



Ministry of Defence Police Committee

Annual Report 2011/12

Chair of the MOD Police Committee

July 2012

Def Sy 5/3/14

16 July 2012

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

Introduction

1. The main task of the MOD Police Committee is to provide the Secretary of State and Ministers with independent assurance that the Ministry of Defence Police (MDP) is exercising its policing powers and authority lawfully and impartially, and is meeting the standards required of a UK police force. I have pleasure in presenting the MOD Police Committee's fifth annual report which provides a brief account of our work over the period from 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012 and our assurance opinion on the MOD Police.

Assurance Opinion

2. From our work over the last 12 months, and the evidence we have seen we can give assurance that the MDP is continuing to deliver policing services in accordance with the Ministry of Defence Police Act 1987, that police powers and authority are exercised impartially, lawfully, responsibly and proportionately by the Chief Constable and the force, and that MDP is meeting the standards required of a police force, in particular those relating to the use of force and firearms.

3. It is of concern that significant risks on the MDP Corporate Risk Register have remained red and have not been down rated during the whole year. This Register has been independently evaluated by the MOD Police and Guarding Agency Audit Committee before it was abolished when Agency status ceased on 31 March 2012. While we are aware of the arrangements in place to mitigate the risks, the continued red rating of significant risks to business continuity, over a year, is disturbing. This is in large measure a reflection of the fact that there is continuing uncertainty over the final shape and size of MDP preventing definitive action to reshape the organisation.

4. It is right to balance that concern with our observation that the Senior Leadership of MDP remains strongly focussed on delivering the highest possible standard of business as usual, and on improving and enhancing critical operational capabilities related to the security of the nuclear deterrent. Similarly we have to observe that while police officers may be demoralised and feeling the strain of uncertainty, the evidence we have shows that they continue to want to do the best possible professional job for Defence.

5. The delays in settling the policy framework that will enable the future tasks and size of MDP to be defined, about which we remarked in our report last year, appear now somewhat closer to resolution. There is no doubt that the substantial reductions in MDP initiated in PR11 and likely to be continued in PR12 will represent a very substantial downsizing of MDP. The challenges of managing the ensuing transition to a substantially smaller force with a narrower focus should not be underestimated, nor should the risk of management being distracted from the core business of security by the burdens of transition.

6. We have been pleased to observe through the year that MDP works in productive collaboration with other forces, and is in an emerging strategic alliance with the Civil Nuclear Constabulary. MDP has been part of the planning for the policing of the Olympics and will make a valuable contribution of officers under police mutual aid, especially to support marine policing of the events at Weymouth. We have noted also the significant collaboration between MDP and the UK Border Agency Force. We recognise the Government's wish to strengthen the capacity for immigration checks at the borders, although we expressed unease over the deployment of police officers to cover for immigration personnel on strike as this could be perceived as a departure from the traditional neutrality of police officers in industrial action situations.

MOD Police Committee – Background

7. Since 2007 the Committee has included in its membership two former HM Chief Inspectors of Constabulary as Police Advisers, and 3 independent lay members, in addition to me; two have experience of serving on Police Authorities, and one was a member of the former Police Complaints Authority. As a cost savings measure within PR11, the independent membership of the Committee has reduced from 6 to 5 during this FY when one of the Police Advisers' appointments came to an end in September 2011. Two senior MOD officials also sit on the Committee; the Security Process Owner and a senior HR representative. The full membership of the Committee is provided at **Annex B**.

8. The remuneration and expenses of members, and the cost of MOD staff who support the Committee, are at **Annex C**.

9. As a committee we meet together formally 4 times a year with the Chief Constable and his senior management team to hold the force to account on your behalf on the use of its powers, its compliance with policing standards, and the effectiveness of its operational service delivery in meeting the MOD's requirements. We commission and consider reports from the Chief Constable, question him and his team as to performance and compliance with standards, and offer our views by way of constructive challenge and advice to the Chief Constable and the Department. Our Terms of Reference are at **Annex D**.

10. We have also an annual work programme which includes several in depth scrutinies by Committee members on aspects of the Force's responsibilities. This year it has included a further round of our ongoing "State of the Force" visits; an assessment of Constabulary Independence; advising the MOD and the Chief Constable on the arrangements for disclosure by MDP of MOD documents to other police forces and coroners; and monitoring the Force's progress on its use of firearms and its public order responsibilities. A summary of our activities and findings is provided at **Annex A**.

The MOD Requirement for Civil Policing

11. The context for the delivery of police services has been dominated by the Department's programme of work being led by the Director Business Resilience to review and redefine the MOD's policy and requirement for civil policing and guarding. Over the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) period this review will entail substantial reductions in the size and footprint of MDP. The Committee has been regularly briefed on proposed reductions to the Force and we welcomed the way that the Director Business Resilience prepared an objective analysis of options for consideration by Ministers and senior MOD officials. The Planning Round (PR) 11 measures have been approved by

Ministers following completion of the formal consultation process with the MDP's staff associations, and implementation of the associated policy changes will commence shortly. Ministerial approval to initiate formal consultation on the PR12 measures has also been given and announcements made to Parliament about them.

12. A reduction of the order of one third of the strength of MDP HQ functions is underway, and it is planned to achieve a further reduction equating to 50% overall. The streamlining of back office functions and overhead costs are absolutely right in order to focus resources on operational capability. The HQ reductions do entail reductions in the numbers of senior police managers and command functions. The committee will want to be assured during 2012/13 that these changes do not impact adversely on resilience or capability.

13. As at 31 March 2012, the MDP had 696 gapped posts from a complement of 3,645. This under bearing is the direct result of an ongoing recruitment freeze that was first introduced in August 2009, which has been exacerbated by the outcome of the MOD Voluntary Early Release Scheme (VERS) that was announced in February 2011 and has resulted in the exit of 246 MDP officers by 31 March 2012 as a significant contribution towards the Department's cost reduction plan and also to transition to the Force's future structure. (A second VERS programme which runs from 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2014 is now under implementation). As a result significant gaps are now emerging at some MDP stations. We are satisfied that operational risks are monitored and managed by MDP in consultation with customers, but for the foreseeable future it is clear that MDP presence at some defence establishments will be severely stretched and incapable of meeting the tasking requirement as it is currently defined.

14. We recognise the considerable efforts of officials in the Department on the civil policing and guarding policy review, and we reiterate that it is imperative for the Department to complete as soon as possible all of the reviews that will determine the requirement for MDP services. That will enable MDP to then confirm the workforce required to deliver them and to start systematically to reshape the organisation to match the requirement.

Transition

15. Despite the exits under the VERS, the Chief Constable currently assesses that the outcome of the changes resulting from PR11 and 12 is likely to necessitate relocation and redeployment of many officers, and possible compulsory redundancies of MDP officers. A police redundancy scheme would be unprecedented in the UK; it will need to be managed with care by both the Force and the MOD. The Committee will expect that progress is regularly reported to them over the next year in order that they can provide SofS with an assurance that any redundancy programme for officers had been managed in a fair and appropriate way and that the consequences for the organisation are being effectively managed.

16. As the combined effects of VERS departures and the HQ led transition programme is taken forward, there are risks arising from a possible complete changeover of senior management in both of the new MDP Nuclear and Territorial Operational Commands. These risks include business continuity, customer relations and command resilience. We will look to the Chief Constable and his senior management team to provide us with an assurance that following the re-organisation and reductions, the new Commands can

operate as intended and continue to be fit for purpose and fully engaged with their customers in order to meet their requirements.

Crime

17. Throughout the year the Committee received regular reports on the achievements of the MDP CID in disrupting and detecting crime and bringing perpetrators to justice. We have consistently noted, and mentioned in previous Annual Reports, the scale of crime, especially fraud, committed against Defence.

18. A 90% reduction in the size of CID was decided on by MOD in the PR12 measures. While we all recognise the seriousness of the situation facing the MOD and of the wider national economic picture, the Committee felt that a proposed further reduction to the MDP's Criminal Investigation Department in PR12 measures would be unpalatable. If implemented it would have left MDP with little more than core intelligence functions and without any investigative capacity. It was our view that such a cut would be inimical to the effective operation of MOD as a police force and it would diminish the MOD's ability to keep a clear and strong focus on preventing fraud and theft, since we believe that more effective prevention would save many millions of pounds for the Defence budget. We made representations to the former 2nd PUS that there was in our view, a high risk that the removal of CID could prove to be a false economy and we welcomed the top level decision to re-consider this measure. At the time of writing this report there is a proposal for the creation of a Defence Fraud and Loss Unit, that would include a significant CID complement, which we fully support.

MOD Police's Human Resources Operational Workforce Strategy

19. To enable the MDP's successful transition, there are pressing and long standing strategic HR issues affecting the MOD Police that need to be addressed. The development and delivery of the MDP HR Operational Workforce Strategy is fundamental to achieving and maintaining a fit for purpose workforce to support its new operational role and future footprint.

20. Tom Winsor's second report "Independent Review of Police and Staff Remuneration and Conditions" was presented to the Home Secretary in March. The MOD now needs to consider how best to implement those recommendations in both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Winsor reports that will be deemed appropriate for the MOD Police.

21. With regard to the recommendations which relate to police pay and terms and conditions of service, the progress will be heavily dependent on additional support being provided from the MOD's HR Department. We trust that PUS, who now leads on HR issues for the Department, will recognise this priority and mobilise sufficient support in order to move swiftly to closure of longstanding issues such as Terms and Conditions of Service, fitness and accreditation, and a system to allow police officers who are no longer able to perform the full range of duties required of the post (i.e. non-capable officers) to have a dignified exit from the force.

Chief Officers Appointments

22. At present the Committee are invited by the MOD and the Chief Constable to participate in selection processes for MDP Chief Officer appointments. We were invited to


provide advice to senior officials on succession planning for the Chief Constable, who is due to stand down in May 2013, and we are in contact with a range of external and internal stakeholders in order to prepare for this.

23. Earlier in 2012, the MOD decided not to advertise externally the post of Assistant Chief Constable (Divisional Operations) following earlier re-assurances from senior officials that the vacancy would be subjected to an open competition. The Police Committee had previously given clear advice to Senior Officials that this appointment should be filled after external competition in accordance with the MOD's preferred and normal position. It was disappointing in the extreme that despite our advice, it was decided that the post should be filled by using an internal trawl only in the first instance, and only going out to external advertisement if the internal process failed. This post is the most senior police post in the UK dedicated to the security of the UK strategic nuclear deterrent. In the circumstances we did not understand the reluctance of the Department to run an open competition for this unique and key role to ensure that the MOD had the strongest field from which to choose.

24. In the event, the Appointment Panel unanimously recommended appointment of the internal candidate who had been in an Acting ACC role for over 2 years with a record of achievement that enabled us to feel confident that he would provide effective leadership in this role.

Future Governance arrangements

25. On 31 March 2012, the MOD Police and Guarding Agency ceased to be a Defence Agency and the Owner's Advisory Board, of which I was a member, was wound up. Its responsibilities for management, performance, finance and resource issues will now be managed from Head Office, by Director General Transformation and Corporate Services. The Police Committee will work with him in respect of the monitoring of MDP performance.



David Riddle
Chair of the MOD Police Committee

MOD POLICE COMMITTEE – WORK PROGRAMME 2011-12

“State of the Force” visits

A1. In February 2012, three members took part in the 3rd phase of our annual State of the Force visits where we consider the Force’s operational effectiveness, customer relations, compliance with policing standards, transitional arrangements, and the overall morale of MDP officers. This year we focussed on stations and assets that will feature significantly in the future footprint; AWE Aldermaston and HMNB Faslane, in the new Nuclear Command, and York which is designated as the HQ for the new Territorial Command.

A2. As the combined effects of VERS departures and the HQ led restructuring programme is taken forward, we assess that there are risks arising from a possible complete changeover of senior management in both the new Commands in the next few months. These risks include business continuity, customer relations and command resilience. We have therefore recommended that the Chief Constable carries out an assessment of the operation of both the Nuclear Command and the Territorial Command structure no later than 12 months from implementation, with customer input, to be satisfied that the relationships and command resilience are working as anticipated and are fit for purpose.

A3. During our visits the officers we met recognised that there was a pressing need to have a strategy to secure a younger, fit workforce. This is a key issue since there has been no recruitment since 2009. We also think that there is a risk to maintaining full operational capability in the next 2 to 3 years if the force cannot start to recruit externally.

A4. There was evidence that morale had deteriorated significantly since our last round of visits in February 2011. This was mainly due to the continued uncertainty about the Force’s future footprint. Officers stressed to us that they wanted to know what the future holds – even if it is bad news for them – so that they can get on with personal planning. This is understandable in the circumstances.

Constabulary Independence

A5. A constable of the MDP should have regard for the interests of the Department, but in the actual exercise of constabulary powers and authority, is answerable to the law alone. The Chief Constable must exercise impartial discretion in deciding whether or not to investigate offences, free of any departmental or ministerial interference. We conducted a scrutiny to provide an assurance that MDP was operating in accordance with the principles of constabulary independence/.

A6. The MDP is in a unique position as a police force, being employed by and entirely funded from the Defence budget. Historically there have at times been Parliamentary and public concerns that the MDP’s paymasters and “customers” could dictate how police functions are carried out, and what the MDP’s law enforcement priorities should be. While other police forces need to have regard to the Policing Plans set by their Police Authority, and performance targets and priorities set by the Government, in the case of MDP, the MOD produces a Statement of Requirement for the MDP which sets the overall

framework for MDP's services and priorities. Those requirements are then negotiated and underpinned by local tasking agreements.

A7. During our scrutiny we interviewed senior CID Officers and a cadre of Senior Investigating Officers in MDP. They all had examples of keen and sometimes intrusive interest in the progress of investigations by Senior MOD Personnel, but none felt that there had ever been an improper attempt to influence them.

A8. We met with senior customers and officials, who were very conscious of proper boundaries and of the importance of respecting the independence of the police. We considered how MDP had operated in the course of one internal investigation of a high profile matter. We saw no evidence of any hindrance or obstruction to MDP in pursuing the investigation as they saw fit.

A9. The Chief Constable and other Senior Officers assured us that the MOD's ownership of the MOD Police did not blur or compromise his independence, while recognising the force's focus had to be relevant to the defence effort and therefore linked with the budget allocation and resources. The Chief Constable was clear that he exercised independent control and direction over the force and that he had discretion to pursue or to decline a task, or to refer matters to other forces where he considered this appropriate (i.e. not in the defence interest, or not a crime which significantly impacted on Defence capability).

A10. Overall we were content that there is no current risk to constabulary independence for MDP. We were satisfied that, with a little adjustment, the guidance and processes available to the force are sufficient for officers to conduct their duties with robust impartiality and allows them to resist inappropriate pressures.

Use of Intelligence

A11. The aim of this work was to enable the Police Committee to better understand how the force was structured to handle intelligence, and to consider the policies, standards and processes for the gathering and use of intelligence.

A12. The Police Committee routinely receives reports on the CID successes in tackling fraud and corruption both inside and outside the Department. We have been impressed with the scale of this work and the value of some of the recoveries made by the force. The current risk is that the MOD may lose its capability to deal with major fraud and crime in order to secure financial savings from 2013/14 onwards (though as we state earlier, there is currently a proposal for a Defence Fraud Unit that will mitigate this). We have strongly urged the Department to consider very carefully whether an ongoing investment in police intelligence, a deterrence factor and an investigative capability, would actually provide more savings to the Defence budget in the longer term.

Use of Firearms

A13. It was agreed that there should be a review of the MDP's implementation of the Police Committee's recommendations following the Firearms scrutiny that was undertaken in 2008. Since that review the MDP had been licensed by the National Police Improvements Agency (NPIA) as an accredited firearms training organisation. The force also introduced a Drugs and Alcohol policy in January 2011.

A14. Arrangements to align MDP's command and control of firearms operations with ACPO standards continue to progress, albeit slowly in some areas. Given the current funding constraints imposed on the force, plans had been reviewed to assess priority and affordability. The force has assured us that there was sufficient resilience at Bronze, Silver and Gold Command levels. However, the publication of a revised Command and Control policy was overdue.

A15. Overall we were satisfied that the recommendations we made in our 2009 report continued to be addressed, and that the force continues to demonstrate appropriate and effective control of the use of firearms.

Public Order

In November 2010, HM Inspector of Constabulary (HMIC) asked the Police Committee to oversee the force's Action Plan and progress in their recommendations following a Public Order inspection in 2008.

A16. The HMIC's recommendations in the intelligence area had taken account of feedback from the MDP's customers and stakeholders. MDP have demonstrated to us that good progress and a change of culture had been made since the inspection. It is important that MDP itself continues to check how satisfied its customers are with the new arrangements and to maintain engagement with customers.

A17. Overall we were assured that these recommendations were being addressed and that there is effective leadership of public order functions within MDP, especially with the appointment of officers as Public Order Senior Officer (POSO) and Public Order Liaison Officer (POLO). We are continuing to monitor progress at our Police Committee meetings.

Disclosure of MOD documents by MDP

A18. Following an invitation from the Chief Constable and the Director Business Resilience, the Committee has produced some guidelines covering the disclosure of MOD documents by the MDP to other police led investigations or coroners.

A19. We have taken account of the Chief Constable's position that police forces have an obligation to disclosure proactively to each other, all information which may have a bearing on an investigation. At the same time, these guidelines also provide for the lead MOD official to be fully consulted in order to be allowed to consider the context of the document advised for disclosure. This provides an opportunity for the MOD to consider the release of other associated documentation in order to ensure that the recipients receive the complete and up to date account of the Department's position on the subject, including any actions taken on progress on any recommendations made.

A20. We trust that these guidelines will complement the Department's intention to be as transparent as possible, while managing the process of document disclosure effectively and in a timely manner to ensure the Coroner and other police forces to have access to all relevant documents and information.

Professional Standards

A21. Audits of complaints and conduct files take place quarterly for the report that is given by members of the sub-committee at Police Committee meetings. Police Committee members have also provided independent input into several Police Appeals Tribunals over the year.

A22. During 2011-12, there were 54 complaints cases (comprising 127 allegations) made against MDP officers by members of the public, and 139 internal conduct cases (comprising 190 allegations). **Appendix A to Annex A** refers.

A23. Complaints numbers are very small reflecting the fact that Ministry of Defence Police officers have limited contact with members of the public. Local resolution provides a useful means of dealing quickly with service complaints. Since the introduction of the new MDP Conduct Regulations in 2009 we see use of more informal approaches of “management action” also providing a quicker, proportionate response to minor conduct issues. So overall matters can be dealt with more effectively than previously and we are satisfied from our force visits that conduct issues receive appropriate attention at a senior level. Despite the current pressures on the Professional Standards Department the quarterly report to the Police Committee contains increasingly useful information and we have been pleased to see that lessons learned from complaints and conduct issues are regularly fed back to the force.

A24. The Police Committee’s Sub-Committee for Complaints and Misconduct has responsibility for complaints against or misconduct by MDP Chief Officers. During the period of this report we considered one such complaint but concluded that this did not disclose any personal conduct matter in relation to the Chief Officer concerned. There were no cases of alleged misconduct by Chief Officers.

A25. The Committee welcomes the introduction of MDP Performance Regulations that came into force on 6 April 2012 (Statutory Instrument SI 2012/808) These regulations move MDP officers away from the informal restoring efficiency procedures that apply to MOD civil servants generally. This provides the force with a bespoke set of statutory procedures for both performance and conduct (MDP (Conduct) Regulations – SI 2009/3069).

Diversity

A26. The Police Committee has continued to monitor the arrangements for promoting Diversity and Equality within MDP particularly by attendance at the MDP Diversity Board. In addition to the overall financial situation, which has begun to impact significantly over this year, the MDP status under Equality legislation has also changed, putting a greater emphasis on the place of MDP within the wider MOD structure for managing diversity. Both of these factors have created a sense of faltering in what in previous years has been a highly focussed and effective part of MDP’s work. This has caused the Committee some concern. The MDP has been on a trajectory of financial retrenchment for some time and there has been a negative impact on to Diversity management both in terms of the loss of skilled individuals within the Diversity Unit, and its overall size and shape. There has also been some loss of data, we hope temporary, in the process of changing HR Business Partners. The necessary decision to cease MDP membership of external benchmarking bodies and to rely on MOD corporate membership could mean that the MDP is less visible

and credible, when it eventually begins to recruit again. Nonetheless, both the senior management and the wider organisation continue to demonstrate a determination to be inclusive and professional and we hope that this will provide a platform for advance.

MOD Police Committee Work Programme 2012-13

A27. Our work over the next 12 months will continue to focus on governance and transformation issues. Alongside a programme of scrutinies, we plan that each Committee member will establish a relationship with one of the force's Chief Superintendents (who have recently been re-organised with functional, rather than geographical, responsibilities). We propose to maintain regular contact in order to understand their objectives, priorities and delivery planning. This will inform our independent assurance of progress of the MDP's transformation.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE COMMITTEE

LIST OF MEMBERS

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| David Riddle Independent Chairman | Appointed 1 Oct 07 |
| Sir Keith Povey QPM Police Adviser (England & Wales) | Appointed 1 Jun 07 |
| Andrew Brown CBE QPM Police Adviser (Scotland) | from Jun 07 – Sept 11 |
| Dr Marie Dickie OBE Independent Member | Appointed 1 Oct 07 |
| Caroline Mitchell Independent Member | Appointed 1 Oct 07 |
| Dr Parvaiz Ali Independent Member | Appointed 1 Oct 07 |
| Susan Scholefield CMG Agency Owner Director General Human Resources & Corporate Services Ministry of Defence | from Sep 08 – Nov 11 |
| Andy Gray Director Human Resources & Transition Ministry of Defence | wef: Dec 11 |
| Mark Preston Director Business Resilience Ministry of Defence | from Mar 09 |
| Karen Feather Clerk to the MOD Police Committee Ministry of Defence | from Jan 07 |

**REMUNERATION AND EXPENSES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE MOD POLICE
COMMITTEE & COSTS OF MOD STAFF**

Independent Members

| | | Fees | Expenses | Total 2011/12 | Total 2010/11 |
|--------------------|--|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| David Riddle | Chair | £16,800.00 | £875.89 | £17,675.89 | |
| Sir Keith Povey | Police Adviser (England & Wales) | £9,750.00 | £1,838.59 | £11,588.59 | |
| Andrew Brown | Police Adviser (Scotland) | £3,575.00 | £293.23 | £3,868.23 | |
| Dr Marie Dickie | Independent | £8,125.00 | £667.09 | £8,792.09 | |
| Caroline Mitchell | Independent | £5,850.00 | £233.69 | £6,083.69 | |
| Dr Parvaiz Ali | Independent | £4,875.00 | £1,267.83 | £6,142.83 | |
| Susan Scholefield* | Director General Human Resources & Corporate Service (& MDPGA Owner) | Nil | Nil | £1,595.00 | |
| Andy Gray* | Director Human Resources & Transition | Nil | Nil | £837.00 | |
| Mark Preston* | Director Business Resilience | Nil | Nil | £1,591.00 | |
| Total | | | | £58,174.32 | £58,336.75 |

MOD Staff

| | | |
|---|----------------|-------------------|
| Clerk to the MOD Police Committee** | £26,736 | |
| Assistant Clerk to the MOD Police Committee** | £9,367 | |
| Total | £36,103 | £38,061.82 |

Grand Total **£94,277.32** **£96,398.57**

* The figures for the Senior Civil Service MOD members of the Committee are based on the number of meetings attended.

** The figures for MOD staff represent an approx rate for the percentage of time spent on Police Committee business

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE POLICE COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The MOD Police Committee's main role is to provide an independent scrutiny and assurance to the Secretary of State for Defence that the Ministry of Defence Police (MDP) is delivering policing services in accordance with the MDP Act 1987.

In order to perform this role the Committee is required to:

1. Provide scrutiny and guidance to ensure that police powers and authority are impartially and lawfully exercised by the Chief Constable;
2. Confirm that MDP is meeting the standards required of a police force;
3. Validate that MDP's exercise of its authority is responsible, proportionate and impartial;
4. Validate that MOD's use of the MDP is appropriate in relation to the exercising of policing powers and authority;
5. Provide scrutiny and guidance on any other matter in relation to the use of policing powers which fall within the responsibility of the MDP;
6. Consider the MDP's targets and performance and the Ministry of Defence Police and Guarding Agency's corporate and business plans as far as required to the exercise the above functions;
7. Consider all complaints made against all members of the Chief Officer ranks of the MDP. This may be delegated to a sub-panel of the MOD Police Committee;
8. Undertake all responsibilities required of the Conduct and Appeal Regulations (Statutory Instruments);
9. Submit an annual report to the Secretary of State for Defence on the MDP's discharge of policing powers;
10. Publish the operating costs and expenses of the Police Committee each year.

Appendix 1 to Annex A
Def Sy 5/3/14 dated 16 July 12

MOD POLICE - COMPLAINT & CONDUCT ALLEGATIONS RECORDED 2011-12

| COMPLAINT ALLEGATION TYPE | NO | CONDUCT ALLEGATION TYPE | NO |
|---|------------|--|------------|
| Serious non-sexual assault | 0 | Honesty and Integrity | 26 |
| Sexual assault | 0 | Authority, Respect and Courtesy | 29 |
| Other assault | 0 | Equality and Diversity | 5 |
| Oppressive conduct or harassment | 25 | Use of Force | 0 |
| Unlawful/unnecessary arrest or detention | 0 | Orders and Instructions | 20 |
| Discriminatory Behaviour | 2 | Duties and Responsibilities | 18 |
| Irregularity in evidence/perjury | 1 | Confidentiality | 1 |
| Corrupt practice | 3 | Fitness for Duty | 3 |
| Mishandling of property | 10 | Discreditable Conduct | 86 |
| Breach Code A PACE (Stop & Search) | 0 | Challenging and Reporting Improper Conduct | 2 |
| Breach Code B PACE (Search of premises/seizure of property) | 1 | | |
| Breach Code C PACE (Detention, Treatment & Questioning) | 1 | | |
| Breach Code D PACE (Identification) | 0 | | |
| Breach Code E PACE (Audio Recording – interviews with suspects) | 0 | | |
| Multiple or unspecified breaches of PACE | 0 | | |
| Other neglect or failure in duty | 30 | | |
| Other irregularity in procedure | 12 | | |
| Incivility, impoliteness and intolerance | 22 | | |
| Traffic irregularity | 9 | | |
| Other | 1 | | |
| Lack of fairness and impartiality | 4 | | |
| Improper disclosure of information | 6 | | |
| Other sexual conduct | 0 | | |
| Total Allegations | 127 | | 190 |
| Total Cases | 54 | | 139 |

Complaint & Conduct Allegations Recorded 2010 - 2011

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| Complaint Allegations | 113 | Conduct Allegations | 175 |
| Complaint Cases | 49 | Conduct Cases | 163 |