

DRAFT
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD
MINUTES

MDPGA/AMB/M/15/06

Business Development
Room 102 Bldg 1071

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

17 Nov 06

MEETING HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM MDPGA HQ WETHERSFIELD AT 1300 HRS ON 13 NOV 06

Present:	CC S Love DCC D Ray QPM ACC R Chidley	Chief Executive (CE) – Chair Chief of Staff (COS) Director Personnel and Professional Development (DPD)
	ACC J Bligh QPM ACC G McAuley Mr S MacCormick Mr D Applegate Ch Supt R Hoblin Ms K Denwood Mr D Bodle Mr S Farthing Mr P Nealon Mr D Farrow	Director Operational Support (DOS) Director Divisional Operations (DDO) Director Regional Operations (DRO) Director Resource and Planning (DRP) Head of Business Development Head of Finance Head of Human Resources Head of IT and Telecommunications Head of Corporate Communications Secretary
In Attendance	Ch Supt S Walker D/Supt M Taylor D/Supt R Allen Mr D Hubbard	Div Cmdr North Eastern Division Hd FIB Hd Fraud Squad Hd Diversity and Equality
Apologies	Det/Ch Supt G Nicholls	Head of CID

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1. Apologies – see above. 2. CE welcomed all to the meeting and particularly Mr Daniel Applegate who was attending his first AMB as the new Director of Resource and Planning and Ch Supt Walker who had travelled down from North Eastern Division.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. Age Retirement for MDP Officers. 2. AMB Papers and Processes	DPD Sec
3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on 02 Oct 06 MDPGA/AMB/M/13/06 Dated 12 Oct 06	1. <u>Minutes – AMB 02 Oct 06</u> . Minutes were agreed without redaction. 2. <u>Matters Arising – AMB 02 Oct 06</u> . None	

<p style="text-align: center;">&</p> <p>Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on 09 Oct 06 MDPGA/AMB/M/14/06 Dated 02 Nov 06</p>	<p>3. <u>Minutes – AMB 09 Oct 06.</u> Minutes were agreed, with an amended form of words to be forwarded to Sec from Hd Fin for the item under AOB, without redaction.</p> <p>4. <u>Matters Arising – AMB 09 Oct 06.</u> None</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Hd Fin</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>Diversity Action Plan MDPGA/AMB/P/58/06 Dated Oct 06</p>	<p>1. Hd Diversity and Equality gave some background information as to why and how the Diversity Action Plan evolved.</p> <p>2. CE explained that he was the Diversity “Champion” for the Agency, that the Agency had a Diversity Strategy and Diversity Board that would actually manage the Action Plan. The Action Plan itself would enable the Agency to raise its standards and achievements in the area of Diversity which should enable it to address the issues that had led to receiving a “poor” rating on Diversity from HMIC.</p> <p>3. DRP asked about the origins of the % figures set out in Strategic Goal 2. Hd Diversity and Equality explained that Goals 2.1 and 2.2 originate from the Agency’s Key Targets. However, 2.3, dealing with numbers of female MGS officers, is a “first attempt” based on the MDP’s target for female officers. It is believed that these targets are achievable.</p> <p>4. DDO commended the Plan and said that it would be “usable” at Divisional level. However, he then raised the question of funding. CE responded by saying that the initial way forward would be by doing “the cheap things and the free things” first whilst future funding options were considered. He then explained that he was trying to link into the wider MOD’s Diversity community and extent the Agency’s reach within this community.</p> <p>5. The point was made regarding the increase of business partners and outside contractors that provide services to the Agency and that not all diversity issues were within the “gift” of the Agency. As a result the way that the Agency does business with these partners would have to be carefully monitored.</p> <p>6. The Plan was approved and it was agreed that monitoring of the Plan would be done by the Diversity Board, however, the key point was to get the whole process started as soon as possible.</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">5 CID Review MDPGA/AMB/P/56/0 Dated 30 Sept 06</p>	<p>1. CE introduced the subject of the CID Review by emphasising that although the paper contained a range of detailed recommendations but as Chairman there was only one decision to be made by the AMB at the meeting; whether or not to centralise the command of the CID. If the decision made were to centralise then DOS would be required to take forward a programme of work drawing on various parts of the Review paper. However, if the decision were not to centralise then DOS and DDO would need to study the recommendations and take the CID forward.</p> <p>2. However, CE felt that nowhere in the Review was there a paper that addressed the advantages/disadvantages nor the costs/benefits of any possible option and the actual question of whether to centralise or not wasn't addressed. Therefore, he instigated a debate based on the knowledge and experience of those present at the end of which there would be three possible options:</p> <p>a) Centralise command of the CID,</p> <p>b) Command of the CID to remain as it is,</p> <p>or</p> <p>c) No decision could made due to a lack of information and understanding.</p> <p>CE explained to the meeting that although Hd CID was unable to be present, he had discussed these issues with him and Hd CID was content for a decision to be made in his absence.</p> <p>3. A debate then followed in which all present were given the opportunity raise and discuss all relevant issues and many valid and informed issues were raised, analysed and considered.</p> <p>4. To enable a decision to be made CE called for an adjournment of some 30 minutes whilst he wrote up a list of the pros and cons for centralisation based on the prior debate. The list follows:</p> <p><u><i>For Central Command of CID</i></u></p> <p><i>Division's primary focus is customer tasking</i></p> <p><i>The crime working group recommends it</i></p> <p><i>The majority of Divisional Commanders consider unified chain of command a benefit</i></p>	
---	--	--

Increasing significance of level 2 crime

It would be 'clearer' and 'neater'

Command chain better able to manage crime

Performance and investigation stands – bar is rising

We have a small CID with big cases

There are a number of crime entries in the critical risk register

Economies of scale for scarce specialised resources

DPF support for centralisation

Better position to pursue more MOD business

Better able to respond to Defence Irregularity Reporting Cell

HMI concerns about capacity to sustain major case

HDPF general trend towards central CID

Better fit to intelligence structure

Better able to improve HMIC AFIs

Easier to manage IT and telecoms

Critical mass when needed

Command was centralised until 2003

For retaining divisional CID

No change required

Divisions are more 'complete' with a crime capability

CID more distanced culturally and operational from divisional uniform operations

Customers expect a local crime response

Divisional Commanders can deploy crime resources without having to go via HQ CID

Local knowledge is good for case work

Divisional crime detection targets support other customer outcomes

Most HDPFs have Divisional CID resources

NIM allows resources to be tasked objectively regardless of who wants them

If the protocol is not successfully amended, we will retain local non-significant crime responsibilities.

5. In summing up and in addition to putting forward the pros and cons of centralisation, CE explained that this was yet another fundamental decision to be taken by the AMB, the third in recent meetings (MGS Restructuring and DII(F) being the other two) and that this was more than just a CID issue but was also a leadership issue with Agency staff looking to the AMB for strong leadership and it is the Board's role to give the Agency's people a clear direction. There are no easy answers to the CID issue; under-resourcing is an issue within Home Office forces as well as the MDP. The problem that needs resolving is to create a "fit for purpose" crime investigation resource that meets Defence needs and costs, won't fail critically and will raise the MDP's profile and resources.

6. Whilst the meeting agreed that there was insufficient evidence to make a decision based purely on the CID Review paper, CE emphasised that the AMB was competent to make a decision by dint of those present and the knowledge and experience they had brought to the discussion. He recommended to the meeting that the case for centralisation of the command of the CID was so strong that further for the AMB to wait for further paperwork would be nugatory effort and that the decision should be implemented from the start of the FY 07/08.

7. The Board members summed up as follows:

DPD – This is the pragmatic way forward

Hd Fin – DOS must ensure that all budgets are re-cast before the end of March to ensure the transfer of control can happen within the timescales.

Hd Fraud Squad – This is the time and opportunity for putting a team together, with stakeholders such as finance heavily involved, to get this right.

DOS – This is an ambitious timescale and a dedicated project team will be required.

DRAFT

	<p>DDO – Content with the proposals.</p> <p>Ch Supt Walker – Divisional Commanders will give all the support required.</p> <p>COS – The AMB needed to be seen to make a decision and not defer on the matter despite the lack of direction from the Review Paper.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> The Board agreed that,</p> <p>a) command of the CID would be centralised from the start of the next Financial Year, 07/08. This decision will need to be ratified by 31st March 07 on the basis of a report to be compiled by DOS on CID structure within existing budgets, headcount and geographical locations and which would also plan how any “downsides” would be addressed, DOS to be appointed the Project Director.</p> <p>b) COS would engage the Customer/Stakeholder committee, &</p> <p>c) CE would engage 2nd PUS,</p>	<p>DOS</p> <p>COS</p> <p>CE</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">6 Police Vehicle Livery MDPGA/AMB/P/60/06 Dated 16 Oct 06</p>	<p>1. DOS introduced this paper by explaining the iconic status of police vehicles and it is this status and the cost implications of a change in police vehicle livery that has brought the paper in front of the AMB. The paper itself was straightforward and highlighted in particular the road safety implications of a change of livery.</p> <p>2. It was estimated that approximately 100 vehicles a year would receive the new livery and with costs varying depending on the type of vehicle to be re-branded, the annual bill would be around £10k to £15k which could be found within the existing annual maintenance budget. Hd Fin asked that if there was “spare” money in the annual maintenance budget to carry out this work couldn’t this be given to a higher priority requirement but it was felt that the annual cost would be negligible compared to the cost of a serious and/or fatal accident. COS highlighted the work that was carried out when the “Battenburg” livery was first being considered by the Metropolitan Police and pointed out the proven SHEF benefits and accident reduction that this higher conspicuity livery provides.</p> <p>3. CE thanked DOS for the paper and the proposal was accepted by the AMB with DOS to implement programme of livery change.</p>	<p>DOS</p>

DRAFT

<p style="text-align: center;">7 Service Police Access To MOSS MDPGA/AMB/P/61/06 Dated 25 Sept 06</p>	<p>1. COS gave the background to the paper, explaining that the jurisdiction requirements for Service and MDP Police were legally different and that counsel's advice was that access could only be given on a case by case basis. Unlimited access to MOSS by service police was not a legal requirement or legally acceptable procedure.</p> <p>2. The recommendation in the paper was approved by the AMB and COS would ensure that the service police were made fully aware of the decision and the reasoning behind it.</p>	<p>COS</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">8 MDP Overtime Limits MDPGA/AMB/P/62/06 Dated 31 Oct 06</p>	<p>1. CE expressed concerns over the Occupational Health issues raised which he felt needed to be resolved before a decision could be made on the proposals in the paper. Therefore, it should be referred back for more detailed Occupational Health advice.</p> <p>2. Hd HR proposed that the paper should be referred to the MOD Occupational Health Consultant and also to seek legal advice on any vicarious liability issues.</p> <p>3. It was decided that these consultations and referrals should be made before a revised paper is brought back to the AMB.</p>	<p>DPD</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">9 Hate Crime Policy MDPGA/AMB/P/63/06 Dated 20 Oct 06</p>	<p>1. DOS introduced the paper by saying that it was based on Home Office good practice which had been customised for MDP usage and that he commended it to the board as policy.</p> <p>2. DDO expressed his support for the paper but pointed out that the reference to FOI should have also included FOI Scotland. DOS stated that this would be amended.</p> <p>3. The Policy was approved by the Board.</p>	<p>DOS</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">10 Domestic Violence Policy MDPGA/AMB/P/64/06 Dated 20 Oct 06</p>	<p>1. DOS introduced the paper by explaining that its main contentious issue centred around MDP primacy in cases and investigations.</p> <p>2. CE expressed his appreciation to the CID staff involved in preparing both this and the previous paper. This Policy was also approved by the Board.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">11 Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. Age Retirement For MDP Officers. Home Office forces, under Older Workforce legislation, have put in for authority to set a retirement age for officers up to the rank of Supt at age 60. DPD is requested to look into this on behalf of the Agency and report back to the CE through the bi-lateral process.</p>	<p>DPD</p>

DRAFT

	<p>2. AMB Papers and Processes. The Secretary raised the issue that since the retirement of the AMB Sec and the decision not to replace him, the standards and procedures surrounding the preparation, staffing and submission of papers to the AMB had not been adhered to in some quarters causing delays and in some cases in-complete or un-submittable papers to be sent to the BMU as finished documents. The guidance on procedures for submitting papers to the AMB has been updated on the Agency Intranet and a “pack” with a time-line, guidance and examples will be issued to all writers of AMB papers once they have officially notified the BMU that the preparation a paper has been authorised by a Portfolio Head. A review of how closely these procedures are followed and their effectiveness will be carried out by the BMU mid-year 2007 to give time for these procedures to have adequately worked their way into the system. A question was raised about the stage at which the TUs/Federation/Professional Bodies should be involved in the process; an issue was raised at a recent local Whitley Committee meeting as to whether these bodies should be involved in the staffing process. Hd BD to investigate.</p>	<p>Hd BD/Sec</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">12 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The next AMB will be on 27 Nov 06 at 12-30 hours with a buffet lunch in the Conference Room, Building 1070 to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “On what would HMIC consider a Force’s commitment to diversity” – Presentation by Mr Everett Henry b) Presentation on Automatic Number Plate Recognition – Insp Brian Boyes c) Agency Performance Analysis d) Financial Performance Report e) CTLB Issues f) Noting of Ex-Committee Decisions in the period prior to this AMB 	<p>CE</p> <p>CE</p> <p>DOS</p> <p>Hd BD DRP DRP CE</p>