as indicated. The minutes were agreed for publication without any redaction.  <b>Secretary's Note.</b> DRP has subsequently requested a clarification (additional text) to the text of paragraph 9.3 which has been actioned by the Secretary. The amended text now reads:	

	<p>“T/Ch Supt Goldsmith advised that because of the difficulties our Regional Prime Contractors (RPC) were having in accommodating the requirement to refurbish one accommodation block in the current financial year, the Agency had asked MOD DD/Commercial for a short term exemption on using the RPC.”</p> <p>2. Progress on actions from previous meeting was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.2 Finance - action complete.</li> <li>• 4.3 Finance - action complete.</li> <li>• 5a.1 CTG - action complete.</li> <li>• 5a.2 and 5a.3 are updated via the CTG report</li> <li>• 5a.4 CTG - action complete.</li> <li>• 6.1 Safety &amp; Env actions are recorded in the Safety &amp; Env report.</li> <li>• 7.2 Performance – Attendance Management is addressed at Item 12.</li> <li>• 7.4 Performance - MGS overtime graph will be included in the July Performance Report.</li> <li>• 8.3 Marine Firearms Policy - action complete.</li> </ul> <p>3. The outstanding action list was updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRO and DDO are requested to provide the AMB Sec with an update on No 4.</li> <li>• No 7 is recorded in HR Business Plan and is to be removed from this list.</li> <li>• No 8 is captured in the MDP competency framework work stream and is to be removed from the list.</li> <li>• AMB Sec to remove No’s 10, 11 and 13 (CARMS report and Dynamic Risk Assessment) from the outstanding actions list as they are complete.</li> <li>• No 12 Note that Mandatory &amp; Critical Training is coming to AMB in July 08 and the wider Functional Training report is planned for September 08. Action list is to reflect this.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DRO/DDO</b></p> <p><b>Sec</b></p> <p><b>Sec</b></p> <p><b>Sec</b></p> <p><b>Sec</b></p>
<p>4 Finance Update No Paper</p>	<p>1. It was noted that AMB had discussed finance outside the meeting. A note of the outcome of this meeting would be circulated by Hd of Fin.</p>	<p><b>Fin</b></p>
<p>5a Closing the Gap Work Programme Progress Report June 08</p>	<p>1. <b>CTG Report Item 1.5 (page 6) MDP Rosters</b> - DDO was asked to clarify if MDP rosters could be reviewed without access to an electronic roster package such as CARMS. DDO confirmed that this was possible and that it was intended to review all MDP rosters. The terms of reference for this review were currently being</p>	

	<p>documented.</p> <p><b>2. CTG Report Item 1.6 (page 7) Mobile MDP Patrol Capability</b> – DDO confirmed that the initial scoping report was being looked at and risks were being identified.</p>	
<p>5b Closing the Gap Work Programme Risk Register June 08</p>	<p>1. Risk 005 – Richard Hatfield confirmed that he expected this risk to be realised. It was likely that the MGS TU's would not accept the revised roster management arrangements. However, progress would/could still continue whilst recognising TU disagreement. DRO hoped that the 1<sup>st</sup> trial could start in July 08.</p>	
<p>6 Safety &amp; Environment Protection Audit Report Action Plan - U</p>	<p>1. CE commented that the action plan was developing.</p> <p>2. Head of HR confirmed that the internal adverts for the SHEF positions were in hand. CE asked Hd of HR to forward a copy of the position adverts to him.</p> <p>3. Hd of HR was tasked with including the populated traffic light system in the report.</p> <p>4. DRP said that as the owner of a number the actions he needed the opportunity to update the report before each meeting. Hd of HR agreed to circulate it, seeking update and comment from action owners and portfolio Director's, prior to submitting the report to the AMB at each meeting. This would replicate the staffing process in place for the CTG report.</p> <p>5. 07/05d DRO confirmed that he could provide an update on the removal of the footwear allowance to Richard Hatfield prior to his TU meeting later this week.</p>	<p><b>HR</b></p> <p><b>HR</b></p> <p><b>HR</b></p> <p><b>DRO</b></p>
<p>7 Agency Performance Report May 2008 - R</p>	<p>1. Updates for pages 1, 4 &amp; 5 were issued.</p> <p>2. AMB requested that the 12 month moving average figures should be shown with all graphs where it was relevant as this would help identify trends.</p> <p>3. It was not clear if the sickness figures for MDP on Page 2 included HQ staff. AMB would like to see a sickness graph that covers the whole of the MDP.</p> <p>4. CE pointed out that the crime detection rate for significant crime is looking close to target.</p> <p>5. AMB would also like to see asset recovery data as it informs the Board in respect of Key Target 5.</p>	<p><b>PSC</b></p> <p><b>PSC</b></p> <p><b>PSC</b></p>

	<p>6. It was agreed that the customer tasking data shown on page 5 should include the previous 12 months data.</p> <p>7. CE queried why the customer tasking for repayment customers was running at 84% when the Agency key target was to deliver all customer taskings. DDO explained that staff shortages would affect the customer tasking achieved and there were shortages at Royal Mint and some of the US bases. DDO agreed to investigate why the performance data was low and report back to the AMB.</p> <p>8. The graph detailing MGS overtime should be included in next months report.</p> <p>9. CE noted the female officers data reported on Page 7 related to MDP only. He asked if it was possible and easy to produce Ethnic Minority data for the MDP. Hd of PSC agreed to find out.</p> <p>10. It was noted that the newly formed Staff Resource Management Group (SRMG) had provided footprint data that supported the four year plan. It was agreed that this data was not necessary as part of the performance data but should come to the AMB under separate cover when required.</p> <p>11. The AMB Sec agreed to ensure that all not-protectively marked AMB papers were published on the intranet.</p> <p>12. CE asked that the final page of the performance report be updated with the Key Targets for this year.</p>	<p><b>PSC</b></p> <p><b>DDO</b></p> <p><b>PSC</b></p> <p><b>PSC</b></p> <p><b>Sec</b></p> <p><b>PSC</b></p>
--	--	---

<p>8 20080522 AMB Paper Special Priority Payments - U</p>	<p>1. DPD introduced this paper by explaining that it made sense to set the number of day's absence that would trigger the removal of Special Priority Payments (SPP) as less than the number of day's absence before unsatisfactory performance might be triggered. It was also thought that the system would be much more transparent if posts that might attract SPP were identified prior to a year start, but allowing a level of flexibility for changes during a year where it was appropriate.</p> <p>2. Richard Hatfield asked what the criteria for a post to be considered for attracting SPP, was. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Posts that carry a significantly higher responsibility level than the norm for the rank;</li> <li>• Posts that present special difficulties in recruitment and retention;</li> <li>• Posts that have specially demanding working</li> </ul>	
---	---	--

	<p>conditions and working environments.</p> <p>3. It was agreed that the new absence criteria should be included in the SPP policy and it should be amended to include these, prior to consultation with the DPF. The change to policy will be communicated by way of a Force Order which will also restate the criteria against which a post is considered as qualifying for the payment of SPP.</p> <p>4. HR is also asked to change the text in paragraph 2b to read 'absence period'.</p> <p>5. The AMB agreed to the recommendations listed at paragraphs 2 and 3 subject to the changes documented here.</p>	<p>HR</p> <p>HR</p>
<p>9 20080623 AMB Paper Certificate of Internal Control-U</p>	<p>1. DRP explained that the Certificate of Internal Control was developed in response to a suggestion by the independent members of the MDPGA Audit Committee. It was a form of self-assessment that should be used as part of the bilateral monitoring process.</p> <p>2. It was noted that the consultation process had identified a number of concerns regarding additional workload. DRP replied that the data was already available to managers but putting it into the format required to complete the certificate was an extra task, but one that needed to be undertaken.</p> <p>3. AMB agreed to the introduction of a Certificate of Internal Control that would be monitored via the bilateral process. It agreed to review the process after the certificate had been in operation for 12 months.</p>	
<p>10 20080623 AMB Paper DIA Risk Management Audit -U</p>	<p>1. CE was congratulatory as Defence Internal Audit (DIA) had given a 'substantial assurance' on the Management of Risk by the Agency.</p> <p>2. CE also stated that it was important that the methodology used to manage risk did not detract from the importance of managing the risk itself. It was not sufficient to document all risks in a risk register but it is important to actively manage risk. CE went onto to say that there are two different categories of risk. Firstly, the "stuff we know about" that is captured and managed through our normal business processes, and secondly, "the not expected and not foreseen stuff". CE would like to see our risk management process support this second category and that would include allowing risk registers recording a risk as 'Mission failure at location X'.</p>	

	<p>3. The AMB accepted the majority of the recommendations made by DIA; however, the Board was not able to accept the 2<sup>nd</sup> DIA recommendation (which is linked to their observation number 1). DRP agreed to discuss this further with the DIA. AMB agreed that the Risk Management paper did not have to come back to AMB.</p> <p>4. The following changes were agreed to the Risk Management Audit Action Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Recommendation 1 Target 1a - Change the date to 31 Dec 08.</li> <li>b) Correct typing error – Target 2b</li> <li>c) Recommendation 3 Target 3a – Needs a definition of ‘directly involved in risk management’.</li> <li>d) Recommendation 4 Target 4a – CE would like to write the Foreword to the Risk Management Guidelines and they should be presented to the AMB out of committee.</li> <li>e) Observation 5 Target 1a – This should read that if the risk management process requires additional resourcing for MGS then the guidelines should be revisited.</li> </ul> <p>DRP added that the recent resignation of the current risk manager would mean that some of the targets would probably slip in time until a replacement is in post.</p> <p>5. In summary the AMB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) agreed to note the DIAs substantial assurance – AMB paper paragraph 2a.</li> <li>b) agreed to accept the DIA recommendations subject to DRP revisiting recommendation 2 with the DIA – AMB paper paragraph 2b.</li> <li>c) agreed the Management Action Plan (paragraph 2c) subject to the changes (see above) being made. The Action Plan should then be published</li> </ul>	<p><b>DRP</b></p> <p><b>DRP</b></p> <p><b>DRP</b></p>
--	--	---

<p>11 20080623 AMB 06 Changes to ACS Methodology and Team Structure – U</p>	<p>1. COS introduced the paper by saying that the review of the ACS was conducted as an HQ department review and not as a complementing review. He added that the Fylingdales review highlighted that the current complementing process needed to be updated.</p> <p>2. COS recommended the paper to the Board as an approach that would be more consultative, more business focussed and manage risk and governance more appropriately. The complementing process would be conducted by experienced MDP or MGS officers only and the process allowed a fast track system for small</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>MGS complement changes. The changes proposed in the paper would also see some minor cost savings.</p> <p>3. DDO requested that a fast track approach be considered for some MDP complement changes.</p> <p>4. DRO expects to see minor refinement to the MGS fast track process as it matures.</p> <p>5. DRP initiated a discussion on 'who can request a complement review', because the Agency often spent time and effort on complementing reviews where funding was never present at the TLB level. It was agreed that the process be amended to show that the initial request comes to the COS, who conducts an initial assessment of viability in consultation with the TLB, before deciding to authorise a complement review.</p> <p>6. There was further discussion on the correct use of capitation rates and relieving margins. DRP raised the question of customer risk. It was agreed that complement review reports would include an assessment of the degree to which the customer's security risk would be mitigated by the recommendations of the report and the risk that would remain if they were not implemented.</p> <p>7. COS confirmed that the AMB paper would be amended to show the justification for the requirement of police and MGS only posts, prior to the paper going to consultation.</p> <p>8. COS confirmed that TLBs, as major stakeholders in the complementing process, would now be consulted, as would the DPF/TUs.</p> <p>9. The title of the restructured team was debated and it was agreed to change the name to 'Agency Complementing Team' (ACT).</p> <p>10. The AMB :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Agreed the new name and structure of the team (para 2a).</li> <li>b) Agreed the revised TOR for the ACT (para 2b).</li> <li>c) Agreed the proposed methodology with the inclusion of an MDP fast track process; assessment of customer risk in the review and a change to the flowchart showing the COS decision to authorise a review (para 2c).</li> <li>d) Agreed that COS would now initiate consultation with TLBs on the new TORs and methodology.</li> <li>e) Requested that the paper be amended to include the police &amp; MGS post justification and then proceed to consultation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ABS</b></p> <p><b>COS</b></p> <p><b>ABS</b></p>
--	---	---

Final

	f) Agreed the introduction of the audit trail (para 2d).	
12 Attendance Management No report	1. The Attendance Management report had been scheduled for discussion. However, the CE had asked DPD to assess the recommendations in the report and identify those that need to be considered by AMB.	<b>DPD</b>
13 Any Other Business	<p>No formal business was declared, but it was noted that the quality of the papers for AMB had been very good and that the consultation process was working effectively.</p> <p>Richard Hatfield was then invited to address the Board.</p> <p>Richard Hatfield announced that he was moving onto the Department for Transport during the Summer and this would be his last visit to the MDPGA. He went onto describe his time and associations with the MDP and MGS and lately as a member of the Police Committee and as Agency Owner. He complemented the work and professionalism of the Police and Guard Service and wished them well for the future.</p>	
14 Next Meeting	<p>1. The next AMB will be on Monday 14 July 2008 held in the conference room 1070 at 14:00.</p> <p>2. Items currently planned for the next meeting are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance update</li> <li>• CTG Report</li> <li>• CTG Risk Register</li> <li>• SHEF Audit Action Plan</li> <li>• Performance Report</li> <li>• Changes to Overtime and T&amp;S procedures</li> <li>• Flexible Working Hours Assurance</li> <li>• MDP Ballistic Protection Policy</li> <li>• MDPGA Invitation to Partner</li> <li>• Mandatory &amp; Critical Training</li> <li>• Additional Housing Emoluments Policy</li> <li>• Random Pre-employment Drug Testing</li> </ul>	