

**MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE AND GUARDING AGENCY
MGS MANAGEMENT BOARD MINUTES**

Distribution: MGSMB Members and
Advisers

30 January 2009

**MEETING HELD IN THE MARKS TEY HOTEL 0900 HRS ON 30 January
2009**

Present:	Mr S MacCormick	Director Regional Operations (DRO)
	Mr M Shreeve	DD Strategy
	Miss A Leverett	MGS HR BP
	Mr J Bills	Snr Ops Mgr
	Mr J Egan	RM1
	Mr M Cairns	RM2
	Mr P Brennan	RM3
	xxxxxxxxxxxx	RM4
	CSO2 D Halford	Representing RM5
	Mr D Coates	CSO1 London
Ms R Scott	HR Partner Snr Manager	
Ad Hoc Members	Mrs C Roberts	MGS Business Manager
	Mrs E Lee	Reg 3 Business Manager
	Mrs J Tokley	Bus Sp Manager
	Mrs A McKay	Secretary
	Mr D Farrow	Representing Hd CIS
	Mr K Graham	CSO1 ACT
	Ms C Sievwright	HR OHS SNR MNGR
Apologies	Mr T McKinnon	DD C,D&C
	Mrs K Malough	RM3
	Mr J Oliver	Hd Fin
	Mr A Clapp	Sn SHEF Mgr
	Mr R Clancy	Hd P, S, & C

Item (a)	Discussion and Decision (b)	Action (c)
1 Opening Remarks and Apologies	1. The Chair welcomed those present and received apologies for members not attending. He then introduced new members to the board. 2. In his opening remarks the chair gave	

	<p>those present an update on recent events and told them there was a new Senior Civil Servant appointed to the AMB as Head of Unarmed Guarding, Mr David Wray. He would take the organisation forward into the Competition Phase if the Minister gave authority to proceed. The Chair said he would remain as Head of MGS and that these changes were designed to get the organisation as efficient as possible before Competition. He said Recruitment was one of the biggest challenges and especially the clearance procedures. He said there was a need to get customers to understand there was no need for every guard to be Security Cleared. He said that the PR09 financial round was likely to be especially difficult as a result of the current financial situation in the country/world.</p>	
<p>2 Confirmation of any other business</p>	<p>The Chair confirmed items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance at USO Courses 2. Adverts for jobs on Web Site 3. National Call Off Contract 4. JBAs 5. IT and DII (Landmark) 6. Driving White Fleet or Military Vehicles-draft MI 7. IT support for dial up systems 8. How we approach Industrial Action 9. Set Boundaries on Communications 10. Merchandising 	
<p>3 Minutes and Actions arising from MGSMB 12th November 2008</p>	<p>a. TOR for CSO4 review - Action complete. b. MGS HR BP waiting for PPPA to respond with answers to query with regards to RTOs accessing training data – L&D Mgr has temp fix c. Mgs Hr BP to produce a draft Management instruction on maximum tour lengths. Complete, with TUs for consultation d. Chair to check if Hd Fin has included the feasibility of job swaps at C2 in his paper on Civilianisation-Action Ongoing e. The Dog Trials will take place at Strensall in September this year. Region 3 has volunteered to have the trials the next year and Region 1 and 5 are to check if</p>	<p>L&D Mgr Hr BP Chair RM1 and</p>

HR Issues	<p>they will be able to hold the trials in following years.</p> <p>f. Item 5 from Nov Minutes should say MGS HR BP is the focal point for all MGS recruitment issues.</p> <p>g. TMP to come back with proposals and costings for an MGS advert.</p> <p>h. Standard Job Description – Action Ongoing</p> <p>i. Dates for future meetings to be clarified</p>	<p>RM5</p> <p>MGS HR BP</p> <p>MGS HR BP</p> <p>Chair</p>
4. Rosters Trials	<p>CSO2 Project Mgr said the Alternative Roster Trials were to start in the first 2 weeks in February. A transport issue at Bovington/Blandford had been resolved. He said a Power Point (PP) Presentation was going out to each unit and surgeries were set up for Management and Staff. The PP Presentation would be on the Agenda for the next MGSMB. The Sn Ops Manager pointed out that the Rosters were under no circumstances to be changed locally. The Chair stated there was a need to get the staff to “buy into” the trials otherwise they would never work. Mobility and permanent duty station status could be reconciled within the current mobility rules. He said the TUs were to be fully involved in the trial at all stages. The Sn Ops Mgr said the guidelines, with the TUs agreement, were to be issued on movement of staff within shifts at 48 hours notice. However it has been agreed that nobody would be forced to move/change during the trial.</p>	
5. Exchange Programme	<p>CSO2 Project Manager said arrangements were in place with the Border and Immigration Agency for 2 managers to exchange places for one day in March and the following month this would increase to 2 days. The Chair stated there was a need to find out the benefits and roll the programme out across the regions. RM2 is to get CSO3 Dave Rayner, who has also made contact with the Border and Immigration Agency to liaise with CSO2 projects.</p>	RM2
6 HR Issues	<p>a. Stressors In the Workplace – Hr OHS Sn Mgr said PPPA would be distributing the Questionnaire and Managers should encourage staff to complete it. She explained the Questionnaire could not be</p>	All

	<p>changed as it had been consulted at National Level. She said posters would be issued and that she was taking into account the fact that many MGS did not have electronic access. RM3 requested the Questionnaires for his region come to him for distribution.</p> <p>b. SHEF Officers – in the absence of Mr A Clapp, Snr SHEF Officer, she said she would attach a brief to the minutes on the progress of the 3 new SHEF Officers. RM3 said there was a need for an SLA between MGSHQ and Hd SHEF. The Chair said he would take an action to improve communications between himself and Hd SHEF. He told RMs to make the SHEF Officers aware of their requirements and conflicts should be resolved.</p> <p>c. FACILITY TIME-HR BP said there was a need to find out how to get the facility time to work between Managers and TU Reps. It was agreed, in accordance with MOD policy, for managers and TU reps to negotiate facility time. In order to achieve this managers should understand the need for Facility Time. The Chair stated that he would take the matter of Facility Time up with the TUs at the next informal meeting and tell them that Reps needed to submit forward plans to allow managers to understand the requirement. HR BP pointed out T&S for Reps on purely TU business should not be paid by the Organisation. She will check the rules on payment of TU T&S and the Chair will check the paper that was issued by the Centre on the matter.</p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>RMs</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>HR BP Chair</p>
<p>7 Absence Management</p>	<p>RM1 went through the paper on Absence Management and said Annual Leave is counted in hours and therefore Sick Leave should also be counted in hours or as a % of attendance. Snr HR Mgr said HRMS had problems coping with sick leave counted in hours but it should be explored. OHS Sn Mgr said she would explore what MDP did about trigger points and inform Snr HR Mgr. HR BP staff to submit a case to DCP.</p>	<p>OHS Sn Mgr Hr BP Snr Mgr</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>1. The Sn Ops Mgr said there was a</p>	

NSI Gold	<p>requirement to carry out internal audits as part of the NSI Gold process. He proposed that he and the Ops Mgr carry out a 10% check. RM1 stated he felt there was a need to have the Regional Managers trained to carry out these audits but Sn Ops Mgr stated that NSI had confirmed that there was no need to have any qualifications. DD Strategy stated audit actions would be on Regional Managers and the action sheets would be reviewed at bi laterals. RM1, RM3, & CSO1 London asked for their disagreement on the NSI Gold-Internal Audit Paper to be recorded. The Chair will consider, with all, the need for training for Internal Audit and give his decision as soon as possible.</p> <p>2. Quality Manual – Snr Ops Manager informed the Board that he had submitted a draft Quality Manual to NSI and had been awaiting their response for some time. When received and completed he will pass it to Regional Managers for their comments prior to starting formal consultation with the Trade Unions. CSO1 London stated that the MGS Operations Manual is confusing in its current state and should be removed from the web site. After some debate, the Chair agreed that the need for a MGS Manual would be discussed at the next Management Board.</p>	<p>Chair + All</p> <p>Sn Ops Mgr,</p>
9 Communications	<p>1. MCSIG Action Priority paper is accepted. 2. TOR for Flashlight Co-ordinator is in draft. It was agreed there was no need to restrict the co-ordinator role to CSO4s and the wording in the TORs will be changed 3. The Minutes of the MGSMB should be circulated down the management chain. 4. Communications Group to continue to search for any other issues on communications.</p>	RM5
10 Managers Programme	<p>a. L&D Manager stated the RTOs were doing very good work and delivering quarterly reports on time. She said they had a tremendous workload and thanks go to RM for their support. The first MGS managers course took place in November and the second was due to start on 2 Feb 09. Following feedback</p>	

	<p>there have been a few changes made to the programme. Managers agreed their objectives before the course to facilitate their project work. Any project that is relevant to the whole organisation should be brought up to the MGSMB. L&D Manager said work was underway to get the course accredited to Institute of Leadership and Management. She reiterated what was passed at a previous MGSMB, and sometimes misinterpreted, i.e. all managers were to attend the Managers Programme. The Chair gave Mgr L&D thanks for all the hard work she, and others, had put into getting this programme up and running and he expected 2 managers per Region plus London to attend each course.</p> <p>b. Supervisors Training – the Objectives have been agreed, the design is underway and the pilot should be about end April or the beginning of May. L&D manager is to discuss, out of committee, whether SHEF should be included in the course.</p> <p>c. L&D Manager said there was a lack of qualifications recorded on HRMS. She said DCP were looking into sweeping up MGS in Apprentiships and therefore it was important to record skills on HRMS. She was to work with DBL and Logica on the use of PDAs.</p> <p>d. The Chair is to look at the minutes from February 2008 to clarify the wording on managers attending USO courses and will append his reply to these minutes or send it out separately.</p>	<p>L&D Mgr</p> <p>L&D Mgr</p> <p>Chair</p>
<p>11 Financial Performance Report</p>	<p>a. The Chair noted at AP09 the portfolio had been showing green and within .1% of control total. He said there had been a central adjustment of £550K downwards in staff costs. He thought it unlikely that cost risks arising from a forthcoming ET on the allocation of TOIL or remuneration for work on Public/Bank Holidays would affect this FY.</p> <p>b. The Chair said the method of recording</p>	

	<p>Audit Failures for MGS managers was flawed and that Hd Fin was trying to have this changed. He stressed that managers had to complete T&S and Overtime Audits.</p>	<p>Hd Fin All</p>
<p>12 AOB</p>	<p>a. RM1 stated adverts for MGS vacancies at Welford and Abbeywood had recently been posted on the MGS intranet page. In both cases that was to try and reach a larger target audience. It was evident from the number of applications received for both locations that the placing of adverts on the MGS intranet site had been a success. It was therefore agreed at the meeting that all MGS recruitment campaigns that seek to recruit 5 or more staff, irrespective of grade, would be advertised on the MGS intranet pages. MGS managers initiating large scale recruitment campaigns were to contact the MGS web administrator, Janet Tokley, and ensure that the job adverts were posted on the MGS intranet to coincide with the job requisition appearing on HRMS. Bus Support Mgr stated that JOB Vacancies could go on the WEB Site but it was necessary to include a removal date.</p> <p>b. The Management Instruction on use of the Call Off Contract is to be followed up and DCP asked to clarify and amend the PRG on the use of Agency Staff. The use of the Call Off Contract is to be taken to JCC as a standing item on the Agenda.</p> <p>c. The Chair reminded the Board that, in accordance with MOD policy, all change proposals that are likely to affect staff must be consulted with the Trade Unions.</p> <p>d. Joint Business Agreements(JBA) – GSSORs – The Business Manager explained JBAs and GSSORs, she said they would each contain the Tasking unlike the present system whereby the Tasking was issued to individual units less the overarching CSA. DE&S insist they will be calling the Doc GSSORs and other units would be calling them JBA but for MGS purposes it would be irrelevant which name was used.</p> <p>e. Problems with DII – RMs to forward a list of where these problems are to the Chair for him to take to the next AOB.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>RMs Chair</p>

<p>13 Next Meeting</p>	<p>1. The dates for the DRO's Bi Lateral with the CE are as follows: 20th May, 06th August, 17th November 2. RMs Bi Laterals with DRO followed by the MGSMB will be as follows: 3. 7/8 May, 22/23 July, 3/4 November</p>	
----------------------------	---	--

MGS MANAGEMENT BOARD SHEF BRIEF

1. The MGS Regional SHEF Focal Points (RFP) have undertaken unit SHEF "health check" inspections in the following Regions:

Region 1 - 15/21 (71% complete);
Region 2 – 19/54 (35% complete);
Region 3 – 20/36 (56% complete);
Region 4 – 0/48 (0% complete) and;
Region 5 – 25/30 (83% complete).

Region 4 health checks of MGS units at Warminster are to commence 28th January 2009 followed by the units within the Gosport peninsula in early February. Across the Regions inclement weather conditions have dictated availability of the RFPs to undertake inspections and have delayed the inspection being carried out in some instances.

2. Top issues identified whilst undertaking health checks across the MGS Regions are:

There is an inconsistent approach to undertaking risk assessments (RA) by MGS line management. Some units inspected have not completed any generic or specific RAs, whilst others have undertaken generic RAs e.g. manual handling, when there should have been a specific RA to take account of the individual. Other evidence that noise assessments for guards / staff in kennel areas has not been undertaken. Confusion and misunderstanding exists in how the risk assessment process actually works and especially who has the responsibility for compiling risk assessments (e.g. line managers or SHEF focal points) and the issue of their competency.

MGS access control point staff are being potentially placed at risk of significant injury, where the site has not invested in adequate physical control measures to minimise the risk, especially where two-way traffic systems are operated in conjunction with narrow roads.

SHEF Training is not being undertaken due to the restricted availability of IT access and insufficient cover of staff to allow them to complete courses. This is making it difficult for line managers to ensure this training is completed.

Inconsistent approach to the communication of SHEF issues due to the geographical spread of sites, lack of on-line IT facilities and the shift patterns worked by MGS guards.

Inconsistent approach to displaying essential SHEF information, due to the limited space available within guard rooms and the misunderstanding of what information is required.

Lack of general safety awareness concerning the dangers associated with electrical appliances e.g. broken plugs, overloaded power sockets and exposed live wiring in cables.

Some confusion exists in the responsibilities of the accident reporting process, with line managers uncertain of what and how to report accidents.

General housekeeping issues concerning cleanliness and inappropriate storage of materials and equipment.

3. Direct assistance provided by the RFPs to the MGS in undertaking these checks:

Most of the issues identified above have been dealt directly by the RFP by the provision of workplace health check reports submitted to units. Specific guidance has been given directly on the procedure on how to undertake a risk assessment and who should report accidents and what forms are needed to be completed. General advice has been provided to MGS staff to highlight the dangers involved in using electrical appliances and the requirements of good housekeeping.

The RFPs have assisted in accident investigation processes, clarifying the information required to be reported by MGS line management. They have also helped line management resolve site specific issues.

4. RFP Attendance at Regional SHEF committees:

The RFP have attended 100% of the regional manager SHEF committees since they started in post in September 2008. This is a total of six meetings in almost four months. This is helping to improve the profile of SHEF management and consultation and clearly demonstrating that the management of MGS SHEF is improving.

5. Resistance encountered by the RFPs from the MGS Regions.

There has been one instance of resistance from an MGS line manager concerning a health check, which has since been resolved. The RFPs otherwise report 100% cooperation from all they have encountered.

This is essential for the improvement of SHEF within the MGS to continue.

6. Intended future actions

The RFP will continue to work through their respective Regions until all units have been inspected and assist with ongoing accident reporting and investigation requirements and provide assistance as required.

To clarify one of the above issues, a new accident reporting process will be implemented soon. The draft is being reviewed by the Agency SHEF focal points. Once completed it will be subject to Agency Management Board endorsement and be issued through publication of an Agency Notice. This is expected to occur during February 2009.

This is a Central TLB requirement which we have to implement, but which should make reporting accidents easier across the Agency. It will involve a new simpler 2 part form. Part 1 is for the line manager to complete and send directly to Central TLB Incident Notification Cell (CINC) and part 2 will be completed by the RFP in conjunction with the line manager. There will be no need for the MOD form 510 to be completed, as this is incorporated into the new form.

It has various reporting requirements and is intended to grasp the required information in one hit to reduce administrative burden. So it is essential for it to be completed in full to prevent CINC coming back to the RFP and line managers for incomplete information.

A new Agency SHEF management plan will be developed for the last SHEF committee meeting of this year. This will provide the overarching requirements which MGS Regional line management and staff are required to work towards achieving.

In the next financial year an overarching Agency SHEF management system will be developed. Once implemented, this will provide higher level direction to the MGS Regions to develop their own SHEF management systems to meet these requirements.