



	<p>3.3 (Item 4.2) SCW to ensure the Family Feds receive a copy of the PAC Report as soon as it is published. Action closed – publication widely available in the public domain.</p> <p>3.4 (Item 5.12) DE to provide SCW with the complaints procedure guidance note before publication. Action closed – there was some confusion after the last meeting about this action. DE/Hd Ops Hsg briefed the meeting that it was an internal procedural update, rather than a wider brief to SP.</p> <p>3.5 (Item 5.13) DE Ops Housing to review Housing Forum TORs and circulate to JCB members for comment. <b>Action - ongoing with DE.</b></p> <p>3.6 (Item 5.13) SCW to circulate JCB TORs for comment. <b>Action ongoing – JCB TORs redrafted. Waiting for Housing Forum TORs to be finalised so that JCB TORs can be confirmed.</b></p> <p>3.7 (Item 5.15) SCW to provide policy changes to DE Ops Housing for the 6 monthly report, prior to publication in Dec 09. Action closed – email sent from DCDS Pers AFW SCW Accom Pol SO2 to DE on 4 Dec 09 with new version of JSP 464. DE/Hd Ops Hsg briefed the meeting that this 6 monthly report had yet to be published.</p> <p>3.8 (Item 6.1) SCW to consider planning meetings in accordance with Quarterly Reports. Action closed.</p> <p>3.9 (Item 8.3) DE to investigate whether occupants were signing off attendance by contractor, rather than signing off resolution of the problem. DE/Hd Ops Hsg briefed the meeting that where the occupant wished not to comment, the PDA wasn't presented or didn't understand, MHS had been requested to follow it up with a phone call in the evening. It was hoped that this would help to clear up any problems and alleviate the issue of the occupant not wishing to comment in the contractor's presence. It was confirmed by DE that there are three boxes for occupants to choose from to sign off, as listed below. (Occupants are not prompted to sign off when work is incomplete).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not answered (the occupant chose not to answer)</li> <li>• I can confirm that the operative arrived within the timeframe expected.</li> <li>• I can confirm the work is complete</li> </ul> <p>3.10 (Item 8.4) DE to look at the underpinning process and charging that relates to the transfer of SFA from SP to spouse immediately after bereavement. <b>Action ongoing – DE have redrafted letter of condolence and produced HIN. SCW requested sight of these on 27 Jan 10. ██████████ directed to provide.</b> <b>Action – SCW to discuss with P&amp;A about the work that is required on the JPA change for the charging process following the SP's death and the transfer to the bereaved partner.</b></p>	<p>DE</p> <p>SCW</p> <p>DE</p> <p>SCW</p>
4	<p><b>ACTION PLAN AND GOVERNANCE OF JCB/HOUSING FORUM</b></p> <p>4.1 The Chairman briefed the meeting on the discussion from the previous meeting about the Accommodation Issues List. HQ LF had proposed a joint action plan between the Army and DE. CE DE had approved the establishment of such a list, but proposed that it should be a tri-service document. He proposed that Agenda Items 4 and 10 were discussed</p>	

together as the Action Plan and Governance of the JCB were linked.

- 4.2 The Chairman asked D Infra to brief the meeting on the Action Plan. In Dec 09, AG gave direction that he wanted a plan to be put together based on LF's accommodation initiatives and the DE plan. CE DE directed that this needed to be a tri-Service approach, rather than having separate sS plans. It was proposed that the JCB and Housing Forum needed to work through how this was delivered to get DCDS Pers engagement. The Army Action Plan was agreed by DE, but needed to have formal TORs approved before they could move forward.
- 4.3 DE/Hd Ops Hsg confirmed that there was a need for a strategic approach on the difficult decisions that were being made at the moment and welcomed the formulation of a joint Action Plan. It will also provide some exposure to the work being done within DE, but it must be tri-Service and not based on a bespoke sS approach.
- 4.4 The Chairman asked the meeting how they saw the work being divided. D Infra said that work should be cleared at the Housing Forum and if it was not possible to clear it there, then it should be brought forward to the JCB. If it was not possible to clear it at the JCB, then it should be brought forward to the SPB. He asked all attendees for comments.
- 4.5 DE/Hd Ops Int noted that there were 11,500 SFA in Germany alone and asked how these would feature in the new framework. D Infra confirmed that the Action Plan would incorporate all estates and not just UK. CE DE had directed that this was why the Action Plan needed to be tri-Service so that it was all encompassing. The Chairman noted that the membership of the Housing Forum would need to be adjusted slightly in order to cover all the business that would feature on the Action Plan.
- 4.6 CTLB CEStO commented on the fact that although there were 6 TLBs, there were only 3 FLCs and therefore only 3 Housing Cols. The CTLB was not represented via the Housing Cols and so this would cause confusion at the Housing Forum as to who was representing Centre owned estate issues.
- 4.7 DE/Hd Ops Hsg clarified that hard infra such as Grading Boards lies with the CEStOs and was no different to SLA. Soft infra would remain with sS and DE would not recommend a change to this due to the unique way in which each of the sS operates. She then queried whether the Housing Cols were talking to tri-service units. Air DACOS Cmty Spt commented that there were focal points for each service in each unit. Asst Hd SCW AFW noted that these units would also be covered by the FFs.
- 4.8 DRNEO noted his support for the construction of an Action Plan and said that it made eminent sense.
- 4.9 D Infra noted that in order to manage any risks that may arise with DE actions on people issues for next generation plans, some work needed to remain with the JCB.
- 4.10 RAFFF Chair noted that there was currently no link between their FF and the RAF CEStO. The other FFs responded to say that they did have contact with their respective CEStO. The Chair noted that this was an area that would need attention.
- 4.11 The Army Housing Col responded that the moral component of fighting

	<p>power needed to be maintained and it was hoped that the Action Plan would help to support this.</p> <p>4.12 DRNEO queried whether the Action Plan would be based on a regional or national basis. He also noted that the paper on Next Generation Estates Contract (NGEC) would be presented to the IAB in Mar 10. The Chairman noted that he was not aware of this piece of work and that it should have been brought to the JCB before now. He asked for it to be briefed in Agenda Item 9. Asst Hd SCW AFW reiterated the need for strategic decision making to be conducted at the JCB and not as internal DE business. This was supported by the Chairman.</p> <p>4.13 The NFF Chair commented on the need for the FFs to better understand the baseline about how the sS are getting their requests (for example, for new kitchens) across. DE/Hd Ops Hsg responded that these requests should be raised at the Housing Forum and if they could not be resolved there, would be brought forward to the JCB.</p> <p>4.14 The Chairman commented that he was still not clear about how the Housing Forum functions. If the JCB is to be strategic, there needs to be clarity that the tactical issues are being dealt with at the Housing Forum. He noted that he saw the Action Plan as being the method for raising issues, to be controlled at the Housing Forum and only raised to the JCB if not cleared.</p> <p>4.15 The governance of the Housing Forum was then raised by the Chairman. He directed that DE were to chair and administer it as the Centre did not have the resources to be able to lead this – the Defence Board had also directed that the Centre should not be involved with non-strategic issues. The concept of a revolving chair was not approved. D Infra, DE/Hd Ops Int and RAFFF Chair were not in favour of DE leading the Housing Forum as they did not believe that it would allow DE to be accountable. The Chairman suggested that one of the Housing Cols take on the Chairmanship of the Housing Forum, but noted that it must be dynamic and must be a joint document. It was essential that the Action Plan was a method for reporting back to the JCB and as such must be transparent and be a tool for ensuring that all issues are dealt with.</p> <p>4.16 The AFF Chair asked for confirmation that the NAO LFE Action List would be incorporated into the Action Plan. Asst Hd SCW AFW confirmed that this would be the case.</p> <p>4.17 The Chairman confirmed that the Action Plan was the way forward and DE/Hd Ops Hsg noted that the first item on the Apr Housing Forum agenda would be to agree the tri-Service Action Plan.</p> <p>4.18 DE/Hd Ops Hsg will ask JCB attendees for comments on the Action Plan before the next Housing Forum. The Chairman noted that all members of the JCB would be consulted.  <b>Action – A revised attendance list and TORs to be distributed prior to the Housing Forum. All comments to be returned to SCW for revisions as required.</b></p>	SCW
5	<p><b>HOUSING UPDATE – UK</b></p> <p>5.1 DE/Hd Ops Hsg noted that the move in experience was still not very good and could be done much better. All comdrs received a note from DE before Christmas to say that move ins were their main effort. The stats are now</p>	

starting to improve. Over the summer period 09, the London region only scored a 20-30% success rate at move in. This is now up to upwards of 70%. High Wycombe was last week up to 100%. This increase in success is helping families and can also illustrate DE improvement.

- 5.2 Dec 09 was a low churn month and the complaints figures were low, but this was in a condensed period. This has however been sustained throughout Jan, where the success rate was up to 91% in the Central Region, with 68 complaints. In Dec 09 there were 800 move ins and in Jan 10 there were 697. If DE can sustain this success rate until Easter then it bodes well for the summer churn. Confirmed was given that the stats covered the number of SFA that were deemed up to standard for move in, rather than the number that were accepted by occupants. D Infra noted that the Action Plan would address the issue of informing occupants that they could accept an SFA at move in, but have it recorded as a failure if they did not feel it met the required standard.
- 5.3 The NFF Chair asked about what work was being done to bring SFA up to standard following a previous occupant's failings. In some cases, occupants felt that they had to hand over their SFA in a much better state than they had moved in to. All FFs agreed that there was a need for education on this.
- 5.4 The Void Surge Programme was reaping rewards and now stands at just over 15% which is the lowest ever and should be on target for 15% by the end of the FY. The number of SSFA has significantly reduced and DE are now looking to charge TLBs for any short notice change in requirements that require personnel to be accommodation in SSFA due to a lack of SFA. TLBs are now having the provision of SSFA stopped if they have not planned and cannot budget for it. The SSFA budget is £ but previous spends on SSFA had reached as high as £. This figure has now been reduced to £. The overspend on this budget has been taken at risk against improvement programmes
- 5.5 D Infra queried if there was a rebate for TLBs when units moved out of locations and SFA was returned to Annington Homes? DE/Hd Ops Hsg confirmed that this was the case.
- 5.6 Asst Hd SCW AFW noted that SP should not be disadvantaged by not having accommodation provided due to TLB budgetary issues.
- 5.7 DE/Hd Ops Hsg noted that work was ongoing between DCDS Pers and DE to clarify the entitlements for substitute accommodation and to tighten up on the system to prevent individuals playing the system.
- 5.8 The Area Accommodation Plans work is going really well and the London plan is nearly complete. The London plan is a tri-Service document which shows SFA hot spots. It also illustrates that SFA is available in London. Once the London plan is complete, Salisbury Plain, Future Brize and Portsmouth area plans will be put together. These plans cannot be completed at the same time due to DE only having 2 members of staff dedicated to the task. D Infra offered to assist by providing staff from RF Bdes to help conduct the work. DE/Hd Ops Hsg acknowledged that this was an area that could be investigated.
- 5.9 The financial constraints imposed by the PR10 savings measures and budget restrictions mean that there are a difficult couple of years ahead with regards to accommodation. Until now, there has not been the funding

	<p>restriction activity in accommodation that some other areas have experienced, but it was anticipated that the net was closing in. There are lots of In Year Saving measures happening though and all business cases are being scrutinised a lot more than in previous years.</p> <p>5.10 The Chairman asked how DE was dealing with prioritisation in that framework. DE/Hd Ops Hsg explained that DE was focusing on the tactical issues currently with attention being paid to the management of voids and low level staff in the HICs working hard to be in a better position for the summer churn.</p> <p>5.11 DE/Hd Ops Int noted that savings measures meant that work on statutory requirements would be conducted before new works on bathroom and kitchen upgrades for example.</p> <p>5.12 The NFF Chair noted that the management of expectation for SP needed to be better. If occupants were informed of how stretched DE is financially, they may have more realistic expectations of what work will be done. Therefore a better communication plan was required to inform occupants.</p> <p>5.13 The Chairman asked if there was anything that DE should be particularly focussing on now. DE/Hd Ops Hsg responded that they are looking at the contractual obligations with MHS on response repairs.</p>	
6	<p><b>HOUSING UPDATE – OVERSEAS</b></p> <p>6.1 DE/Hd Ops Int briefed the meeting on the high void rate currently in due to the Op Borona move. This was largely because of the number of SFA that are inside the wire. D Infra noted that the PR10 saving by delaying the return to the UK of the Signal Regiment by 2 years would have an impact on the number of voids. DE/Hd Ops Int noted that these issues would in future be raised at the Housing Forum as it was a management issue.</p> <p>6.2 DE/Hd Ops Int briefed the meeting that kitchen and bathroom upgrade work was currently being conducted with the assistance of D Infra.</p> <p>6.3 There is also a large number of void in Cyprus. In particular this relates to the SBA, which also has some of the poorest graded SFA. Once the electrical upgrade programme has been completed, it is proposed that Cyprus should be looking towards a lease and hire programme as in Germany, rather than funding more upgrade work programmes. D Infra noted that the Area Accommodation Plan would really assist with the management of issues such as these and would help to look at the longer term plan. Once approved by CE DE, DE/Hd LART will be able to promulgate a template that could be used in the instance.</p> <p>6.4 It was noted that out of the PJOBS PI stats, Cyprus showed high voids due to the number of old SFA that needed to be demolished, but this was difficult to action as PJHQ needed to find the funding for it. DE/Hd Ops Int proposed that the SFA could be taken off line instead of just downgraded so that they did not show as voids. He then noted that he would work with D Infra on this matter.</p>	
7	<p><b>HOUSING UPDATE – SINGLE SERVICES</b></p> <p>7.1 RN – no comments to be noted.</p>	

	<p>7.2 HQ LF requested that it be noted that the responsive nature by DE to housing issues had been good and acknowledged that DE were working on the ease of complaints reporting.</p> <p>7.3 RAF – no comments to be noted.</p>	
8	<p><b>HOUSING UPDATE – FAMILY FEDERATIONS</b></p> <p>8.1 NFF briefed the meeting on some observations. These were areas of concern that had not yet been raised with the Minister. Firstly, mould and damp issues in SFA had increased in the winter months and the NFF would be briefing this to the AFPRB.</p> <p>8.2 Recently the NFF had held a Ships Company brief on housing. Some requests were made by SP about the need for awareness briefs earlier in their careers and the possibility of a savings scheme from initial training to assist them with saving towards a deposit.</p> <p>8.3 The NFF Chair noted that there was a requirement if possible to not place F&amp;C families in SSFA as they required more support and protection that could be afforded by living on the patch. For instance, there were now two Thai brides in the Plymouth area who could not speak any English.</p> <p>8.4 The NFF were concerned about the state of external areas on SFA estates. The same standard of care and attention that was paid to the inside of SFA was not being paid to the external areas and this was possibly due to the perceived lack of money in the department for works. Could responsibility for making occupants keep areas looking presentable be incorporated into the Housing Officers' TORs? DE/Hd Ops Hsg responded that DE was trying to engage with the CoC to do walk arounds on SFA estates and get people engaged. AG had recently written to the Army CoC on these issues and had ordered comdrs to improve in this area. It was noted however that purple sites were generally the worst as there was a perceived lack of CoC. The Chairman noted that there was a CoC in all areas for all SP and SFA.</p> <p>8.5 The NFF Chair noted that funding for kitchens repairs was poor as was illustrated by 40 recent call outs for kitchen repairs in 1 SFA in the Plymouth area. NFF believed that the cost of these call outs would have paid for a new kitchen to be installed. DE/Hd Ops Hsg responded that although the response repair programme should have initiated a complete new kitchen being necessary in this instance, due to financial restrictions, it had to be accepted that some work being new to be patched up instead of new works being initiated.</p> <p>8.6 AFF noted that the FFs had written a collective letter to the Minister to express concern that if funding was cut to accommodation and housing upgrades given the current financial pressures experienced by the Department, that we would be back to square one.</p> <p>8.7 Upgrade work to bathrooms with DE/MHS/AFF working together was going well.</p> <p>8.8 The AFF Chair noted that the AFF conference is scheduled to be held on 29 Sep 10 and would not be focussing on housing for the first time.</p> <p>8.9 RAFFF – all issues are now being raised through the Housing Forum and so</p>	

	<p>there was nothing strategic to be raised at the JCB.</p> <p>8.10 The RAFFF Chair briefed the meeting that they would be conducting some research work later in the year into home ownership by its personnel.</p> <p>8.11 The RAFFF Chair also noted that some issues were being discussed outside of the JCB and not being fed into the FFs with regards to longer term planning. The Chairman agreed that this sometimes had been the case and noted that every endeavour should be made to include them.</p>	
9	<p><b>MATTERS TO BE RAISED AT DESG/SPB</b></p> <p>9.1 D Infra briefed the meeting on the NGEC work and explained that he represented all the CEStO, while DE/Hd Ops Hsg was leading on the paper, which will be presented to the IAB on 8 Mar 10. The NGEC is forecast to be in place from 2012/13 onwards.</p> <p>9.2 Various options were being reviewed as part of the NGEC, one of which was whether the training estate could go out to a nationwide contract. The main question was whether housing should be a nationwide contract in future or whether it should fall under one of four RPCs. The advantage of RPCs was that it cut down on management issues and meant that if one failed, there was only a regional problem, rather than a national one. The disadvantage was that the RPC would lack focus and money that should be spent on SFA could instead be spent on airfields.</p> <p>9.3 The Chairman noted that DCDS Pers needed to be engaged on this piece of work and would ensure that JCB concerns would be raised with CE DE prior to the DESG. Whilst there was a strong view on the NGEC, there was not a complete consensus, but a lot of work had gone into getting the paper to where it was now. <b>Action – D Sp Pol to raise concerns from JCB with CE DE prior to DESG.</b></p> <p>9.4 Asst Hd SCW AFW briefed the meeting on the Grading Review. The Sample Survey work had been completed before Christmas on data collection, but there is still significant work to be done before it can be presented to the SPB. Software work is needed to be able to prove the system and the representative sample size needs to be confirmed. Once the modelling work has been completed, the AFPRB will be engaged. The earliest date for this was 2012, though it was more likely to slip by one to two years. Asst Hd SCW AFW will put together an outline of work and implementation paper to go to the SPB, though the SPB had already accepted that this piece of work was not a quick win. The Chairman noted that CE DE wanted this work complete by 2010, but this was unworkable. By 2012, it may be possible that the MOD will be looking towards different models of accommodation provision.</p> <p>9.5 DE/Hd Ops Hsg noted that everyone was working together well on the Grading Review and as such it would give credibility to any future decisions on it.</p>	D Sp Pol
10	<p><b>GOVERNANCE OF JCB</b></p> <p>10.1 Covered in Agenda Item 4.</p>	
11	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	



	<p>11.1 Asst Hd SCW AFW briefed the meeting that the AFHOS(P) had been launched on 26 Jan 10. It is a £ . scheme that was launched in order to assist SP with lower incomes onto the housing market. So far there had been 354 applications, of which 79 SP were not eligible. Approximately 50 SP had been processed through the financial advice stage and another 50-60 were registered for this. There was a mix of locations and services, ORs and Officers.</p> <p>11.2 Asst Hd SCW AFW briefed the meeting on the Future Accommodation paper. There were some radical options which were proposed in a paper which was published in 09. It features in the Personnel elements of the SPCP and some work was being conducted to look at future accommodation models as part of the pre-SDR work. Some workshops have already been held, but it was noted that there were wider families' expectations on provision of accommodation. This pre-SDR paper will be produced by 17 Mar 10.</p> <p>11.3 The Chairman noted that the wider part of remuneration and TACoS was being looked at in the round. It was designed to give incoming Ministers the best possible brief on the current position and the potential way forward. This was not designed to box them in, but to inform them and enable them to be able to move forward. This work will also allow us to understand the linkages between pay, pensions, accommodation etc, but so far there was nothing well defined.</p> <p>11.4 DE/Hd Ops Hsg asked for her thanks to be recorded on the minutes for all JCB members, as everyone was now working together as a body and was packing a larger punch collectively as a result.</p> <p>11.5 D Infra queried how the eradication of Grade 3 and 4 properties was being incorporated into the upgrade programme. DE/Hd Ops Hsg noted that DE was working on this part of the plan.</p> <p>11.6 PJHQ JSU 2IC briefed the meeting that CJO was taking a particular interest in voids and queried whether empty SFA could not be given back to if they were in a poor state of repair. DE/Hd Ops Hsg commented that this was not possible as to regardless of the state of properties.</p>	
12	<p><b>DONM</b></p> <p>12.1 The Chairman thanked all attendees and stated that whilst the aspiration would be to move to 6 monthly meetings in the future, that this was not possible yet and proposed that the next meeting was held in late May/early Jun.  <b>Action – all attendees to note Wed 9 Jun 10 as the next JCB meeting. Meeting room to be promulgated in due course.</b></p>	All

(SIGNED ON ORIGINAL)

DCDS Pers SCW AFW Accom Pol C2  
9621 89469