



Ministry of Defence
 Directorate of Personal Services (Army) – PS12(A)

Telephone
 Switchboard
 Facsimile
 E-Mail

Military
 Switchboard
 Facsimile

D/DPS(A)/25/1/1 /PS12(A)

See Distribution

14 December 2004

MINUTES OF 320th MEETING OF THE ARMY DRESS COMMITTEE HELD AT ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY SANDHURST ON 29 NOVEMBER 2004

Present	Maj Gen TN Tyler [Redacted]	DAG DACOS Pers HQ LAND SO1 PS12(A) RO2c PS12(A)	Chairman Secretary
In Attendance	[Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted] [Redacted]	SO1 Future Army Dress (FAD) Senior Customer Liaison Manager (SCLM)- DC IPT Customer Liaison Officer (CLO) Army at DC IPT Team Leader Clothing & Textiles System (CATS) DC IPT DPO 1 DC IPT Hist Adv AcSM RMAS	

ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
1. Minutes of 319 th Meeting.	The Minutes of the 319th Meeting held on 26 Jul 04 were approved as a true record.		
2. Future Army Dress	a. <u>FAD – Roadshow Report.</u> SO1 FAD reported on feedback from the series of Roadshows to A&SD/Regtl DC in Oct & Nov 04. The PowerPoint presentation pack used is attached. In summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous support for the No 2 Dress design incl 		



ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
	<p>bound by it. Feedback from the Roadshow supported the brown shade. Initial feedback from AcSM on RMAS trial indicated brown khaki was the popular choice. The preference by ADC Members was for the brown khaki. The selection process for shade/colour was to be reported in the APRC Paper.</p> <p>(2) <u>Material</u>. Barathea was the recommended material. A target weight of 370 g/m² (10.9oz/yd²) was the requirement. Trial uniforms were 389g/m² and within tolerance of material production. Initial feedback from the trial was it was a comfortable weight. 370g/m² remains the target weight.</p> <p>(3) <u>Style</u>. The style preferences agreed at Jul 04 ADC and Roadshow feedback were discussed and advised by DCIPT and the Historical Adviser. The style issues agreed and further actions are shown in the Style Table attached.</p> <p>SO1 FAD reported that the drafting of the No2 Specification had commenced and DCIPT would update it as firm decisions were made. The final design decisions & specification would await APRC/ECAB endorsement in Mar 05.</p> <p>c. <u>No 2 Dress Trial</u>. The ADC received an update on the RMAS trial which started in mid-Nov 04. 8 key personnel are involved trialing both green and brown khaki uniforms. AcSM, wearing a brown khaki trial uniform, provided an initial report that the uniforms had stimulated considerable positive interest at RMAS. Trial of various belt and sword requirements would be included. Trial diaries and a final questionnaire would be used to generate both an Interim Report (Jan 05) and Final Report (Mar 05).</p> <p>d. <u>No 13/14 [Barrack] Dress - Trousers</u>. The role of Barrack Dress order within the Working Dress range was discussed. It was noted that lightweights [TML] would continue to be an appropriate or preferred working trouser for users on armour/heavy equipment such as the RAC, Inf, REME, etc. A user survey would differentiate cap-badge requirements and Mat Regs</p>	<p>Endorsed</p> <p>Endorsed</p> <p>Endorsed</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>SO1 FAD</p> <p>SO1 FAD/ DCIPT</p> <p>SO1 FAD/ DCIPT</p> <p>SO1 FAD /DC IPT</p>



ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
	<p>complement No 2 Dress shade and shirt selection would be obtained by DC IPT.</p> <p>f. <u>No 1 Dress</u>. SO1 FAD reported progress on No1 Dress requirements re ceremonial, Op Bridges and proposed LAND pool requirements. The LAND/Army pool requirement needs development and the case for its establishment made in conjunction with PS12(A) and HQ LAND. The Chairman directed that the No1 Dress requirement needed to be presented in the APRC Paper as an alternative option to No 2 Dress which should be seen as a 'business suit' for those that need it. The case for No1 Dress should be clearly articulated with item costs reflecting FAD work on harmonising the current specs to a standard specification that will enable economies of scale to be achieved. Costing options should include an option re No1 v No 2 Dress. The assumptions should be clear including proposed changes to current policy/Mat Regs re entitled users. SO1 FAD to proceed with this work and report progress at the next ADC.</p> <p>g. <u>FAD Way Ahead & Project Timelines</u>. SO1 FAD reported timelines for FAD deliverables:</p> <p>(1) <u>No 2 Dress</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apr 05 - finalise Specs + Master Pattern • May 05 - SUR + Technical Data Pack • May 05-Apr 06 - Tender Process • May 06-Mar 07 – Supplier production • Apr 07 - Delivery/Deployment <p>(2) <u>No 13/14 [Barrack] Dress</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nov 05 - finalise Specs + Master Pattern • Dec 05 - SUR + Technical Data Pack • Dec 05 - May 06 – Tender Process • May – Dec 06 – Supplier production • Jan 07 – Delivery/Deployment <p>(3) <u>APRC Paper</u>. A proposed structure for the APRC Paper was outlined which accommodated the issues discussed. In outline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope (incl assumptions) • Scale • Design Process • Supply Options • Peripherals 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>SO1 FAD /DC IPT</p> <p>SO1 FAD /DC IPT</p> <p>SO1 FAD /DC IPT</p> <p>SO1 FAD /DCIPT</p>



ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy • Deployment • Resources • TA & Res • Communication Plan • Future Work <p>The Chairman stated that the assessment of options was important and much detail was needed in the APRC Paper. Some slippage may occur to enable capture of the necessary detail. SO1 FAD was to staff the Paper.</p>	Noted	SO1 FAD /DC IPT
3. Matters Arising From Current Proposals	<p>a. <u>Senior Warrant Officer Class 1 Rank Badges.</u> Having canvassed opinion amongst Corps RSMs, the AcSM stated that there was a general lack of enthusiasm for the proposal; the problem centred on the variable nature of the appointment: for some cap badges this was an onerous one, whilst for others it was more titular – and this apparent lack of equivalence seemed to undermine its intended purpose. It was agreed therefore that the AcSM would seek a wider consensus, in effect a unanimous endorsement of the proposed design or otherwise, at his meeting of senior RSMs in Jan.</p> <p>b. <u>Lanyard and Stable Belt for 16 CS Med Regt.</u> Having expressed its reservations on the elitist element of the proposal, the Committee nevertheless gave retrospective approval for the wearing of the lanyard and stable belt worn by former members of 23 & 144 Para Fd Ambs, in recognising the special and historical nature of these accoutrements as highlighted by DGAMS. The belt and lanyard would not be worn by members of 16 CS Med Regt when posted out of 16 Air Asslt Bde.</p> <p>c. <u>Forage Caps for Female Musicians in H Div Bands.</u> ██████████ briefed the Committee on her discussions with H Div, and her investigations on the wider aspects of a male versus female forage cap across the Army. It was decided that: (1) In view of H Div’s reversal of their original proposal, female musicians in H Div would continue to wear the male style forage cap</p>	<p>APPROVED Decision 4043</p> <p>Decision 4044</p>	<p>AcSM</p> <p>HQ AMS</p> <p>HQ H Div</p>



ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
	(2) The adoption of a male pattern across the Army in the future was a recommendation of the Committee, but the Chairman would discuss the matter with AG.		DAG
4. New Proposals.	<p>a. [REDACTED]</p> <p>b. <u>LD Officers Shoulder Belt.</u> The Committee agreed in principle the proposal, which sought to rationalise the anomaly currently existing in the regt with the wearing of four differing styles of shoulder belt deriving from amalgamations in 1922 and 1992. The display of BHs on the belt was deemed to be correct by the Hist Adv but he would provide the historical justification. However the incorporation of the Jordanian crown required the prior approval of the College of Arms, with necessary input from CMAB (previously HB(A) – and ultimately The Queen. Sec ADC was tasked with taking the necessary action, with a final decision to be taken OOC. <u>Afternote.</u> The Hist Adv confirmed that the LD, as the descendants of the 13th Hussars, were the only British regt to have any claim to their special distinction of wearing BH scrolls on the shoulder belt – and also that there is precedent for a chain boss in the form of a crown. Also CMAB have made the point that it would be more correct for the BHs to be displayed in chronological order.</p>	APPROVED Decision 4045	[REDACTED] Sec ADC DGS Sec ADC



ITEM	DISCUSSION	DECISIONS	ACTION
	<p><u>Afternote.</u> Addressees should note that in future the Minutes will be promulgated via e-mail, as well as being on the PS12(A) website within AG web, and Army portal. To that end addressees are asked to confirm their e-mail addresses with Sec ADC.</p>		<p>All addressees Sec ADC</p>
<p>6. Arrangement for Next Meeting.</p>	<p>The next meeting would take place on Mon 21 Mar 05 in the conference room HQ AG Upavon at 1330 hours, with light lunch available at 1300 hours.</p>		<p>Sec ADC</p>

[REDACTED]

RO2c PS12(A)
Sec Army Dress Committee

Annex:

A. Future Army Dress – No 2 Dress Style Issues.

Distribution:

External:

Action:

SHAPE (for D/UKNMR(A))
PJHQ (for DACOS J1)
HQ LAND (for Log Sp Branch)
HQ ARRC
HQ NI (2) (G1, Log Sp Branch)
HQ 1 (UK) Armd Div
HQ 2 Div
HQ 3 (UK) Div
HQ 4 Div
HQ 5 Div
HQ UKSC(G)
HQ 101 Log Bde
HQ 102 Log Bde
HQ LONDIST
HQ BF Gibraltar
HQ BF Cyprus



HQ BF South Atlantic Islands
HQ H Div
HQ DRAC
RHQ RA
RHQ RE
RHQ R SIGNALS
HQ INF
HQ Scottish Div
HQ Queen's Div
HQ King's Div
HQ Prince of Wales's Div
HQ Light Div
RHQ R IRISH
RHQ PARA
RHQ Brigade of Gurkhas
RHQ AAC
HQ RACHD (2) (Copy to Chaplain DST Leaconsfield)
RHQ RLC
HQ AMS
RHQ REME
RHQ AGC
HQ SASC
HQ INT CORPS
HQ APTC
HQ DCAMUS
HQ RMAS (2) (Copy to AcSM)
DCT IPT (P&S)

Information:

FSPO RN Supply Organisation
UCPSM(1) RAF Innesworth
HQ RM
HQ 238 Sig Sqn

Internal:

Action:

HQ ATRA (for SO1 Plans)
All Committee Members and those in attendance ([REDACTED] by email).

Information:

SP Pol Allces(for SP Pol R+T1a)
Info (Exp) Analysis Branch
PS10 (A)
PS12 (A)

MOD RQMS
Chairman Army Historical Society
HQ AG – SO2 Gender (DMA)
AGWeb



FUTURE ARMY DRESS – NO 2 DRESS STYLE ISSUES

Feature	Selection/Decision	Comment/Decision
MALE JACKET		
Back	Patrol style	Double vent of 20 cms (medium length).
Front	Single breasted/4 buttons	Button arrangement – cruciform design selected Detachable buttons – identify cost & pros/cons DCIPT advise on button spacing to accommodate belts.
Pocket: U	Patch with pleat; curved shape. Winged flap (3 pointed) with button & press studs.	3 x internal pockets [left, right & ticket]
Pocket: L	Sewn-on patch – no pleat; curved shape at lower corners Rectangular flap angular; no button	No button on lower pocket flap With poppers fore and aft
Sleeve	Rifle cuff	No sleeve button
Waist	Fitted waist but looser fit	Acceptable for ceremonial. Test of looser fit is for wearer to sit down in comfort. [6cm overease]
Belt + Hooks	Accompanying detachable cloth belt	Fitted retractable belt hooks x 2; DCIPT advise on best location re side or back seam. Black enamelled. No material belt loops on jacket. Cloth belt – include in costings.
Shoulder straps	Standard design models to include shoulder straps under collar	Shoulder button location to accommodate max rank reqts
Edge stitching	Swelled or stitched edge	Stitched edge
TROUSERS		
Waist	For use with braces (via inside buttons) and stable belt 1 x pleat; zip fly No side straps	Belt loops x 6 standard 75mm/3” depth; 20mm/ 3/4” width; not buttoned
Length	Maximised/tailored for shoe wear	Minor crimpling/bagging with boots acceptable Supercrease at front only Plain side seam
Pockets	Standard side pockets 1 x hip pocket (right)	Use appropriate strength pocket liner material
FEMALE REQUIREMENTS		
Jacket	To echo male design for front,	Panel seams – shoulder to hem



	back, sleeves & shoulder straps; no upper pockets to reflect female design reqt	Length optimised for wear with both slacks and skirt Female button arrangement to accommodate Sam Browne/Belt for bottom two size ranges (maintain minimum spacing or raise top button by 2cm or alternative optimum solution) will be determined by DCIPT and via RMAS trial. DC IPT to review proportions of lower pockets relative to jacket size.
Slacks	To echo male design + appropriate tailoring to meet female reqt	Front zip fly; belt loops 1cm width and shallower to reflect narrower stable belt; 1 x pleat; right hip pocket
Skirt	Waist band same depth as slacks & stable belt	Twin pleat at front; belt loops 1cm width Maintain option of slack and trouser DCIPT advise on permanent crease in the pleat line.