

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

20070430-AMB 04 2007 Final Minutes U

Business Development
Room 102 Bldg 1071

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

30 Apr 07

MEETING HELD IN THE CONFERENCE ROOM MDPGA HQ WETHERSFIELD AT 13-00 HRS
ON 10 APR 07

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

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1.	
2 Confirmation of Any Other Business	1. None. The proposed item on the Agency Core Brief was withdrawn by DRP.	
3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on	1. Minutes were agreed with the addition of an action being placed on DRP in item 5 and a minor amendment at P3 para 2. 2. Matters Arising – None.	
4 DMCS Report 20070330 - AMB 04 DMCS Integration Report - U	1. Withdrawn from this meeting due to further information being required. Paper will be considered at the next AMB.	

<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>Special Priority Payments 2006</p> <p>20070312 AMB 04 Paper DPD Special Priority Payments 2006 - U</p>	<p>1. With DPD not present at the meeting CE introduced the subject by querying whether the payments were affordable. DRP explained that money already existed for the payments and that it was financially prudent for the AMB to decide on the payments at this meeting in order for the money to be accrued in the current financial year.</p> <p>2. DDO explained that he and DOS had not as yet had the opportunity to sit down together and discuss the merits of the various business cases before the subject came to AMB, as was the normal procedure. However, due to the financial implications pointed out by DRP it was accepted that the AMB should make the decisions at the current meeting. Hd HR pointed out that the 3 criteria to be used when considering the validity of the business cases were that there was a high level of responsibility attached, there were difficulties with recruitment and retention the posts were specifically demanding.</p> <p>3. The business cases were then discussed and decisions taken as to their validity and whether payments would then be made:</p> <p>SEG – the recommendation was accepted as valid and payment of £2000 approved</p> <p>OSU – the recommendation of a payment was accepted but the value of the payment was not. It was decided that a payment of £1000 rather £2000 was appropriate and approved.</p> <p>CID posts with SIO responsibilities – it was felt that the business case was not strong enough to support a recommendation for payment.</p> <p>Whitehall – the business case was accepted with particular emphasis on the recruitment and retention criteria due to an aggressive recruitment campaign by the Metropolitan Police.</p> <p>Fraud Squad – It was felt that the business case was not strong enough to support a recommendation for payment and Supt McCleneghan stated that Hd CID had expressed a desire to withdraw the business case.</p> <p>Scotland Division Firearms Training Department - the recommendation was accepted as valid and payment of £1000 was approved.</p> <p>North East Division Firearms Training Department – DDO withdrew the proposal and stated that alongside the Divisional Commander he would consider other ways of recognising the work done.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Having made the decisions based on the numbers of officers put forward for payments in each business case DRP calculated that the total amount to be paid in Special Priority Payments would be £277k.</p> <p>4. CE asked that the minutes reflect that the AMB recognises the work of the whole range of MDP officers and the stringent financial circumstances within which the Agency had to live. However, the AMB retained the authority to increase or reduce Special Priority Payments annually in accordance with need, budget and the emergence of new and even more demanding forms of duty.</p>	
<p>6 Superintendent's Performance Pay Policy 20070330-AMB 04 Paper DPD PRP For Superintending Ranks U</p>	<p>1. CE asked if this were something that had to be decided upon by the end of the current FY for payment in the same way as the previous item. Hd HR and Mr Moore explained that this wasn't the case.</p> <p>2. CE pointed out that nothing could be paid until the reporting system was changed to reflect the proposed payment policy. However, DDO did remind the meeting that the principle behind Superintendent's Performance Pay had previously been agreed by AMB.</p> <p>3. As there was no financial imperative for the AMB to make a decision before the end of the current FY then CE deferred any further discussion and debate on the paper until the next meeting when DPD would be available to present the paper and answer any particular questions arising.</p>	
<p>7 Closing The Gap</p>	<p>1. COS introduced the subject by explaining the urgency of the matter and that a detailed action plan had to be presented to 2nd PUS by 30th June. The "Gap" had been agreed to be £23m, £20m apportioned to the MGS side of the business and £3m to the MDP. The proposals being put forward to close the gap are through economies and changes to working practices but if these aren't effective then the customer tasking will need to reduce which could ultimately lead to post losses. The opinion of the Board members was that this was indeed the correct concept to adopt, i.e. that the customer will get what they pay for and the "gap" retains its visibility.</p> <p>2. It was pointed out at this stage that during consultation DOS had indicated that he should personally have a greater involvement in some of the areas that involve his portfolio's staff and areas of responsibility.</p> <p>3. DRO then raised the issue of the MDP relieving margin. He said that he was worried about the practical effects of how and when this would be implemented and how this particular "gap" could be made visible. He</p>	

continued by agreeing that although introducing efficiencies and new ways of working would enable the current compliments to meet more of the current tasking, this would still leave a “gap” and while this was all well and good he felt that it still left problems with MDP taskings. COS explained that the change in the Key Target to reflect what is in the actual agreements between the Agency and the customers (CSAs) should help to reduce the MGS “gap”.

4. DRP suggested that there is much more to involving the customer than just pointing out to them what the “gap” is and leaving it to them to decide how to deal with it. He also questioned whether the “gap” should be considered to be more of an “Agency Gap” and shouldn’t be seen to be split as MGS and MDP individual “gaps” making up the whole.

5. DDO stated that assurances had to be given that the Agency wasn’t looking to bail out the MGS “gap” by cutting back the MDP taskings but with the caveat that this may be something that the customer decides to do.

6. COS then went through the list of preliminary options and explained the potential impact. DRP stated that the proposals were a full and comprehensive list but felt that the timescale should indicate the “Completed” rather than the “To Commence” date. He also said suggested that a holistic approach should be taken to all reviews carried out within and by the Agency.

7. CE summed up by explaining that what COS had presented were some proposals to develop the detailed plan which would develop and take shape. He also outlined what he saw as the 6 Principles:

a. The Gap belongs to the customers and it is for the customers to decide how to bridge it. However, we have no intention of bailing out MGS customers by making cuts to MDP services and capability.

b. The Agency will not offer up simplistic options that meet customers' shortfall in MGS funding by reducing MDP tasking or outputs. Variations to tasking and creative ways of working, including customer initiated variations in the MDP/MGS mix will require thorough investigation and negotiation with customers.

c. Savings will be sought in operational business areas, the Agency corporate services, and internal Agency efficiencies.

d. In the future we will seek greater clarity in the way that the budgetary Gap is presented separately from the relieving

	<p>margin gap for both MDP and MGS.</p> <p>e. The MDPGA will come under considerable scrutiny for its own efficiency and value for money and we must meet that challenge.</p> <p>f. We will need to be prepared to change the basis of our performance measurement.</p> <p>These principles support those already agreed with the Closing the Gap Steering Group, in terms of openness, integrity and transparency with the Centre and with all customers.</p> <p>8. A proposed Core Brief had been prepared: CE to study and amend as required before publication.</p> <p>9. COS would identify and specify the requirements for the "Closing The Gap" team.</p> <p><u>Post Meeting Note:</u></p> <p><i>1. At the AMB held on 30 Apr 2007, DOS stated that it should be noted there is other work on-going such as the SoR Project and CID Review that stand outside of the CTG Action Plan and double-accounting of any savings and cross-over of effort must be avoided.</i></p>	<p>CE</p> <p>COS</p>
<p>8 Financial Performance Report AP11 20070315 AMB 04 Paper DRP - Finance Report AP11 - U</p>	<p>1. Mr Moore, representing Hd Fin, explained that during the Financial Year 05/06 the Agency's FOO was £5m up on the AP9 figures and as a result 2nd PUS introduced a moratorium which is still impacting on this year's figures. This year since AP9 there has been a reduction of £1m in AP10 mostly due to Op Vintage payments and for AP11 all portfolios have indicated a reduction in forecast.</p> <p>2. DRP was concerned about the accuracy of forecasts as the AP11 figures showed a reduction across the board and this would have been even greater if the civilian pay hadn't been higher than expected.</p> <p>3. The report was accepted by the AMB.</p>	
<p>9 Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. None</p>	
<p>10 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The next AMB will be on Mon 30 Apr 07 at 13-00 hours in the Conference Room, Building 1070 to consider:</p> <p>a) Presentation on AWE Firearms Capability Review and Training by Ch Supt Dave Allard Div Cmd AWE</p> <p>b) Consideration of the recommendations of the DMCS report</p>	<p>DDO</p> <p>CE</p>

	c) Fast Track Medical Treatment for Operational MDP Officers d) Agency Inspection Strategy e) MGS IT Access f) Agency Performance Pack	DPD DRP COS DRP
--	--	--