

<p>5. Item 5 (10): SLA MIS. DIO stated that lessons from Phases 1a and 1b demonstrated that Phase 2 could not commence until technical performance issues had been resolved, the requirement had been reviewed further and additional functionality developed. There had been significant improvement in the data capture from units, although DIO was still hastening some units that had not returned Site Surveys. There was a great deal of potential to review, improve and standardise the allocation processes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure greater efficiency; and • Potentially facilitate improved technical performance. <p>6. The User Requirement Document (URD) had been fully reviewed to ensure that the SLA IMS was fit for purpose whilst governance of the SLA IMS Project would continue to be reviewed to ensure it was rolled out in an integrated fashion.</p> <p>7. The SLA MIS allowed inclusion for a Priority Allocations List which the SLA MIS WG had drafted (based on best practice at units visited to date) for the APWG to consider for incorporating into Policy as the SLA MIS WG believed it would support the Local Service Commanders. Finally, DIO advised they were also progressing Data Validation and the SSSA Requirement. DIO would write to SVW with their observations on SLA policy anomalies which the MIS work had brought to light.</p>	<p>DIO</p>
<p>6. Item 5 (12): Publicly Funded Mid Tour Moves. An options paper, to address whether HASC or CO should be responsible for authorising delayed moves of up to 6 months post assignment, and whether such moves should be made at public expense, would be submitted by RAF Pay Col SO2 to apt Policy leads and PACCC. SVW Accom Pol 2, in conjunction with REM, would consolidate views and advise APWG of outcome accordingly. Ongoing</p>	<p>Secretary</p>
<p>7. Item 6 (15): SLA/SSSA Entitlement. Following direction from the recent Employment Tribunal, SVW and REM continued to review JSPs 752 and 464 to identify and remove or justify any direct or indirect cases of discrimination, consulting with MOD Legal to understand risk of action, as necessary. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Ongoing</p>	<p>Secretary</p>
<p>8. Item 6 (17): Housing Complaint Review. SVW Accom Pol 2 advised the Review was undergoing further consideration from Hd SVW in light of changes since the tasker was first introduced, such as introduction of NGEC, including the new NHP, and changes to the Service Complaints process. The APWG expressed their concern with the length of time the Review was taking which SVW acknowledged was due to the above changes. Secretary's post-meeting note: Hd SVW had since directed a revised TOR for a review to take into consideration NGEC and the new Service Complaints process. New TOR shall be circulated to stakeholders in January 2015. Ongoing</p>	<p>Secretary</p>
<p><u>Item 4 – New Issues</u></p>	
<p>9. Surplus SFA & FTRS – Exceptional Cases. At JFC's request, the APWG discussed JSP 464 Annex A to Ch 11 Serial 14, which led to following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SVW Accom Pol 2 would amend JSP464 to reflect REM as POC for 'exceptional case' submissions which seek FTRS occupancy of SFA at 	<p>Secretary</p>

<p>entitled rates, rather than market rates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JFC was invited to write to SVW proposing delegated use of surplus accommodation in some locations in order to encourage Reservists with specific skill sets (eg: Cyber). Chair advised there were implications with this approach such as accounting for where costs fell (ie: to TLB/DIO and not JFC) and, more generally, agreeing suitable conditions in the event Reservists were subsequently required to vacate at short notice. • The APWG agreed the varying nature of “exceptional circumstances” cases did not lend itself to requiring further definition. 	<p>JFC</p>
<p>10. SLA Prioritisation List. RAF stated that a proposed prioritisation list had been constructed by the SLA IMS Working Group for providing greater guidance to Stns/Units and SLA allocation staffs. RAF, Navy, Army, JFC and DIO had all agreed this list and DIO stated it was essential to provide prioritisation to support both the SLA MIS Tririga system and managing Notice to Vacate for SLA when there is a requirement to vacate rooms in favour of higher priority entitled personnel. The Chair stated that though the List was a logical step, he believed it to be more a process tool that supported policy and could therefore be adopted for local use rather than embedded in Policy. The Chair nonetheless invited further comments from the APWG for his further consideration – comments requested by 12 Dec 14 in first instance. Ongoing</p>	<p>APWG</p>
<p>11. SLA NTV – Request for JSP Change. RAF requested the period of notice provided to vacate SLA by non-entitled/eligible occupants to be standardised to 28-days and the use of an Occupation Certificate to be provided to all SLA occupants in alignment with their request for an SLA Prioritisation List. SVW Accom Pol 2 stated CLS Legal advice re 28-days remained extant; that such an approach could not be legally enforced. A preferred route would be for any exceptions to be managed and dealt with as hardship cases at Local Command level. At RAF request, the Chair agreed to consider further, in conjunction with the SLA Prioritisation List, and advise the APWG accordingly. Ongoing</p>	<p>Chair</p>
<p>12. 2nd Offer SSFA. RAF stated that options for how the two offers of SSFA were made to applicants (ie: concurrently or consecutively) had resulted in some applicants rejecting the second offer not realising it was their final offer. To overcome this, RAF proposed for SSFA allocations to follow the similar two stage offer process for SFA. The Chair invited the Secretary to elicit and coordinate views from the APWG for further SVW consideration. Ongoing</p>	<p>Secretary/APWG</p>
<p>13. Chief WO – SFA By Appointment. RAF proposed entitling VOA, when serving unaccompanied, to use misappropriated SFA. This would impact 3 posts (1 per s-Service). RAF stated entitlement would not lead to D Band entitlement for WO (RAF) and that other factors, such as separation from other WOs/SNCOs, would be considered within the approval process. SVW Accom Pol 2 stated he had received comment from the sS HC but was concerned that the proposal could drive wrong behaviours; the Chair concurred, and cited such entitlement would go ‘against the grain’ of the future accommodation direction which LASR and the Strategic Options Paper was developing. The Chair offered to consider a formal proposal if RAF believed the case was compelling – RAF to advise the Chair, accordingly. SVW Accom Pol 2 agreed to circulate to APWG, out of committee, earlier comments to the proposal including those from Second Sea Lord. Ongoing</p>	<p>RAF</p>
<p>14. SLA – Reduced Charges. Whilst RN and RAF and Army (Involuntarily</p>	

<p>Separated) personnel in PStat Cat 1 and 2 were exempt from SLA charges when living in SLA (and usually commute home at weekends); personnel in PStat Cat 3, 4 and 5 pay SLA charges in similar circumstances. The Chair stated there were a number of anomalies within current accommodation policy which NEM, through the Strategic Accommodation Options paper, was seeking to harmonise, one of which being applicability of SLA charges for personnel with residences away from their duty stations. Ongoing</p>	<p>SVW Accom Pol 4</p>
<p>15. Commodity Management. SVW Accom Pol 4 noted the need to reconcile differences in how % points for furnished/part furnished were attributed and stated that a review to address this and the charging methodology for furniture, was in train. A paper was due to be presented to APWG on both issues before Christmas. Ongoing</p>	<p>SVW Accom Pol 4</p>
<p>16. SSSA Policy – Sharing Policy. Army PS4 requested an amendment to JSP 464 Part 3 Chapter 8, Annex C, SSSA Regulations, Property Entitlements – to clarify the amount of personal choice available for personnel when applying for SSSA. The proposed amendment was as follows:-</p>	
<p><u>Proposed policy amendment</u> <i>The removal of line 2 at JSP 464 Part 3 Chapter 8 Annex C para 6b(2).</i></p> <p><i>Amendment to E1154 Form Note 2 to read: B, C and D band Occupants are expected to share unless they have been authorised sole occupancy by the appropriate sS Housing Colonel. These requests are to be staffed for approval prior to the submission of their SSSA application to the SAT (SSSA) in accordance with section 8 of MOD Form 1154</i></p>	<p>Secretary</p>
<p>17. The APWG agreed the proposed amendment which, SVW Pol 2 advised, would be effective from 1 Dec 14. Ongoing</p>	
<p><u>Item 6 – AOB</u></p>	
<p>18. Contact Houses. RAF stated there were varying types of welfare/contact properties across MOD and that RAF were conducting a survey of its contact houses to inform whether there was potential for utilising void properties in the event contact properties were unavailable. Concurrent with this, DIO were developing a “Void Strategy” to determine how best to utilise their void estate. The Chair offered to raise this with DIO SD Accommodation at the Accommodation Delivery Forum (ADF) (13 Nov 14). [Post Meeting Note: This discussion took place; the DIO stated its current 10% void property margin was no longer sustainable, and welcomed RAF’s intent to review their contact houses]. Item Closed.</p>	
<p>19. SSSA Policy – Smoking: Army PS4 questioned whether sole occupancy of SSSA due to smoking/non-smoking, and choice of 2x SSSA bed spaces which often led to sole occupancy of 2 bedroom properties, was an efficient use of estate and requested consideration for their removal. DIO stated these concerns would be reviewed as part of the process for tendering the new contract for the provision of Substitute Accommodation; and, in the meantime, Army could address these issues to DIO SAT Team. Item Closed.</p>	
<p><u>Item 7 - Date of Next Meeting</u></p>	
<p>20. TBA.</p>	

--	--

Prepared by:
{Signed on Original}

Approved by:
{Signed on Original}



Mr
Accommodation Policy 2
Military Network: 9621 89469

Mr
APWG Chair
Military Network: 9621 80295

Distribution:

Action:

All Attendees and Apologies

LAWG ACTION GRID AS AT 6 Nov 14

Action (a)	Item/Subject (b)	Action (c)	Lead (d)
6 (26)	Publicly Funded Mid Tour Moves	<p>25/09: NAVY PERS-PFCS ACCOM SO2 highlighted an anomaly between JSP 464 and JSP 752 with reference to exceptional authority for a publicly funded mid tour move. The Housing Colonels (as the single-Service branch responsible for considering publicly funded mid-tour moves) had previously approved cases in accordance with JSP 464 without issue, despite the implications on allowances of such moves. However, a challenge to this authority had been raised with a recent Navy case which had to be referred to the PACCC because of the allowance implication, as required by JSP 752. Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2 explained that initial discussions with CDP REM confirmed the primacy of JSP 752 over allowance issues but he agreed to have further discussions and report back to the APWG. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2 explained that initial discussions with CDP REM confirmed the primacy of JSP 752 over allowance issues but he agreed to have further discussions and report back to the APWG. Ongoing.</p> <p>06/11: An options paper, to address whether HASC or CO should be responsible for authorising delayed moves of up to 6 months post assignment, and whether such moves should be made at public expense, would be submitted by RAF Pay Col SO2 to apt Policy leads and PACCC. SVW Accom Pol 2, in conjunction with REM, would consolidate views and advise APWG of outcome accordingly. Ongoing</p>	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2
4(9)	Surplus SFA & FTRS – Exceptional Cases.	<p>At JFC’s request, the APWG discussed JSP 464 Annex A to Ch 11 Serial 14, which led to following outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SVW Accom Pol 2 would amend JSP464 to reflect REM as POC for ‘exceptional case’ submissions which seek FTRS occupancy of SFA at entitled rates, rather than market rates; • JFC was invited to write to SVW proposing delegated use of surplus accommodation in some locations in order to encourage Reservists with specific skill sets (eg: Cyber). Chair advised there were implications with this approach such as accounting for where costs fell (ie: to TLB/DIO and not JFC) and, more generally, agreeing suitable conditions in the event Reservists were subsequently required to vacate at short notice. Ongoing • The APWG agreed the varying nature of “exceptional circumstances” cases did not lend itself to requiring further definition. 	JFC

4(10)	SLA Prioritisation List	06/11: RAF stated that a proposed prioritisation list had been constructed by the SLA IMS Working Group for providing greater guidance to Stns/Units and SLA allocation staffs. RAF, Navy, Army, JFC and DIO had all agreed this list and DIO stated it was essential to provide prioritisation to support both the SLA MIS Tririga system and managing Notice to Vacate for SLA when there is a requirement to vacate rooms in favour of higher priority entitled personnel. The Chair stated that though the List was a logical step, he believed it to be more a process tool that supported policy and could therefore be adopted for local use rather than embedded in Policy. The Chair nonetheless invited further comments from the APWG for his further consideration – comments requested by 12 Dec 14 in first instance. Ongoing	APWG
4(11)	SLA NTV – Request for JSP Change	06/11: RAF requested the period of notice provided to vacate SLA by non-entitled/eligible occupants to be standardised to 28-days and the use of an Occupation Certificate to be provided to all SLA occupants in alignment with their request for an SLA Prioritisation List. SVW Accom Pol 2 stated CLS Legal advice re 28-days remained extant; that such an approach could not be legally enforced. A preferred route would be for any exceptions to be managed and dealt with as hardship cases at Local Command level. At RAF request, the Chair agreed to consider further, in conjunction with the SLA Prioritisation List, and advise the APWG accordingly. Ongoing	Chair
4(12)	2 nd Offer SSFA.	06/11: RAF stated that options for how the two offers of SSFA were made to applicants (ie: concurrently or consecutively) had resulted in some applicants rejecting the second offer not realising it was their final offer. To overcome this, RAF proposed for SSFA allocations to follow the similar two stage offer process for SFA. The Chair invited the Secretary to elicit and coordinate views from the APWG for further SVW consideration. Ongoing	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2
4(13)	Chief WO – SFA By Appointment	06/11: RAF proposed entitling VOA, when serving unaccompanied, to use misappropriated SFA. This would impact 3 posts (1 per s-Service). RAF stated entitlement would not lead to D Band entitlement for WO (RAF) and that other factors, such as separation from other WOs/SNCOs, would be considered within the approval process. SVW Accom Pol 2 stated he had received comment from the sS HC but was concerned that the proposal could drive wrong behaviours; the Chair concurred, and cited such entitlement would go ‘against the grain’ of the future accommodation direction which LASR and the Strategic Options Paper was developing. The Chair offered to consider a formal proposal if RAF believed the case was compelling – RAF to advise the Chair, accordingly. SVW Accom Pol 2 agreed to circulate to APWG, out of committee, earlier comments to the proposal including those from Second Sea Lord. Ongoing	RAF
4(14)	SLA – Reduced Charges.	06/11: Whilst RN and RAF and Army (Involuntarily Separated) personnel in PStat Cat 1 and 2 were exempt from SLA charges when living in SLA (and usually commute home at weekends); personnel in PStat Cat 3, 4 and 5 pay SLA charges in similar circumstances. The Chair stated there were a number of	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Charging 3

		anomalies within current accommodation policy which NEM, through the Strategic Accommodation Options paper, was seeking to harmonise, one of which being applicability of SLA charges for personnel with residences away from their duty stations. Ongoing	
4(15)	Commodity Management.	06/11: SVW Accom Pol 4 noted the need to reconcile differences in how % points for furnished/part furnished were attributed and stated that a review to address this and the charging methodology for furniture, was in train. A paper was due to be presented to APWG on both issues before Christmas. Ongoing	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Charging 3

CLOSED ACTIONS

Action (a)	Item/Subject (b)	Action (c)	Lead (d)
1202	Veterinary Officers SFA allocation in London	HQ Army proposed that 2 x VOs assigned to HCMR and Kings Troop RHA should be entitled to SFA within 45 mins of their place of duty. LAWG to approve this exception to the current policy. 24/1 – HQ Army informed the meeting that this issue did not require a change in policy and it should be considered as casework by the Army Housing Colonel. Issue closed.	Accom Pol C2/Army
1203	DIA SSSA Audit actions – failure to notify HCR of vacant property.	LAWG to consider whether current policy should be amended in light of DIA SSSA Audit as per email dated 20 Dec 11. 24/1 – The LAWG agreed that the proposed wording should be included in both JSP 464 and the LTO. Issue closed.	Accom Pol SO2
1204	DIA SSSA Audit – review of policy for exemptions to 61 day absence rule.	LAWG to consider whether current policy should be amended in light of DIA SSSA Audit as per email dated 20 Dec 11. 24/1 – The LAWG considered that each TLB would have a different criteria which a cost benefit analysis for retention would be based on. DE&S HRJSST-Plans SO1 agreed to draft a paragraph to be included in JSP 464 to be considered OOC. Once received, it may be necessary to consider a proportionality exercise type form. 4/07 – An agreed form of words was agreed OOC and will be incorporated within the next iteration of the JSP on 13 Jul 12. Issue closed.	Accom Pol SO2
1206	Form 1132a revision	Application for SSFA to be approved by the LAWG. 24/1 – LAWG informed that the Form 1132a revision was currently being staffed in DIO Ops Accn and would be distributed OOC for LAWG approval in due course. 4/07 – The revised 1132a will be incorporated within the next iteration of the JSP on 13 Jul 12. Issue closed.	Accom Pol C2/DIO SSSA Cell
1207	NHP GfC Options	LAWG to consider 3 options proposed by NHP for future GfC process. 24/1 – Army and RAF did not agree with the proposal to transfer the GfC process to the contractor. RN stated that they could see some benefit. All agreed that it was impossible to make a more informed decision without a properly detailed and staffed paper. 4/07 – Asst Hd AFW responded to DIO Hd Ops Accn to inform him that the LAWG had considered the proposals and believed that the status quo should be retained with the potential for the DIO representative on the BOO being replaced by a member of the contractor's staff. Hd SP Pol SVW believed that further effort should be focussed on addressing the Grade for Charge process, rather than the way in which it was assessed. Item closed.	Accom Pol C2

1209	Charging of cleaning at move out.	LAWG to consider whether under new NHP contract, Disturbance Allowance could be reduced to pay for a clean on move into SFA, rather than the inconsistent clean at move out service. 24/1 – NHP proposal presented to the LAWG, who agreed to review it OOC. 4/07 – LAWG members reviewed the proposal OOC and were not supportive of the initiative. Item closed.	Accom Pol SO2
1210	Bereaved spouses entitlement to SFA whilst remaining in service.	LAWG to approve amendment to JSP 464, Part 1, Annex C to Chapter 3 to include provision for bereaved spouses who are still serving. 24/1 – Accom Pol SO2 briefed the LAWG on the disparity in policy about serving bereaved spouses being permitted to retain an SFA on posting, within the 2 year entitlement period. Accom Pol SO2 to draft an amendment to JSP 464, Part 1, Chapter 3, para 0316 to permit these individuals to retain SFA on assignment within the 2 year entitlement period, for approval OOC. 4/07 – The FLEET rep advised the Committee that retention of SFA by bereaved spouses was already incorporated within JSP 464 (Para 0316). It was not considered necessary therefore to make any further amendments to the JSP but any specific cases not covered by current regulations could be staffed to Accn Pol staffs in the usual manner. Item closed.	Accom Pol SO2
1211	NI removals allowance issue.	LAWG members to inform CoC of disparity between NI removals contract against subsistence allowance policy and inform that PACCC will look favourably on requests for subsistence claims between 4 and 10 days. 24/1 – Accom Pol C2 updated the LAWG on the disparity between the new contract and the subsistence allowance policy for those returning to UK from NI. Pay and Manning are aware of the issue and are currently investigating. In the meantime, they have advised that units should submit a claim to the PACCC for additional subsistence, which would be looked on favourably. LAWG members to promulgate this information through their Chain of Command. Item closed.	Accom Pol C2
1212	Disparity of entitlement to SSSA for Service couples occupying their own homes.	Current policy states that 2 Service personnel who are married/in a civil partnership can occupy SSSA at separate locations, as one must occupy SFA. Policy challenges have occurred for those individuals who own their own homes and do not wish to be forced to occupy an SFA as their second home instead of SSSA (where no SLA is available). LAWG to consider. 24/1 – JSP 464 was amended in 2010 to prevent serving couples from both occupying SSSA. RN have now received a piece of casework for consideration on this as the couple in question own their own home and do not want to have to occupy SFA. RN agreed to consider this issue as casework	Accom Pol SO2/Fleet

		<p>and Accom Pol C2 agreed to review the reason why the policy was changed in 2010.</p> <p>4/07 – Accom Pol C2 was not able to ascertain why the policy was changed in 2010. If the RN believes the policy needs to be reconsidered following the on-going Redress of Complaint, they would need to staff a case to the LAWG for consideration at the next meeting.</p> <p>12/07 – Fleet and DE&S confirmed that no casework would be submitted. Item closed.</p>	
1214	Interim Grading Review.	<p>12/07 - The Committee was advised that a key recommendation of the Future Accommodation Project would be to introduce an entirely new system for grading SFA. Noting this, the Committee agreed that if the Interim Grading Review was introduced now, it would lead to unnecessary confusion for those responsible for implementing and managing the system. The Chair undertook to raise the LAWG's recommendation that the Interim Grading Review should not be implemented with the SWSG. Item Closed</p>	Accom Pol C1
4a	FTRS (Home Commitment) and (Limited Commitment) entitlement to SLA	<p>FTRS (HC) and (LC) SLA entitlement is currently unclear in JSP 464. As a result, the Army and RAF have created DINs affording entitlement to FTRS (HC) and (LC) personnel. Wording needs to be refined in JSP 464 and agreement reached that these personnel are not entitled, nor should then be charged entitled rates.</p> <p>24/1 – The LAWG agreed that FTRS (HC) and (LC) personnel should not be entitled to SLA. Accom Pol C2 to distribute amended wording for JSP 464, Part 3 for OOC approval.</p> <p>4/07 – Following representations from each of the Housing Colonels regarding this issue, Hd AFW has written to them and asked that they undertake a review on the issue and report back to him by 18 Sep 12. An informed decision on the way forward will then be staffed to all concerned.</p> <p>11/10 – The Group was advised that the sS Housing Cols had now provided evidence of the number of FTRS (HC) & (LC) personnel within their respective Services currently residing in SLA / SFA at entitled rates and were therefore affected by the clarification of policy with regards their entitlements as detailed in JSP 464 issued in Jul 12. DCDS (Pers & Trg) SVW reviewed the evidence and proposed the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That those FTRS HC/LC ADC (and NCS) posts on current contract should be given grandfather rights i.e. they would continue with their current accommodation arrangements. Thereafter, any new contract must be in 	

		<p>accordance with rules in JSP 464 as issued in Jul 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any FTRS HC/LC ADC (and NCS) appointments that were currently going through the system would also be afforded 'grandfather rights', on the basis that the job adverts may have stipulated accommodation at entitled rates. These had to be concluded/signed before <u>1 Nov 2012</u>. Thereafter, all job adverts for these groups of personnel must comply with the regulations in JSP 464 as issued in Jul 2012. The sS Housing Cols had to identify those individuals affected and ensure they registered their 'grandfather rights' with the Unit Pay HR in order that they could continue with their current accommodation arrangements. Individuals would have until <u>31 Dec 2012</u> to register. Individuals who failed to register would be charged at the non entitled rates from this date. <p>These arrangements would be reviewed every 12 months to ensure that those on 'grandfather rights' were decreasing in line with expectation. The sS HC would be required to provide evidence of this.</p> <p>A DIN would be published in due course setting out these 'transition' arrangements.</p> <p>The group agreed that the proposal was the most reasonable way forward. Item Closed.</p>	
4d	Defence Accommodation Stores	<p>The NGEC recently produced a paper regarding the future provision of DAS. SO2 Accom Pol advised the Committee that he would be conducting further research on the issue and his findings would be reported to the Committee at the next meeting.</p> <p>11/10 - DCDS (Pers & Trg) undertook an analysis on the usage of DAS which confirmed the continuing need for its provision; a position which sS Housing Colonels supported. DIO have been tasked to determine the most economical way to continue with this provision. Item closed.</p>	
4e	DIA SSFA Audit – Withdrawal of the NAC within 51 days of the required date	<p>12/07 - A DIA Audit on SSFA had commented that current policy does not allow for the withdrawal of a NAC by DIO once the 51 day point had been reached and that this represented poor value for money. The Committee discussed a variety of solutions that would address the perceived gap in policy and it was agreed that JSP 464 should be reworded to make it clear that if there is any dispute over the 51 day rule, cases were to be referred to</p>	

		<p>the single Service Housing Colonel for resolution in consultation with the Local Service Commander. The Fleet Rep agreed to review the current policy and produce an alternative form of words for consideration out of committee.</p> <p>11/10 - A DIA Audit on SSFA had commented that current policy did not allow for the withdrawal of a NAC by DIO once the 51 day point had been reached and that this represented poor value for money. Fleet DN Pers WS Accom SO2 reviewed the current policy and produced an alternative form of words which was considered OOC. The Group further discussed the comments received and agreed the following statement:-</p> <p>'The NAC maybe cancelled at any point up to the time that the applicant is required to sign the Property Acceptance Certificate for a particular property without incurring costs. The NAC may be cancelled in the following circumstances:-</p> <p>c. The HASC, having issued a NAC, subsequently find that suitable SFA becomes available:</p> <p>(1) The HASC may withdraw the NAC and offer appropriate SFA at any time up to 51 days (for moves within the UK) and 65 days (for moves to UK from overseas) before the applicant's required date (i.e. the latest time the SSFA Application Form 1132a must be submitted to ensure its timely administration).</p> <p>(2) Thereafter, the HASC may only withdraw the NAC if the applicant is prepared to forego SSFA and accept the offered SFA. Disputed cases should be referred to the Single Housing Colonels for decision in consultation with the Local Service Commanders.'</p> <p>This will be reflected in the next updated JSP 464. Item closed.</p>	
4f	Delay in allocation impacting on allowances	<p>Delays in allocating SFA / SSFA were beginning to impact a Service person's right to claim allowances associated with Move in / Move Out within the JSP 752 regulated 3 month period. It was agreed that this issue should be raised to DCDS Pers – Pay and Manning / Allowances for consideration. It was also suggested that reference to this could be mentioned in the proposed flagged message on the e1132 form as another consideration when rejecting a first offer of accommodation</p> <p>11/10 - This issue had been raised through the SO1 Pay Group and agreement reached to extend the current claim period to 6 months, whereby any claims between the 3-6 month period could be signed off by the relevant CO where the evidence</p>	Accom Pol SO2 / DCDS Pers Pay & Manning

		provided showed that no accommodation was available within the first 3 month period. Item closed.	
4g	Short Notice Requests	DIO Ops Accom raised the issue of the growing number of short notice requests for SFA received by the HASC (less than 30 days). At the recent Housing Forum DIO Ops Accom agreed to provide evidence of this to the Housing Colonels and TLBs to investigate. However no evidence had been received to date. It was decided that DIO Ops Accom was to provide the Housing Colonels and TLBs with the requested evidence in order for them to action. 11/10 - DIO Ops Accom reported that the perceived issue with Short Notice Requests was not as big as it first appeared. Item closed.	
5a	Retention of SFA – Adult Education/Notice to Employees	11/10 - <u>Retention of SFA</u> Adult Education Courses Notice to Employers The Army Families Federation (AFF) had written to DCDS (Pers & Trg) suggesting that SFA retention policy should be extended to include circumstances where an SP was reassigned before the completion, by a spouse, of an adult education course, and in situations where an SP received a short notice posting which was outside the period required for sufficient notice to be given to a spouse’s employer. A proposal was put to the LAWG OOC for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Adult Education Courses</u> – The Group discussed the proposed comments and amendments. It was agreed that those amendments offered by Fleet DN and DE&S would be incorporated and submitted to the LAWG, OOC, for final agreement. • <u>Notice of Employers</u> – The Group agreed to the proposed amendments offered by Fleet DN. This too would be circulated to members OOC for final agreement. PJHQ J1 Ops SO3 undertook to ascertain how this extension would affect SP overseas and report back at the next meeting. Item Closed	Accom Pol C2
5b	LSAP JSP Amendment	11/10 - Fleet DN requested an amendment to the LSAP regulation currently in JSP 464 following a specific case of misuse of LSAP. The amendment was to make it clear that neither partner should be entitled to SFA nor SLA within 50 miles of the property purchased with the use of LSAP. The Group agreed to the proposed amendment. Item closed.	Accom Pol C2
5c	Declaration of LSAP on 1132e	11/10 - DIO requested an amendment to the 1132e form with regards to similar issues raised by Fleet DN. The Group agreed to the proposed	DIO Ops Accom

		amendment. Item closed.	
5d	Chaplains SFA	11/10 - RAF Chaplain Service perceived that the current rules pertaining to entitlement to SFA were discriminatory to PCatStat 3, 4 and 5 and had requested that the existing rules in JSP 464 be amended accordingly, to enable these PCatStats to occupy SFA in lieu of SLA prior to undertaking Initial Service Training. Fleet DN provided documented evidence on the background to the current policy, confirming that it was to assist those Chaplains (PCatStats 1 & 2) with families, with a smooth as possible a transition into service life and the unique conditions that membership of the Armed Forces brought. It was the Group's opinion that the current rules were not discriminatory. Any further appeal against this decision from any of the three Services should be staffed accordingly. DCDS Pers & Trg would reply to the RAF Chaplain Service. Item closed	Accom Pol C2
5e	Service Reasons – 40 day rule.	11/10 - The Service Complaint Panel (SCP) had requested that 'Service reasons' in JSP 464 Part Chapter 8 Annex C – Vacation of SSSA Paragraph 52 – Notice to Vacate, be defined. This was as a result of an SP appealing against their assignment order which made it difficult to comply with the 40-day notice requirement. The LAWG agreed that it would be extremely difficult to define 'Service reasons' and that it would remove the current flexibility and be limiting. Furthermore, it would lead to anything outside of those listed being taken forward as casework to a greater authority. DCDS (Pers & Trg) SVW Hd would respond to the SCP accordingly. Item closed	Accom Pol C2
5f	Gardening Support – Tied SFA	11/10 - DIO had produced a paper on proposed gardening support to Senior Officers, which had been circulated to members for consideration OOC. With the withdrawal of Official Service Residence (OSR) status and the issue of JSP 915, Domestic Assistance and Official Hospitality, there was still an issue concerning the maintenance of Tied/Ex Officio houses, and who had responsibility to maintain such properties. The Chair proposed the following:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For single and married unaccompanied officers in SFA (in lieu of SLA) by virtue of their appointment or 'In Command' status, their employing TLB should determine whether gardening support should be provided and the level of that provision. • Gardening support for those SP in SFA, where the incumbent, as a result of their appointment, was expected to provide a level of representational hospitality, TLBs should determine if they were eligible for 	Accom Pol C1

		<p>Domestic Assistance in accordance with JSP 915, and gardening support provided accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All other SFA must be maintained in accordance with JSP 464 (Part 1, Chapter 7, Section V). <p>The Group agreed to these proposals. DCDS (Pers & Trg) SVW Hd would respond formally to DIO Ops Accm based on the LAWG's agreement and JSP 464 would be amended accordingly idc. Item closed</p>	
5g	Commercial Kitchens – OSR	11/10 - The Group agreed that the issue was out with its remit, but was for DIO to take forward with the relevant TLBs. Item closed.	DIO Ops Accn
5 (17)	MPGS – Retention of SFA	<p>24/01 - DIO Ops Accn stated that AGC (MPGS) were entitled to SFA at the entitled rate. However, due to the specific static employment conditions of service for AGC (MPGS), there was no entitlement to SSFA in the event of SFA not being available. It had come to DIO's attention that some AGC (MPGS) had been granted retention of SFA outside their entitlement. Discussion followed on entitlement and eligibility, with the rules being clarified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Static employment conditions refers to normal entitlement within a 10 mile radius of the Duty Stn (or 20 miles where approved by the LSC). MPGS are not entitled to retention of SFA at a location other than at their Duty Stn. MPGS are neither entitled nor eligible to apply for surplus SFA at a location other than at their Duty Stn. <p>DIO would issue instructions to the HASC on how best to manage the situation. Item closed</p>	DIO Ops Accn
5 (19)	SSFA – Accommodation Required Date	<p>24/01 - LF DPSA PS4 SO1 raised the issue of advancing the SSFA occupation date by greater than the 2 days currently allowed by JSP 464. This was to address potential 'move-in' problems for SP around Christmas/New Year and Bank Holidays, in particular.</p> <p>DIO Ops Accn provided the cost implication of changing the current policy (potentially £38K per day based on the number of 'move-ins' in a 12 month period) which the Group agreed was not cost effective to change policy. It was felt that DIO SAT, who managed the SSFA process were known to be flexible in their approach and would try to accommodate the SP's request as far as possible, in such instances. Item closed</p>	
4 (4)	Form 1132 amendment on second offers	Current policy states that if a SP turns down the first offer for personal reasons, there is no set time limit for receiving a second offer. Some HICs	

		<p>(HASC) are placing these SP on a waiting list, to which they will never come to the top due to SP on first offers receiving preference. LAWG to consider whether a time limit should be set for a second offer and if agreed what it should be. The Form 1132 would need to be amended subsequently. Allowance policy now states that if a SP does not move within 3 months of assignment, they will receive no DA and removals expenses.</p> <p>24/1 – After considerable discussion, the LAWG agreed that in some areas it may not be possible to give a second offer of SFA to those SP who turn down the first offer for personal reasons. As a time limit for a second offer could not be agreed, Accom Pol C2 agreed to draft alternative wording for the 1132 which would state that HIC (HASC) staff would advise a SP of the inability to offer a second choice, at the point when the first offer was made - this would allow SP to make a more informed choice.</p> <p>12/07 - SO2 Accom Pol agreed to draft some revised wording for both JSP 464 and the e1132 and circulate it out of committee for comment. The proposed wording would explain that if the first offer is rejected, the family would rejoin the bottom of the application list and then be treated as if it were a new application. Once incorporated into policy, the revised wording should be reviewed after 12 months. DIO Ops Accon Pol also agreed to investigate whether the new electronic application system could generate an e-mail prompt advising applicants to contact the HASC 15 days after turning down the first offer.</p> <p>11/10 - DIO Ops Accon stated that they had started a trial from 1 October 2012 for two months to test a 2nd offer proposal. LAWG members were provided with the parameters of this trial and DIO would analyse their findings and provide the Group with a proposed 2nd offer protocol when the trial was completed.</p> <p>24/01 - Chair agreed to draft a DIN for agreement by members with reference to an appeals process for 2nd Offers. DIO Ops Accon and Fleet DN Pers stated that they would investigate the possibility of amending the current e1132 application to incorporate an 'appeals' process.</p> <p>[Sec Note: On reflection, the Chair suggested (OOC) a 'review' process instead of an appeal, for where the SP was considering rejecting the 2nd offer. The e-1132 could be updated to facilitate this by notifying the SP of the action required in these circumstances, as stated above.]</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>25/4: The 'Second Offer' DIN had been published. The new process would come into effect on 1 May 13. Its impact on the HASC, Local Service Commanders and/or single-Service Housing staffs could not be quantified at this early stage, but feedback on the process (including volume, timelines and associated impact) should be provided at the next APWG. Housing Colonel staffs were encouraged to collate evidence/statistics to support the feedback. Similar information would be required from the HASC and it was recommended that the HASC be invited to the next APWG to present their findings and views.</p> <p>25/09: The 'Second Offer' DIN had been published and the new process came into effect on 1 May 13. Its impact on the HASC, Local Service Commanders and/or single-Service Housing staffs appeared to be low and members agreed that it was working well, although communication with Service personnel throughout the process was key to its continued success. It was agreed that JSP 464 would be amended to reflect the new process, and to incorporate the new e1132b Form. DIO Ops Accn-PR1 undertook to incorporate the relevant flowchart and form onto the DIO website.</p> <p>11/02: DIO Ops Accn-PR1a stated that relevant flowchart and form had been incorporated onto DIO's website. Item Closed.</p>	<p>Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 2/ DIO Ops Accn-PR1</p>
4 (8)	Retention of SFA on discharge Overseas	<p>24/01 - Pers &Trg SVW Accom Pol 3 explained that a recent case had highlighted the need to review the policy surrounding the retention of Service provided accommodation (including substitute equivalents (hiring's)) in the period leading up to normal discharge for SP based overseas (JSP 464, Part 2). Discussion followed on the differences within the sS regulations which highlighted that the case in question was exceptional rather than the norm. Nevertheless, it was agreed that the rules should be reviewed with a view to tightening up. Ongoing</p> <p>25/4: A review of the policy surrounding retention of Service-provided accommodation in the period leading up to normal discharge overseas had been undertaken. A revised form of wording had been agreed OOC and would be incorporated into the next update of JSP 464, Part 2 in Jul 13. Item Closed.</p>	<p>Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 3</p>
4 (9)	DIO Delivery Improvement Action Plan	<p>25/4: Single-Service representatives were aware of this DIO initiative, but their involvement was limited to focus group discussions. They did not recall having sight of the up to date 'Action Plan' and would <u>welcome a copy</u>. The majority of 'actions'</p>	

		<p>were considered to be delivery related, but there was concern that some initiatives could have policy implications that would require wider stakeholder engagement. One such issue was the intent to widen the search radius beyond 10 miles at the request of families, which the single-Service representatives at the focus groups had 'red-carded', but remained 'live' on the Action Plan. DIO Ops Accn-BM HPCS3 was to ensure that actions with potential policy implications were rightfully referred to the APWG.</p> <p>The 4-month trial of the 'Enhanced Move In Standard' would end in Jun 13, and the Chair highlighted the need for DIO to provide feedback on it at the next APWG in Jul 13. APWG members requested clarification of what the 'enhanced standard' would include.</p> <p>25/09: DIO Ops Accn-PR1 agreed to provide members with a copy of the elements covered within the Enhanced Move-In Standard. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 2 stated that APWG members had been provided with a copy of the elements covered within the Enhanced Move-In Standard OOC. Item Closed.</p>	DIO Ops Accn-PR1
4 (11)	RAF Opt Out	<p>24/01 - LF DPSA PS4 SO1 accepted the RAF's Opt Out on allocation of SFA below entitlement and RAF Warrant Officers being able to occupy Type D ORSFA regardless of the size of their family were part of the Future Accommodation considerations. However, he felt that the APWG could change policy now to regularize the anomalies as they were solely accommodation policy issues and had no implication on allowances. The Chair agreed to look to determine whether this could be taken forward by the APWG. Ongoing</p> <p>25/4: A paper on the 'RAF Opt Out' was currently with the RAF Housing Colonel for consideration and likely to be reviewed at the highest level. To be monitored through FAW WG.</p>	Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 1
4 (5)	UK wide review of non-entitled occupation of SFA.	<p>Some non-entitled civilian personnel have occupied surplus SFA for a number of years. Due to the surplus stock declining, DIO have served NTV to those non entitled personnel. RAF would like DIO to review how many individuals this affects and what provisions their LTOs were signed on. In addition, the LAWG is to consider whether the current wording in JSP 464 about who has the authority to endorse key worker status should be amended.</p> <p>24/1 – RAF outlined their current issue with CDO staff occupying SFA and being served NTVs. DIO Ops Accn was tasked to review how many non-entitled civilian personnel were currently occupying</p>	

		<p>SFA and what provisions their LTOs were signed on. Audit to be conducted by DIO Ops Accn, through Housing Colonels, with an update required by 29 Feb 12. Air requested that the approval of key worker status paragraph in JPS 464 was amended and agreed to draft this for OOC approval.</p> <p>4/07 – DIO Ops Accn had advised that due to manpower resource issues, they were unable to undertake the detailed review required by the Committee. It was therefore agreed that NTVs would not be issued until they were in a position to carry out the review and an informed decision had been made by the LAWG Committee members.</p> <p>11/10 – DIO Ops Accom explained that they continued to have resource issues and had therefore been unable to undertake the detailed review as requested at the previous LAWG. The Group felt that this work was required urgently. It was suggested that perhaps the issue needed to be addressed at 1* level and the Chair undertook to take this forward.</p> <p>Following discussions with DCDS (Pers & Trg) SVW Hd, it has been suggested that the best approach might be for the sS to identify the properties where this was an issue and notify DIO for further investigation. Members are therefore asked to consider as a potential workaround and provide feedback.</p> <p>24/01 - DIO Ops Accn explained that it was still the intention, as agreed at the recent Accommodation Steering Group (ASG), to provide sS HC with the relevant data by 31 January 2013. Ongoing.</p> <p>25/4: The provision of data on non-entitled occupation of SFA was taking longer than anticipated. Data had been collected from HASCs 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8, but was still outstanding from HASCs 1, 3 and 4. Members expressed disappointment that this exercise had yet to be completed and DIO Ops Accn-BM HPCS3 was tasked to forward the 'raw data' on non-entitled occupation of SFA to Housing Colonel staffs by 31 May 13; this should include outstanding data from HASCs 1, 3 and 4. Thereafter, the Housing Colonel staffs should analyse the data to determine what follow-on action was required and report back on the position at the next APWG.</p> <p>25/09: The HASC had instigated a full review and had assessed continued occupancy against current/anticipated demand and, in areas of high demand from entitled families, had issued a 3</p>	
--	--	---	--

		month warning (to be followed by a Notice to Vacate (NTV)). The HASC had engaged with Local Service Commanders, where appropriate, prior to action being taken. This was now routine business for DIO. Item Closed.	DIO Ops Accn
4 (6)	Damage for Trespass	<p>11/10 - The Chair explained that the issue was currently being looked at by CLS but the general discussion which ensued agreed that a regional market average rate (as determined by the Future Accommodation Workstrands) could potentially be the answer going forward.</p> <p>24/01 - Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 3 stated that CLS had provided guidance suggesting that the calculations for damages should be based on the value to the IO of local authority social housing. Further guidance was required on whether this could be applied UK wide as housing was a devolved issue and different laws applied in Scotland and Northern Ireland. CLS have requested data on the monetary difference between the Local Authority values and the non entitled rates. DIO Ops Accn stated that DIO was best placed to provide such data and undertook to speak to the relevant section. Ongoing</p> <p>25/4: DIO/HASC had expressed concern over the calculation of DFT on a case-by-case basis using local authority (LA)/Housing Association (HA) rents for an equivalent property. The HASC often experienced difficulties obtaining up to date rates from these organisations and was currently using official (ODPM) average, regional figures, by bedroom size, from 2009/2010. CLS had been asked to confirm whether use of retrospective, average, regional rates would be acceptable to the courts and whether 'English' figures could be used for IO in the Devolved Administrations (as this was how DIO was currently calculating these rates due to a lack of similar figures for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland). MoD had also provided CLS with a rate comparison (entitled v average LA/HA) to determine whether it might be simpler to ask for the 'Entitled' rate (i.e. for the MoD's loss rather than 'benefit' to the IO). This exercise had confirmed that SFA attracted higher or lower rates depending on Grade and Type but, in general, LA/HA rates were slightly higher. Further work was required to identify the difference in monetary terms should one method be adopted over another. This work was ongoing. In the meantime, as DCLG and the Home and Communities Agency (HCA) had recently (Dec 12) issued more up to date (2011/2012) average figures, the HASC should use these figures. Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 3 would forward (DCLG provided) links to the published 2011/2012 LA/HA statistics to DIO</p>	

		<p>Ops Accn-BM HPCS3 for the HASC to use going forward until a more permanent solution was identified. Per & Trg SVW Accom Pol 3 would continue to liaise with CLS to take forward the remaining work strands (use of average retrospective rates, Devolved Administrations, monetary value etc).</p> <p>25/09: The HASC was using the latest rates as issued by DCLG and HCA. There was an expectation that IO charges would therefore increase. Item Closed.</p>	
4 (7)	Extension of Retention Policy	<p>24/01 - JFC-J1-Pol-SO1 was unable to provide an update at this time. Ongoing</p> <p>25/04: JFC Hd Infra was unable to provide an update. Ongoing.</p> <p>25/09: JFC-J1-Pol SO3 was unable to provide an update. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: JFC-J1-Pol SO3 requested the closure of this item. Item Closed.</p>	JFC-J1-Pol SO3
4 (10)	TA & Reservist – JSP 464, Part 3	<p>25/4: LF had submitted a proposed amendment to JSP 464, Part 3, seeking to clarify the SLA charging regime (entitled or non-entitled) for TA & Reservist SP undertaking obligatory and voluntary training:</p> <p>Air Cmd highlighted that JPA was not ‘set up’ To manage the additional billing that a more detailed policy might require, and that charges were currently collected by numerous agencies in a variety of ways. Members concurred that collection of charges was complex, but agreed that this was a delivery issue that should not drive policy (though it should be a consideration). Moreover, a governance and assurance regime could be implemented to ensure that correct charges were being applied. LF confirmed that such practices already existed.</p> <p>Air Cmd also expressed concern that additions to the policy now might reignite the wider debate over FTRS entitlement to SLA. The Chair acknowledged this, but advised that accommodation formed just one element of the FTRS remuneration package, and that RFC needed to articulate the detailed requirements of FR20 before further consideration could be given to the issue more widely. In the meantime, LF’s amendments could be considered, but minor changes should be made to make it tri-Service in nature, reinforce the need for a governance and assurance regime (including retention of supporting evidence) and clarify the meaning in some areas. The revised draft should be approved by RFC to ensure compliance with ‘Reserve Forces’ regulations.</p>	LF DPSA PS4 SO1

		25/09: LF agreed that there was no need to now amend JSP 464 with reference to this issue. Item Closed.	
4 (11)	Amendments to Table 4, JSP 464 – 4TGB	<p>25/4: LF submitted proposals to amend Serial 1 of Table 4, JSP 464, Part 4, Annex A to Chapter 1 - 'Scaling of SFA fixtures and fittings', in particular the award of deficiency points for power sockets and razor points. APWG members approved the following proposals:</p> <p>Table 4 currently stated that garages should have one double socket, suggesting that deficiency points could be awarded in a 4TGB if this was not provided. However, as DIO assessed garage condition and size separately and the charge did not constitute part of the accommodation charge, garages should not be assessed as part of the 4TGB. The reference to 'Garages (1)' in Table 4 will be removed.</p> <p>Table 4 currently suggested that a double razor point should be provided in a bathroom, but JSP 315 provided for a single point. The reference in JSP 464 was considered to be an error and will be amended from 'Bathroom (1) razor point' to 'Bathroom 1 single razor point'.</p> <p>25/09: JSP 464 Part 4 had been amended accordingly, effective from 1 July 2013. Item Closed.</p>	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2
4 (12)	Barrack Damages Charges	<p>LAWG to consider whether Barrack Damages should be charged through JPA in the UK, as in Germany.</p> <p>24/1 – LAWG agreed with the principal of Barrack Damages being charged through JPA for UK SFA, as long as there was an opportunity for SP to dispute the charge before it was levied. DIO Ops Accn to consider the proposal with SPVA.</p> <p>4/07 – DIO Ops Accn has agreed a process with SPVA which will start from 1 Aug 12. Item closed.</p> <p>24/01 - DIO Ops Accn stated that a process had been agreed for the collection of Barrack Damage Charges from JPA which would come into affect from 1 April 2013. The task would be undertaken by SPVA, and SP would have 14 days to challenge the charges raised. He undertook to provide members with a copy of the DIN.</p> <p>25/4: The DIN covering recovery of Barrack Damages through JPA had not been issued, as SPVA had advised DIO that it could not be accommodated. DIO Ops Accn-BM HPCS3 was to provide the Committee with an update on progress at the next meeting.</p>	DIO Ops Accn

		<p>25/09: A DIN (2013DIN01-188) covering recovery of Barrack Damages through JPA had now been issued. DIO Ops Accn-PR1 stated that at the Move Out appointment, personnel would be informed of any rechargeable damage and deficiencies via the Statement of Charges form (Alloc 015) for SFA, or the Occupant End Certificate (OEC) for SSFA. On receipt of the Alloc 015/OEC, the DIO Ops Accn Licence Team at RAF Wyton would send notification to the Service personnel stating that the charge would be taken direct from pay. Personnel would have 14 working days from receipt of notification to lodge a dispute. In the absence of lodging a dispute, the charge would be taken direct from pay, via JPA. A payment plan would automatically be calculated by JPA if the charges exceeded a set percentage of pay. Item Closed.</p>	
4 (13)	DIA SSSA Audit	<p>DIA had completed their follow-up review of the 2011 SSSA audit. Of the 13 management actions identified in the original report, DIA recorded 12 as 'implemented', and one as 'partially implemented', assessing overall progress as 'Satisfactory'. A number of items remained outstanding:</p> <p>Collection of Personal Contributions (PC). LF's review was ongoing. Cases generally fell into one of three categories: those where collection of a PC had been confirmed and G1 action initiated; those with a discrepancy in documentation; and those on which work was yet to start. Investigation of the former was continuing, and the latter were being addressed in 'bite sizes' due to limited resources. Air A1 Assurance had reviewed the DIO SAT-provided list of RAF personnel and had tasked the relevant unit or TLB (where non-Air Cmd) to review and, where necessary, collect outstanding PCs. The single-Services should now monitor completion of this work OOC. Item Closed.</p> <p>E2E Review of SSSA Process. F1154 had not been amended. However, as part of its work to investigate non-collection of PCs, Air Cmd had identified that the F1154 and/or the SSSA application process may exacerbate or inhibit the collection of PCs, and had offered to undertake an E2E review. The review took place in mid-March. It was attended by stakeholders from the Air Cmd TLB, RAF Units, Pers & Trg and DIO SAT and considered, among other issues, the order and content of F1154, governance and assurance (6-monthly check) and notice-to-vacate. Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 reported that the 'Record-of-Decisions' from the workshop would be available shortly and would be forwarded to Pers & Trg in the first instance before circulation to APWG members</p>	Air SO2 CSpt/Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 3

		<p>OOC for wider comment. It was noted that, whilst it may be possible to make some changes, significant amendments could not be made until the new SSSA contract had been let.</p> <p>25/09: Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 reported that the 'Record-of-Decisions' from the workshop had been distributed to members for comment. It was noted that, whilst it may have been possible to make some changes, significant amendments could not be made until the new SSSA contract had been let. The APWG therefore agreed to wait until the new contract was in place. Item Closed.</p>	
5 (15)	Substitute Accommodation Requirement Review	<p>25/09: The Chair asked why, as part of the minimum furnishings requirement for SSSA covered in JSP 464 Part 3 Annex D to Chapter 8, the Department provided a Colour TV and Telephone Line/Handset. The Single-Service representatives explained that the provision of a TV was to replicate that of a communal facility which would be provided if Service personnel were accommodated in SLA, to ensure there was no disadvantage. They further explained that provision of both a telephone line and handset was to enable Service personnel to be called out by their relevant unit without prior notice. There was a general discussion concerning the option of using mobile phones and subsequent poor reception areas. There was also a wider debate on the provision of broadband. Members recognised that technology had 'moved on', but did not believe that there was a need to change the Dept's provision, or to introduce flexibility to permit reimbursement for alternate solutions where a conventional line <u>was</u> available (extant provision to reimburse mobile costs where a conventional line was not available remains unchanged). Therefore members agreed that there was no need for any amendment to JSP 464. Item Closed.</p>	
5 (16)	Service Authority for SSSA/SSFA – Reference Grade Challenge	<p>25/09: The Chair felt that the Service Authority for grade challenges to substitute accommodation should lie within the DIO as owners of the contract with the service provider. DIO Ops Accn-PR1 confirmed that this was the case with regards to RAF/Navy challenges, but the Army undertook their own process, but it was unclear how this was reported back to the DIO, or indeed why the Army was outside of it. Army PersSvcs-PS4-CtySp-AccnSO3 undertook to investigate and report back. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: Army PersSvcs-PS4-CtySp-AccnSO3 reported that she had spoken to Sp Comd on the issue of occupants of Substitute accommodation who challenged the GfC. She stated that the Army did not undertake their own process, but followed</p>	Army PersSvcs-PS4-CtySp-AccnSO3

		<p>the process laid down in JSP 464. During discussions it was stated that challenges to Substitute Accommodation GfC did not require the conveying of a full BoO and a shorter process for this was detailed in the JSP which the Army was to confirm was being followed.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note: Sp Comd HQ-Pers-SO1 has since confirmed that JSP 464 policy guidelines, in conjunction with grading challenges of substitute accommodation, are being adhered to and that she has sent out comms to all Bdes reminding them of the correct process iaw policy]. Item Closed.</p>	
5 (17)	Allocation of SFA above entitlement	<p>25/09: Following specific casework received by Pers & Trg SVW Accom, there was a requirement to clarify the current policy with regards to the allocation of SFA above entitlement for Service reasons, specifically the associated charge. The Chair undertook to write out to members OOC on the suggested wording to make the policy clearer. On agreement, this would be incorporated into the next edition of JSP 464. Ongoing.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note: Members agreed OOC the following amendment:-</p> <p><u>JSP 464 Part 1 Chapter 3 para 0331 and Part 2 para 0319 -</u> “...In order not to disadvantage personnel when SFA above entitlement is allocated for Service reasons, the SFA charge applied is the lower of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 1 for charge for the type of property to which they are normally entitled or the grade for charge for the type of property actually occupied.”] Item closed 	Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 1
5 (23)	JSP 464 Part 4 4TG – Service Board request for amendment	<p>25/09: Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 3 explained that the Service Complaint Panels (SCP) had expressed concerns over the subjective nature of the MoD’s 4-Tier Grading (4TG) system for SFA, specifically that there was no explanation for the grade awarded. It recommended the inclusion of a short narrative within Table 5 of Annex A to Chapter 1 of JSP 464, Part 4, to help explain to SP the rationale behind the points awarded. Although CAAS would soon replace 4TG, the APWG agreed the proposal to amend the relevant table accordingly. Item Closed.</p>	
5 (24)	JSP 464 Part 1 – Amendment reference DCYP	<p>25/09: The Chair stated that the Directorate for Children & Young People (DCYP) had requested an amendment to current policy on the retention of SFA for educational reasons, to accommodate the Government policy on Raising of the Participation Age (RPA). They stated that in England, the Government now required young people to remain in full-time education/training/employment until the age of 17. This would be extended next year to young people up to the age of 18. Navy Pers-PFCS</p>	

		<p>Accom SO2 stated that their investigation of the RPA on the Dept for Education's website showed that there was no bidding obligation for young people to participate in the RPA. The Chair undertook to investigate further. Ongoing.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note: Further investigation identified the Government <u>had</u> raised the participation age where young people <u>must</u> remain in education or training until the academic year in which they turn 17 from 2013 and until their 18th birthday from 2015. The element to which Navy Pers-PFCS Accom SO2 had referred was the obligation on employers (with regards to apprenticeships, and the like) for which they had no new legal duties (i.e., previous legal duties would continue to apply). Members agreed OOC the following amendments:</p> <p><u>JSP 464 Part 1, Chapter 8, Para 0822 and Part 2 Chapter 7, Para 0707:</u></p> <p>“... 0822 para g (3) Where a Service child/young person subject to the rules governing the Raising the Participation Age, in England, has a local offer that can not be replicated at the new posting address then, on a case by case and exceptional basis, CEAS may provide an Impact Statement for retention of a SFA/SSFA until that child/young person has completed their training/education, or reaches the age of 18, which ever is later. Evidence that the local offer cannot be met at the new location must be provided with the impact statement.”] Item Closed.</p>	
6 (30)	Garages.	<p>25/09: DIO Ops Accn-PR1 raised the issue of garages and the revised height criteria. Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 4 confirmed that the revision had been agreed and JSP 754 would be amended (1 Oct 2013 Edition). Those personnel currently being charged substandard charges would retain 'Grandfather Rights' and revised/increased charges were not to be applied. However, the new height criteria was to be used for all new garage and carport assessments. From 1 Oct 13, on moving into SFA/SSFA, the accommodation sponsor was responsible for informing occupants of the current garage / carport charge; that they had 3 months, from the date of their occupation, in which to challenge the charge, in writing; and that any change in charges arising from a successful challenge (in those instances) would be backdated to the date of first occupancy. This would have implications for a number of the 3,700 service personnel currently paying substandard and below standard garage or carport charges (out of 23,500), but it was not certain how many were sub-standard for other reasons e.g. below length or width criteria or below standard garages due to lack of security.</p>	

		Item Closed.	
6 (31)	March-in/March-out.	<p>25/09: DES HRJSST-JSAU OC asked DIO to confirm the policy with regards to when March-ins/March-outs could take place as currently, within the Bristol area, these only occurred on Tuesdays and Thursdays – was this the case in other regions? This restriction was causing difficulty both regarding capacity/availability of March-in/March-outs and coordinating with the removal of PE between SFA in different geographical locations. As such March-in/March-outs should be available 5-days a week. DIO Ops Accn-PR1 stated that the increase in the size of the estates that Housing Managers covered impacted on the frequency of March-in/March-out. DES HRJSST-JSAU OC nevertheless requested that DIO Ops Accn research the impact with a view to bringing it to the table at the next meeting. Ongoing</p> <p>11/02: DIO SD Accn PR1a reported that the issues raised by DES HRJSST-JSAU OC concerning the position with regards to march-ins/march-outs within the Bristol area, (which had only been occurring on Tuesdays and Thursdays), was the result of short term staffing issues, that had now been resolved following the recruitment of additional DIO staff. Item Closed.</p>	DIO Ops Accn-PR1
5(15)	SLA/SSSA Entitlement.	<p>11/02: The Chair provided an update following the recent Employment Tribunal and the judgement that followed. JSP 464 would be amended to reflect that, married Service couple/civil partners who maintained a privately owned/rented family home, the location of which precluded both of them from travelling to and from during the working week, would have an entitlement to SLA at their respective duty stations when serving married unaccompanied. A Directed letter and DIN would be published accordingly.</p> <p>The Chair reported that as a consequence of this change neither the PStatCat 1s/c nor 5s/c would pay accommodation charges. In discussions, the single Service representatives explained that this would drive the wrong behaviour. The Chair explained that the NEM work on both SLA Waivers and current policy anomalies may in time resolve this.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note: JSP 464 Parts 1-4 were amended with effect from 20 February 2014. A DIN and Directed Letter announcing the amendment were also issued]. Item Closed.</p>	
5(19)	SLA NTV – Request for JSP Change	<p>11/02: Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 explained that he was seeking approval for the period of notice provided to vacate SLA by non-entitled/eligible</p>	

		<p>occupants to be standardised to 28-days and incorporated into the JSP, similar to timescales for SFA.</p> <p>Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 2 reported that advice from CLS legal was that this was inconsistent with the concept of the provision of SLA and that there was no legal requirement to provide such notice. Any exceptions to the policy should be dealt with as hardship cases at Local Command level. The proposal was not supported by the APWG. Item Closed</p>	
5(21)	PStatCat 1s & 5s – Entitlement to SFA.	<p>11/02: Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 had provided the group with a “think piece” paper, the purpose of which was to debate a potential policy change to JSP 464 with regards to those Service couples who share the PStatCat 1S and 5S to resolve employment/duty-type issues. The specific issue was to review current entitlement to SFA for situations where both partners were serving, particularly (but not limited to) to consider the need and appetite to amend extant policy to better accommodated for situations where one spouse/partner was commissioned and the other non-commissioned.</p> <p>The single Service representatives explained that it was personal choice as to who took primacy for accommodation purposes. JSP 752 was clear that it was a matter for the Service couple to elect which of them would be PStatCat 1s or 1c.</p> <p>The APWG agreed that no further policy intervention was necessary and that any case for exceptions to the current policy should be put through the relevant single Service HC. Item Closed.</p>	
5(24)	LSAP Claimants – Alignment with SFA Rules	<p>11/02: Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 2 reported that the policy with reference to non entitlement to Service accommodation when an SP was in receipt of LSAP needed to be replicated in JSP 464 Part 3. However, members felt that the necessary further alignments between provisions, e.g. distance and not permitting single personnel access to SLA if they owned a property within 50 miles of their duty station, would require proper staffing through the appropriate channels.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note JSP 464 Parts 1 - 4 was amended on 20 February 2014]. Item Closed.</p>	
6 (25)	Garden Support.	<p>25/09: Army Infra-Pers SO2 reported that DIO was conducting a review of the level of funded support to SFA gardens over 0.5 acres. Any gardening support over and above this would need to be</p>	DIO Ops Accn-PR1

		<p>funded by the TLBs. Establishing the new baseline was the issue, and it primarily affected Senior Officers accommodation. The change was due to contract amendments and rationalisation currently being pursued by DIO Soft FM in determining budgetary requirements and constraints.</p> <p>DIO Ops Accn-PR1 stated that they would pick up any costs associated with such properties but would clarify the requirements with the DIO Estate Services manager and report back at the next meeting. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: DIO SD Accn PR1a had proposed an amendment to JSP 464 (Part 1 Chapter 7) with reference to ground maintenance to make it easier to get GM tasks completed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enclosed gardens over ½ acre • SFA occupied by unaccompanied officers in command appointments • Headless families and welfare activities. <p>Army Infra-Pers SO2 stated that there needed to be an agreed process provided to the single Services with regards to the levels of ground maintenance support to be provided by DIO. The Chair stated that this was a matter for the DIO to discuss and agree the scope of work with the sS and was outwith the APWG. Item Closed.</p>	
6(26)	FHTB	<p>11/02: DES HRJSST-JSAU OC had asked about the publication of the Defence Internal Brief (DIB) on Forces Help to Buy. The chair reported that it was currently out for comment and would be published shortly.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note The FHTB DIB was published on 20 February 2014 (Serial No: 2014DIB/09). JSP 464 was also amended to incorporate the new policy for both FHTB and FHTB Tranche 4] Item Closed</p>	
4 (12)	Protocol for Short Notice Postings	<p>24/01 - The Chair explained that this subject was discussed at the recent Accommodation Delivery Forum (ADF). Whilst the operational reasons for Short Notice Postings were generally understood, a protocol was required to enable the accommodation issues to be better managed. DIO would be looking to identify, from KPI reports, where the 'short notice' was occurring (i.e. whether SP were receiving assignment orders at short notice from the Manning Cells or whether the short notice to DIO was generated by the SP).</p> <p>DIO Ops Accn stated that DIO had provided a 90 Day Waiver protocol for the RAF, which worked well. A copy of the protocol was provided to</p>	

		<p>members. The Group agreed that a flowchart was required which detailed the timings (in days) of each stage of the allocation process to give an overall total number days for normal postings. Manning Cells would use it to better understand the implications for SP and DIO of Short Notice postings, with a view to minimising them. Ongoing.</p> <p>25/4: LF had reviewed the DIO e1132 Application Process Flowchart. Under perfect conditions, and assuming acceptance of the first offer, a minimum period of 8 weeks was required from 'identification of the need to move' to actual 'move in'. This period was extended to a minimum of 15 weeks if the second offer process was initiated. It was recognised that there was a need to consider 'both sides of the coin', when considering how this information might be communicated. Firstly, the SP's expectations needed to be managed by raising their awareness of the step-by-step process, associated timelines and, importantly, the minimum notice period. Secondly, there was a need to ensure that Manning Authorities were aware of that process/timelines, and factored it into posting decisions, giving careful consideration of moves that were likely to breach the minimum 8 weeks period. LF undertook to reflect this information in the Flowchart, with detailed examples, and circulate to members OOC. It would be appropriate for the single-Service Housing Colonels to bring the Flowchart to the attention of both Manning Authorities and SPs once the updated version was subsequently issued.</p> <p>25/09: DIO Ops Accn-PR1 stated that there was no issue with regards to Short Notice Postings, and that Manning Authorities were fully aware of the process/timelines, which were factored into posting decisions. Nevertheless, he undertook to include timelines, as provided by LF into the Application Process document. Ongoing.</p> <p>11/02: DIO Ops Accn-PR1a stated that following the approval of the flow chart, DIO had sent a copy of the chart to single-Service HC staffs to disseminate to Manning Authorities ASAP. The HASC had recently seen an increase in short notice postings, primarily from the Army, which had caused allocation difficulties in high demand areas. At the last ASG, DIO were requested to provide the Army HC with evidence to support reference of an influx of Army short notice postings. DIO Ops Accn-PR1a agreed that they should monitor the position across all 3 Services and highlight issues, with supporting evidence, to HC so that remedial action could be taken. Ongoing.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		06/11: In light of no new issues highlighted by DIO, and with Army PS4 agreement, this item was closed .	
5 (19)	Chaplains – Discuss policy to cover	<p>25/09: Army PersSvcs-PS4-CtySp-AccnSO3 explained that during the staffing of last year's AFPRB paper of evidence on Chaplain's Pay, a number of non-remunerative issues came to light. Most had been dealt with by signposting / re-educating chaplains. However, a couple, to do with accommodation on entering the Armed Forces, had still to be addressed.</p> <p>The Army HC felt that it was appropriate for Chaplains to be entitled to Type IV SFA (but pay charges for a Type V) as their age, family size and nature of their job necessitated it.</p> <p>Pers & Trg SVW Accom Pol 2 stated that the AFPRB paper made no reference to Chaplains' accommodation and requested the Army better articulate the arguments/business case for consideration at the next APWG. Closed.</p>	Army PersSvcs-PS4-CtySp-AccnSO3
6 (27)	FTRS Waivers	<p>25/09: The Chair reported that D SP Pol had agreed to delegate this requirement to TLB Directors of Resources who were better placed to understand the business needs within their own TLB and how best to achieve value for money in that regard. A formal letter to this effect would be issued in due course. Ongoing.</p> <p>[Post Meeting Note: D SP Pol had since written to all TLB Directors of Resources, delegating to them the authority to consider exceptional cases for FTRS personnel to occupy SLA at entitled rates. JSP 464 would be updated in due course to reflect this.]</p>	Pers Trg-SVW Accom Pol 2
6 (28)	DIO SLA/JBA	25/09: Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 stated that given the recent news that DIO had withdrawn all support to 4TG Boards, and that there was some dispute over the review of policies (i.e. the 3-Stage Complaints Process), there needed to be some grounding for the DIO KPIs that were used to measure performance of the DIO Ops Accn (specifically SFA) and MHS. He suggested the need for a similar arrangement to that provided between the DE&S and other TLBs in the form of a Joint Business Agreement (JBA) or Service Level Agreement (SLA). This would need to be developed from the Command Plans but would allow sS and MOD to hold DIO to account as a necessary part of the MOD New Operating Model 2013. It would be appropriate for the RAF HC to raise through the ASG. AWPG to Monitor.	AWPG to Monitor
6 (29)	DIO NTV - Legal sS Input for IOs.	25/09: Air-COSPers-Pol CSpt1 SO2 reported on a recent correspondence which suggested that the HASC would look to engage with the sS HC in the	APWG to Monitor.

		eviction process. Members were not aware, but felt that such an engagement would be inappropriate and undertook to monitor. APWG to Monitor.	
--	--	--	--