

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
AGENCY MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES

24 May 2010

20100524 - AMB 05 Minutes Draft -U

Secretariat
MDPGA HQ
24 May 2010

Distribution: AMB Members and Advisers

<p>Present:</p>	<p>DCC G McAuley Mr D King ACC J Bligh ACC R Chidley Mr A MacCormick Mr P Taylor Ch Supt R Hoblin T/D Ch Supt Mace Supt M Foulger Supt Pawley</p> <p>Non Executive Members Mr E Keating</p> <p>In attendance Ms L McCarthy Mr H Moore Mr I Moore Mr S Hartley Mr R Plunkett Ms R Gourgey Mr A Clapp Insp R Chaplin</p> <p>Karen Thompson</p>	<p>Deputy Chief Constable (DCC) Agency Secretary (AS) Professional Development (PD) Operational Support (OS) MGS Head of Profession (HOP) Hd HR Hd Agency Business Services (Hd ABS) Hd CID Hd IMOA DBR Policing</p> <p>Defence Police Federation (DPF)</p> <p>For DO For Hd Fin HR Policy - Item 11 CTLB CESO VC Link for Item 8 only CTLB CESO VC Link for Item 8 only MDPGA Sustainability Manager Item 8 only Agency SHEF – Item 12 Agency Dpty SHEF – Item 12</p> <p>Secretary (Sec)</p>
<p>Apologies</p>	<p>CC S Love Mr D Wray T/ACC D Allard Mr J Oliver</p>	<p>Chief Executive (CE) - Chair Head of Unarmed Guarding (Hd UG) Divisional Operations (DO) Hd Finance (Hd Fin)</p>

Item	Discussion and Decision	Action
<p align="center">1 Opening Remarks and Apologies</p>	<p>1. DCC opened the meeting by welcoming all attendees.</p>	
<p align="center">2 Confirmation of Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. DPF asked to raise an item at Any Other Business concerning reviews involving the Agency.</p>	

<p>3 Minutes and Actions arising from AMB on 26 Apr 2010</p>	<p>1. The Secretary agreed to remove the action on AS at 6.2 as no action was required and amend ACC PD to read ACC OS at 9.1. The minutes were then agreed as accurate and approved for publication.</p> <p>2. Progress on actions arising from the previous meeting was reported as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1 Completed • 3.3 is carried forward to the outstanding action list • 7.2a Completed • 8.3 Completed • 9.1 Completed • 11.3 Completed <p>3. The Outstanding Action List was not discussed.</p>	<p>SEC</p>
--	--	-------------------

<p>4 Finance 20100524 – AMB 05 Finance - U</p>	<p>1. AS introduced a new style of report to AMB in dashboard format.</p> <p>2. The key message was that we are forecasting overspend of £15m against Control Total (KT8), but accepting that position we are, at AP1, on-track to achieve the more realistic internal Agency target.</p> <p>3. AS said the new report would help the Board focus on key issues and provide a ready insight into related risks and issues. The one page overview would be supplemented by additional material, by key indicator. . Members were invited to offer comment on the style and content of the report.</p> <p>4. AS and Hd Fin talked to the key financial risks and how these might best be mitigated. Risks included variance on personnel wastage and pay assumptions and income. NPIA Firearms accreditation was a significant and unexpected risk as it added additional training requirements for all firearms police officers.</p> <p>5. ACC OS raised the issue of language around the topic of overtime as the Centre's perception of overtime was that it was a spend option that could be curtailed, whereas for operational police or guarding overtime was a way of achieving task. AS said that progress had been made, MOD Centre understand there was very limited discretionary overtime. .</p> <p>6. HOP asked for clarity on the recent development of limited MGS recruitment and or overtime at critical sites. AS explained that the Defence Operating Board made available an additional £15m for MPGS. A small element of that additional funding would be made available to MGS for overtime at heavily stretched sites. This funding of approximately £1.6m should be made available at the end of AP2. AS also explained that there was agreement in principle, if helpful to DBR and manageable within the budget, to allocate an additional £1M or so for MGS recruitment. This would</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>be subject to exceptions approvals. He added that he was less confident that this would happen.</p> <p>7. DPF asked about programme slippage and AS confirmed that there was some slippage in the student refurbishment programme, but that improvements were still planned.</p>	
5 PR Update - Verbal	1. Hd Fin advised that PR10 was complete and we are working towards PR11. PR11 will be carried out differently from the normal PR cycle and would look more like a continuous rolling review. Hd Fin advised that 2 significant exercises were part of early PR11 progress in parallel with departmental negotiations with the Treasury. These exercises were planned for June and July.	
6 20100524 - AMB 05 Performance Report - U	<p>1. Hd ABS agreed to correct the date shown in Key Target 5 (page 1) to read 2011.</p> <p>2. DCC asked how Key Target 1 would be measured. Hd ABS undertook to report separately.</p> <p>3. AMB noted that the Performance Report would include a section on the HLB good management objectives starting in June 2010.</p>	<p>ABS</p> <p>ABS</p>
7 20100524 - AMB 05 Agency Roadmap Report - R	1. The DCC withdrew the Roadmap Report. He explained that the individual reports were still inconsistent in their reporting style despite advice given. Hd ABS went onto explain that a more appropriate style would be introduced next month where each roadmap project reported progress towards outcomes; project status and key issues and risks. This would be more in keeping with standard project highlight reports.	ABS
8 Presentation 20100524 – AMB 05 Sustainable Development - U	<p>1. Steve Hartley and Bob Plunkett of the CTLB joined the meeting by video link to discuss Sustainable Development. Their presentation showed Government, MOD and Agency Targets. They went on to explain that the Agency through Ros Gourgey's team supported by Head of Establishment had made significant progress especially in recycling. They also spelt out the increasingly challenging targets and business case for reducing energy usage, waste and water. Steve Hartley suggested that early discussions with the new Government indicated that future targets would be significantly more challenging than before.</p> <p>2. There was some clarification about how Agency data was captured and reported.</p> <p>3. AS asked about funding for sustainability projects. Steve Hartley explained that business cases should be prepared early as</p>	

	<p>limited funding could be made available for spend to save projects that repaid the cost over the medium term (4 or 5 years).</p> <p>4. DCC asked about the level of management information that would help the AMB track progress and AS agreed to develop this area of work.</p> <p>5. ACC OS asked about the role of contractors and AS agreed that all contractors must be influenced to contribute to the Agency achievements.</p> <p>6. DCC expressed his thanks to Steve Hartley and Bob Plunkett and also to Ros Gourgey.</p>	AS
--	---	-----------

<p>9 20100524 - AMB 05 Attendance Management Data - U</p>	<p>1. ACC PD introduced the revised format Agency Sickness Data Pack . He drew AMBs attention to the narrative on pages 1 and 2 and further explained the significant impact that long term sickness has on the Agency's performance in this area.</p> <p>2. AS asked that some thought be given as to how the data could be presented so that comparisons could be achieved and therefore weaker areas identified for support and attention.</p> <p>3. DPF raised the known issue of recording for absence in days as it does not reflect the reality of the actual loss. If absence was recorded in hours lost, then the figures would genuinely reflect the loss of productivity (i.e. 4hours or 12 hours dependant on duty) and not a generic total. At this moment in time the loss is a day regardless of the number of hours worked by the individual. AMB accept that this is the MOD's system for reporting but for MDP and MGS the concept of days was difficult because of 12 hour shifts and parts thereof.</p> <p>4. DBR (Policing) also raised a concern that the relieving margin for MDP allows for an average of 9 days absence whereas MDP data shows a current level of 13.4 days with a target to reduce this to 11.9 days.</p> <p>5. The DCC recognised the hard work being done by the Agency and HR Business Partners.</p>	PD
---	---	-----------

<p>10 20100524 - AMB 05 Attendance Management Strategy - U</p>	<p>1. AMB recognised that the MDPGA Attendance Strategy (updated Jan 10) document needed updating. Key Targets 1a and 1b should read 2a and 2b. It was agreed that the strategy should be presented each quarter alongside the Agency Sickness Data Pack, which is still required each month.</p>	Hd HR
--	---	--------------

<p>11 20100524 - AMB 05</p>	<p>1. ACC PD introduced the paper identifying the business cases for MDP Special Priority Payments (SPP). He advised that the MDP were still operating within the parameters of the Home</p>	
-------------------------------------	--	--

MDP SPP – U	<p>Department Scheme but we should recognise that the Agency did not receive funding for SPP.</p> <p>2. DCC spoke on behalf of AMB and placed on record its recognition of the outstanding work undertaken by all firearms instructors. AMB recognised that demands had increased in recent years and the requirements of NPIA licensing have added to this. In the AMBs view, it is no longer sustainable to treat our firearms trainers' differently in different geographic areas and there is a strong case for a comprehensive review of SPP for all firearms trainers regardless of location. The Force Firearms Officer will conduct this review and report his findings to AMB as soon as possible. In the meantime, all existing payments to firearms instructors are paused and no further business cases will be accepted. It was stressed that this decision is taken with a view to addressing the anomaly and a strong desire to reflect SPP for all firearms trainers across the board.</p> <p>3. It was noted that SPP is a one-off payment made quite late in the financial year.</p> <p>4. The following was decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The request for AWE Firearms trainers to have SPP backdated was refused. b. The business case for Scotland Firearms trainers was also in abeyance (see 11.2). c. The business case presented for £1k awards for OSU North and South officers was approved. d. The business case for CMU Escort Group identified a change in the criteria for SPP to those officers trained and working on CMU escort duties. AMB approved the case for £1k awards. e. The business case for £1k awards to SEG was approved. f. The business case for Whitehall Patrol Officers was discussed. AMB recognised that nature of the work met the criteria for SPP however; the case to increase the award to £2k was refused. It was agreed that £1k awards were appropriate and AMB approved this. g. The business case for AWE TSG SPP awards of £3k was approved. It was noted that this amount is built into annual salary costings following agreement with the customer on the revised complement. <p>5. AMB debated the extent to which funding could be recovered through relieving margins. AMB also discussed the possibility of retention of service commitments, but it was decided to continue with the current contractual arrangements.</p> <p>6. AS was concerned about the growth of unfunded SPP. It was introduced back in 03/04 at a cost of £100k and is now estimated to cost nearer £500k pa. He asked AMB to consider the affordability of the growth and perhaps to seek an independent</p>	ACC PD
-------------	---	--------

	<p>view of SPP, mindful of best practice at a time of pay constraint and limited recruitment. He advised that Defence Internal Audit (DIA) might be able to conduct an independent audit. DCC advised that the Woolley work was looking at SPP. AMB agreed to wait for the Woolley report recommendations.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>12 20100524 - AMB 05 SHEF Management Action Plan Progress – U</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was some discussion about the target date of 30 Sep for target T1 because of the dependence on the DIA audit report. It was decided to leave the target unchanged. 2. Div Ops raised the issue of work loads and timescales if the SHEF plan is devolved to portfolios and then divisions/regions for reporting rather than the SHEF office putting the report together as currently happened. The SHEF officer confirmed that SHEF progress will form part of the bi-lateral process and the information would be collected in the same way as for bi-laterals. 3. The issue was raised of the bi-lateral reporting process, which includes SHEF reporting. At this point Head of SHEF made it clear that the CE/CC had previously stated to him that he wanted the two reporting mechanisms to remain separate i.e. SHEF ASMAP and bi-lat. Head of SHEF stated that the ASMAP returns are to go through the Portfolio Holders, who will consolidate their returns into a single return which will be sent from the Portfolio Holder direct to the Head of SHEF. It was agreed Head of SHEF will determine reporting timescales and deadline dates. 4. DCC noted the risks identified, for example the transportation of dangerous goods. The SHEF officer confirmed that he would be discussing the different risks with each portfolio lead over time. 5. DCC asked that AMB see more information regarding the nature of major accidents. It was noted that the Agency had had 4 major accidents in the last quarter but senior management was unaware of the details. The SHEF officer agreed to include a narrative explanation in future. DCC then said that there should also be real-time reporting to portfolio heads on major injuries 6. Mr. Keating (DPF) asked if we tracked accident reports for internationally deployed officers. The SHEF officer confirmed that at present we did not include officers on international deployment as there was concern that these are reported through to FCO chain. Head of SHEF asked who the Portfolio holder responsible for IPSO was and if they can forward the data for inclusion. DCC asked ACC OS to arrange for this. 7. ACC OS asked about further training and it was confirmed that this topic would be taken at June's strategic seminar. 8. Hd of IMOA offered to include some tracking of SHEF incidents via the Operational Assurance strand of work utilising the review, learn and improve (RLI) system. 	<p>SHEF</p> <p>SHEF</p> <p>SHEF</p> <p>ACC OS</p>
--	---	---

<p>13 20100524 - AMB 05 Your Say - U</p>	<p>1. AMB noted that paper and agreed that there was nothing contentious in the proposal. HOP asked that the 1st paragraph be amended to read MDPGA and not MDP.</p> <p>2. It was noted that the Agency Owner DGHRCs is tracking progress on Your Say and that AMB would be discussing the plan in more detail at June's strategic seminar.</p>	<p>CE</p>
<p>14 20100524 AMB 05 Info Assurance Maturity Model Progress – U</p>	<p>1. IMOA briefed that the MOD CIO would be conducting a Behavioural Change survey targeting a rolling 10% of staff every 6 months.</p> <p>2. He added that the work to free up server space had achieved an improvement from 3% free space to 15% free. The IMOA team were aiming for 30%.</p> <p>3. IMOA confirmed that all shredding of sensitive documents goes for recycling.</p> <p>4. IMOA explained that they would be introducing changes to the management of police information systems by separating the governance and audit from the administration of the data.</p>	
<p>15 Any Other Business</p>	<p>1. Mr Keating stated that the concern of the DPF was with the lack of MDP involvement in the reviews and felt that the Agency should insist that they are represented on each of these reviews as the potential impact on our services was massive. Mr Keating had identified 6 different reviews including the Strategic Defence and Security Review; the Armed Guarding Policy review; the review of policing corporate services; the Armed Policing Services review; the Woolley work into terms and conditions of service and the HQ structure review. Mr Keating asked about Agency involvement in the reviews and the logical timing of the reviews. The DCC confirmed that the Agency has sought, and been given assurances, that each review would be properly project managed within the wider programme of work. The various reviews and would be discussed at June's strategic seminar. DPF agreed to articulate their concerns in writing in time for the strategic seminar. AS undertook to draw together an overview of current studies.</p>	<p>DPF AS</p>
<p>16 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The next AMB is scheduled for Monday 28th June 2010.</p> <p>2. Items currently planned for the next meeting are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance report AS • PR11 AS • Performance report DCC • Sickness Data Pack PD • Roadmap report DCC • Programme Board Update DCC/ABS • Probationers Pay PD 	

	• National Police Uniform	OS	
--	---------------------------	----	--