



Ministry  
of Defence

Navy Command FOI Section  
Navy Command Headquarters  
MP 1-4, Leach Building  
Whale Island  
PORTSMOUTH  
PO2 8BY

FOI 2015/11773

Telephone [MOD]: [REDACTED]

Facsimile [MOD]: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Via email: [REDACTED]

22 January 2016

Dear [REDACTED]

Request for Information

Thank you for your letter of 17 December 2015 to CNPS, which also contained a request for the following information:

- a. *“What were the objectives of the Joint Services Evaluation Team (JSET)?*
- b. *How was the JSET team organised (family tree by rank)?*
- c. *Was the method in which each branch conducted its JSET process transparent and was it apparent to all parties?*
- d. *How many JSET branch interview teams were there?*
- e. *How were the JSET branch interview teams comprised, i.e. were the teams conducting the interviews formed of AE specialisations when interviewing AE staff or were the interview teams comprised of a mixed background.*
- f. *What were the findings of the JSET?*
- g. *Did the findings of the JSET determine the Maximum Authorised Numbers (MAuN) for each ET specialisations?*
- h. *From the findings of the JSET what was the breakdown of the WO2 roles being downgraded to CPO or upgraded to WO1?*
- i. *What were the values of MAuN for the years 2010 – 2015 for WO1 Promotions for all ET specialisations?*
- j. *How many were presented to the WO1 ET Selection board (broken down by specialisations) in the years 2010 - 2015?*

k. *What was the duration taken by the promotion board (post sifting process) for the 2014 WO1 ET Selection board (broken down by specialisations)?*

l. *If the Single Vesting Day of the Single WO policy was adopted on the 1 April 2014, with the rank of WO2 no longer existing in the ET Branch, how many CPOs have been promoted to WO2 since this date and in which branch?*

m. *If any CPOs have been promoted to WO2 (regardless of branch) since 1 April 2014 demonstrate how can they are not at a financial disadvantage when compared to a CPO who had been promoted to WO1?"*

Your enquiry is being treated as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Our responses to your queries are attached as an annex to this letter.

If you are not satisfied with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact this office in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting the Information Rights Compliance team, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail [CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk](mailto:CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk)). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain dissatisfied following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.ico.org.uk>.

Yours sincerely

Navy Command Secretariat – FOI Section

RESPONSE TO FOI REQUEST SUBMITTED [REDACTED]

1. Responses as below:

- a. *What were the objectives of the Joint Services Evaluation Team (JSET)?* The objectives were two-fold. One as per the norm – to provide JE data to inform pay at each rank under the NEM Pay Model. The other - to provide management information in the form of job scores to assist Navy HQ in determining the future ranking of WO2 posts. For this aspect, job evaluation was deployed in a support role and would not have been the sole determinant and other issues such as branch structures would have come into play.
- b. *How was the JSET team organised (family tree by rank)?* For this work, the JSJET team was augmented by three WO1s (1 x AET; 1 x ME and 1 x WE). This was necessary in order to achieve the required amount of work within the required timescale with minimum disruption to the ongoing programme of job evaluation work. Each of the augmentees was allocated a job at CPO, WO2 and WO1 ranks from within their area of expertise. Permanent JSJET staff were allocated jobs at AB, LH and PO ranks. The JSJET Team Leader has direct control over the permanent Warrant Officer staff (1 from each Service, mixed backgrounds) and had functional control over the augmentee Warrant Officer staff. Each of the augmentees were given a full briefing on job evaluation by the JSJET Team Leader and, together with JSJET permanent staff and the independent OF5 Job Evaluation Judging Panel, attended a training day.
- c. *Was the method in which each branch conducted its JSET process transparent and was it apparent to all parties?* Although the objective varied from the norm, the methodology was identical. Taking ME(SM) as an example, the liability at each rank was divided up into representative employment groups or job types in order to determine how to sample the branch. Thus at WO2 rank, the liability of 129 posts was divided into 8 employment groups, the biggest of which was “Sea in Trade” – 70 posts and 54.26% of the rank and trade. For this employment group we sampled 2 jobs (1 Trafalgar Class and 1 Vanguard Class). In this way, 124 of the 129 posts were covered in 6 of the 8 employment groups - or 97.67% of the rank and trade - were covered by 8 interviews. The remaining 5 posts, from 2 employment groups (2.33% of the rank and trade) were not covered.
- d. *How many JSET branch interview teams were there?* The augmentee staff were deployed as described above. The permanent staff were deployed as per normal – dividing jobs up to suit geographical convenience and to provide equitable workload for each. Essentially I would regard them as one team conducting 5 evaluations – ET(ME) GS, ET(ME) SM, ET(WE) GS, ET(WE) SM, and AET, albeit that for pay purposes the results for MEs GS and SM were combined as were the results for WEs GS and SM.
- e. *How were the JSET branch interview teams comprised, i.e. were the teams conducting the interviews formed of AE specialisations when interviewing AE staff or were the interview teams comprised of a mixed background.* See above.

f. *What were the findings of the JSET?* All evaluations, including these, culminate in JE judging by the independent OF5 JE Judging Panel. Each job is marked and scored in accordance with the JE Factor Plan and the JE Judging Panel must reach consensus for each mark and score awarded. For these evaluations, the outcomes were:

- Whole Rank Scores (weighted average scores based on the percentage worth of each employment group within a rank) for the ET(ME) (GS and SM); ET(WE) (GS and SM), and AET branches which have been developed into Through Career Whole Trade Scores for each of the Branches. These inform the NEM Pay Model.
- JE job scores for types of job at each rank to help inform Navy HQ's decisions on how best to re-rank the WO2 posts.

g. *Did the findings of the JSET determine the Maximum Authorised Numbers (MAuN) for each ET specialisations?* The Maximum Authorised Numbers (MAuNs) for each ET specialisation were calculated on the basis of the new liability requirements which had been set by each of the ET Branch Managers. The findings of the JSET would have helped each of the ET Branch Managers to determine what those new liability requirements were.

h. *From the findings of the JSET what was the breakdown of the WO2 roles being downgraded to CPO or upgraded to WO1?* A breakdown of the changes made during the WO Liability Transition, based on the findings of the JSET, is shown in the table below. It should be noted that these figures may fluctuate very slightly as a result of normal Establishment Management business within units.

Pre-Transition Rate	Post-Transition Rate	Number
OR8	OR9	81
	OR7	20
	OR4	2
OR9	OR7	5

i. *What were the values of MAuN for the years 2010 – 2015 for WO1 Promotions for all ET specialisations?* The Maximum Authorised Number (MAuN) for promotions to WO1 in all ET specialisations is shown in the table at Enclosure 1 to Annex A.

j. *How many were presented to the WO1 ET Selection board (broken down by specialisations) in the years 2010 - 2015?* The total number of candidates presented to each WO1 ET Board from 2010-2015 is shown in the table below.

	ME	WE	MESM	WESM	AET
<b>2010</b>	104	76	52	33	92
<b>2011</b>	100	83	85	41	27
<b>2012</b>	104	84	50	38	31
<b>2013</b>	73	66	52	32	55

<b>2014</b>	91	98	42	26	86
<b>2015</b>	120	135	41	81	132

k. *What was the duration taken by the promotion board (post sifting process) for the 2014 WO1 ET Selection board (broken down by specialisations)?* The board duration for each of the WO1 ET boards in 2014 is shown in the table below.

<b>Sub-Specialisation</b>	<b>Board Duration</b>
WO1 WE GS	2 days
WO1 FAA Eng	2 days
WO1 ME GS	3 days
WO1 Eng SM	2 days

l. *If the Single Vesting Day of the Single WO policy was adopted on the 1 April 2014, with the rank of WO2 no longer existing in the ET Branch, how many CPOs have been promoted to WO2 since this date and in which branch?* The number of CPOs promoted to WO2 since 1 Apr 14 is shown in the table below.

	<b>ME(SM)</b>	<b>WE(SM)</b>
<b>2014</b>	15	10
<b>2015</b>	23	8

m. *If any CPOs have been promoted to WO2 (regardless of branch) since 1 April 2014 demonstrate how can they are not at a financial disadvantage when compared to a CPO who had been promoted to WO1?* The Freedom of Information process is intended to allow individuals access to those records which already exist. Answering this question would require the generation of new information based on a set of bespoke assumptions about the individuals referred to. As such, this question cannot be answered as part of this request.

**MAXIMUM AUTHORISED NUMBERS FOR PROMOTIONS TO WO1 FROM 2010 IN ALL ET SPECIALISATIONS**

1. The figures requested are shown in the table below.

MAuN Letter Date	Common Promotion Date	Specialisation	Maximum Authorised Number (MAuN)
30 Jan 09	31 Mar 10	AET	6
		ET(ME)	14
		ET(MESM)	2
		ET(WE)	10
		ET(WESM)	4
		MEM	7
		MEM(SM)	0
		WEM	1
		WEM(SM)	0
21 Jan 10	31-Mar-11	AEM	2
		AET	6
		ET(ME) + MEM	12
		ET(MESM) + MEM SM	3
		ET(WE) + WEM	5
		ET(WESM) + WEM SM	1
08 Feb 12	31-Mar-13	AET	9
		ET(ME)	16
		ET(MESM)	3
		ET(WE)	10
		ET(WESM)	3
25 Jan 13	31-Mar-14	AET	8
		ET(ME)	16
		ET(MESM)	5
		ET(WE)	9
		ET(WESM)	4
08 Feb 14	31-Mar-15	AET	30
		ET(ME)	81
		ET(MESM)	50
		ET(WE)	17
		ET(WESM)	5
12 Jan 15	31-Mar-16	AET	32
		ET(ME)	46
		ET(MESM)	22
		ET(WE)	22
		ET(WESM)(SWS)	6
		ET(WESM)(TWS)	10