

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

91ST DEPARTMENTAL COUNCIL (JCM)MEETING
AGENDA FOR THE MEETING TO BE HELD ON 18th NOVEMBER, 2016

Agenda Item No.	Subject
01	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cadre Review of Industrial and Non-Industrial Group 'C' Posts under MoD (pending since 22.12.87)</u></p> <p>The agenda for settlement of all Cadre Review proposal was discussed at length between the members of Staff Side and Official Side in the Steering Committee meeting held on 06.09.2016. It was discussed that a time limit had already been given by Defence Secretary to complete all the Cadre Review proposals <u>by the end of September, 2016</u>. The matter was also being monitored in the senior officers meeting and therefore, a decision was taken that an updated status on progress on Cadre Review would be provided to Staff Side. It is, therefore, directed to all the concerned Divisions to present with the latest status of Cadre Review proposals and furnish the same to the Staff Side in the Departmental Council Meeting to be held on 18.11.2016. Some of the major organizations like Army, MES, BRDB have not got any sought information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action:D(Civ.I)/Conc. Administrative Divisions in MoD</p>
02	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cadre Restructuring of Fire Fighting Staff (pending since 6.11.04)</u></p> <p>As regards the implementation of MoD letter dated 26.07.2010 for granting upgraded pay scales to Fire Fighting Staff, it was decided that all Directorates should ensure the implementation of the same immediately. The Leader Staff side argued that the Govt. has already approved 4 grade structure to FEDs in some organizations of MoD like Ordnance Factories and DGQA. Hence, there is no justification in denying the same to FEDs of other Directorates of MoD. Though this issue was taken up with MoF twice but the same was not agreed to. It has been decided that the matter will be again taken up with the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure.</p> <p><u>DRDO:</u> Cadre Review for Fire Fighting Staff has been carried out in the year 2011 and Fire Engine Drivers have four grade structure.</p> <p><u>Naval HQ:</u></p> <p>(a) Consequent upon the issue of MoD letter dated 26.07.2010, the cadre structure of Fire Fighting Staff in Navy is as under:</p>

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>S.No.</th> <th>Designation</th> <th>Sanctioned strength</th> <th>Pay scale</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(a)</td> <td>Dy. Divisional Fire Officer</td> <td>03</td> <td>PB-2 GP Rs.4600/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b)</td> <td>Station Officer</td> <td>34</td> <td>PB-1 GP Rs.2800/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c)</td> <td>Fire Engine Driver</td> <td>192</td> <td>PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d)</td> <td>Leading Fireman</td> <td>160</td> <td>PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e)</td> <td>Fireman</td> <td>686</td> <td>PB-1 GP Rs.1900/-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All the Dtes/Orgns (other than those furnished information, have to furnish the latest status in the matter.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action: D(Civ.I)/Dir Fin (AG/PB)/Addl. FA and JS/Concerned Administrative Division in MoD/HQ/Organizations</p>	S.No.	Designation	Sanctioned strength	Pay scale	(a)	Dy. Divisional Fire Officer	03	PB-2 GP Rs.4600/-	(b)	Station Officer	34	PB-1 GP Rs.2800/-	(c)	Fire Engine Driver	192	PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-	(d)	Leading Fireman	160	PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-	(e)	Fireman	686	PB-1 GP Rs.1900/-
S.No.	Designation	Sanctioned strength	Pay scale																						
(a)	Dy. Divisional Fire Officer	03	PB-2 GP Rs.4600/-																						
(b)	Station Officer	34	PB-1 GP Rs.2800/-																						
(c)	Fire Engine Driver	192	PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-																						
(d)	Leading Fireman	160	PB-1 GP Rs.2000/-																						
(e)	Fireman	686	PB-1 GP Rs.1900/-																						
03	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grant of Trade Union rights to the Defence Civilian Employees posted in Hospitals and Training Institutions under Armed Forces and also in those areas covered under SRO 17-E</u></p> <p>This issue was discussed in detail with the Staff Side in the Steering Committee Meeting held on 6.09.2016. It was decided that the issue will be examined on receipt of detailed updated proposals from the Federations and a separate discussion would be carried out between Federations/Confederation and all HQs/Orgns. of MoD in order to reach a consensus.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: D(JCM)/All HQ/Orgs</p>																								
04	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Allotment of Office accommodation for AIDEF, INDWF, BPMS, CDRA</u></p> <p>This is a long pending issue of the Staff Side which was also discussed in detail in the recently held Steering Committee Meeting on 6.09.2016. It was decided in the meeting to implement in phases with the following three options:- “(a) Present JCM House at 18 Lodhi Estate can be upgraded and porta cabins erected for creating offices for all the Federations/Confederation. Feasibility of installing porta cabins will be explored. (b) To explore the possibility of already constructed building in Delhi Cantonment area which is old and not in use, that can be made available for office accommodation for the JCM Constituents. (c) As per reply of DG:DE suitable land will be made available but construction of building thereon will take time as it requires permission of MoD (Hon’ble RM) and other formalities done.”</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: CAO/D(Cantt)/DGDE</p>																								

05	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Review of the PLB Formula of EME, AOC, Navy & Air Force</u></p> <p>AIDEF stated that there are two important flaws in the existing PLB formula. As per Govt. approved PLB formula, if the employees of EME, AOC, Navy & Air Force are getting more than 40 days PLB, then the same is not paid to them on the plea that there is a ceiling in the Govt. order not to pay more than 40 days PLB. Moreover, if the PLB days falls below 30 days then they are not paid the minimum 30 days bonus which is the minimum guaranteed Bonus under the Bonus Act. Last year (and even this year) EME employees were paid only 28 days PLB, which is two days less than the Ad hoc Bonus. The Staff Side insisted that there should be a review of the PLB formula of these 4 Directorates. It was agreed that the matter will be considered after receiving a written note from the staff side in this regard. It was assured that a well-considered proposal will be sent to Ministry of Finance for approval.</p> <p>(a) <u>D(Air.III):</u> Comments have been submitted for the approval of PSO i.e, the AOP. After obtaining the approval, comments will be forwarded to MoD/D(JCM).</p> <p>(b) <u>Navy HQ:</u></p> <p>(1) PLB is presently being paid based on the formula evolved vide Govt. of India Ministry of Defence letter No. 24(9)/80/D(JCM) dated 28.9.1983. The maximum limit of PLB is 40 days for Central Govt. employees.</p> <p>(2) The 6th CPC recommended discontinuation of PLB Scheme and instead recommended PRIS. Detailed guidelines for PRIS have not been finalized by MoD so far.</p> <p>(3) The Staff Side had raised a demand that PLB Scheme and PRIS should run concurrently. Further, the limit of 40 days PLB should be removed and PLB should be paid on actual days.</p> <p>(4) The above issue is under consideration at MoD.</p> <p>➤ <u>Current Status at MoD, D(JCM):</u> The proposal was circulated to all concerned. Information/comments have been received from almost all concerned HQ/Dtes. <u>These are under examination in D(JCM)</u>for taking up the matter with MoF so as to take a final view.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: D(JCM)</p>
06	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Revision of Inter-grade Ratio of the Artisan Staff (Tradesmen) in Defence Estts. (Issue raised on 29.09.2010)</u></p> <p>It is pointed out that the issue was earlier discussed with the Leader Staff Side and they were advised to submit a revised proposal as it is not feasible to consider it in the present form. The revised proposal submitted by the Staff Side was examined and circulated to all concerned for comments/financial implications thereon. The desired information is yet to be furnished by many Directorates. Leader Staff Side stated that in view</p>

of the inordinate delay, the case may be considered on priority basis. The Chairman instructed that concerned Dtes. may furnish the required information within one month. JS (E) ensured the Staff Side that he would also take up the issue with concerned JSs for early furnishing of desired information and further processing the same.

- **D(Air.III):** The comments of Air HQ on the revised proposal, submitted by Leader Staff Side, have already been forwarded to MoD vide Air HQ letter No. Air HQ/23049/Deptt/JCM/PC-4 dated 19 Nov 14.
- **Navy HQ:** MoD vide letter No. 11(5)/2009-D(Civ.I) dated 14.06.2010 has issued the following inter grade ratio for the Artisan Staff in Defence Establishments :-
 - (i) 45% of the posts may be granted the pay scale of Skilled Worker (GP of Rs.1900/- in PB-1).
 - (ii) 25% of the remaining 55% may be granted the pay scale of MCM (GP of Rs.4200/- in PB-2).
 - (iii) The remaining posts may be divided in a ratio of 50:50 and re-designated as Highly Skilled Worker Grade-II (GP of Rs.2400/- in PB-1) and Highly Skilled Worker Grade-I (GP of Rs.2800/- in PB-1).

(a) After implementation of ibid inter-grade ratio, the sanctioned strength of artisan staff in Navy is as follows :-

(i)	Mastercraftsman (MCM)	-	3029
(ii)	Highly Skilled I	-	4544
(iii)	Highly Skilled II	-	4543
(iv)	Skilled	-	9913
	Total :	-----	22029

(b) Taking all aspect of the matter in consideration, the following proposals were made by Navy on 26.12.2013 :-

- (i) To revert the post of MCM to that of a 'placement post' instead of 'Promotion post' and the feeder grade for promotion to Chargeman be kept as HSK-I.
 - (ii) The post of MCM be made a 'Transfer post' for the post of Chargeman. This will be subject to exercising option for transfer to the post of Chargeman without any financial implications, passing of DQE and with zero seniority in the grade of Chargeman.
- **Current Status at MoD, D(Civ.I):** The Federations proposed to adopt the inter grade ratio, as is being followed by the M/o Railways for the Artisan's Cadre of Railways. In this context, Comments of field formations were sought on the proposal.

“Despite repeated reminders (last reminder dt. 03.02.2016) the requisite information is still awaited from (i) AF/MP-4(Civ)(d) (ii) OFB, Kolkata, (iii) DGAFMS/DG-2B.”

Action:D(Civ.I)/All Concerned Admn. Sections/HQ/Orgns

07	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grant of Pay Scale of Rs. 5000-8000 to the Master Craftsman (MCM) at par with the Railways by applying the Principle of Equal pay for Equal Work</u></p> <p>Leader Staff Side expressed pleasure on the decision of the Govt. to grant of pay scale of Rs.5000-8000 (GP of Rs.4200) to the MCMs at par with their counterparts in Ministry of Railways. However, he raised objection on treating the movement from HS Grade to HS Grade-I as promotion and not placement. He invited the attention of the Chairman towards the judgment of Hon'ble CAT, Calcutta and Principal Bench CAT, New Delhi, which have given clear directions to the Govt. to treat the movement from HS Grade to HS Gr-I due to restructuring as placement and grant ACP to the concerned employees by ignoring the placement. These two Judgments were given based on various Supreme Court Judgments, which clearly stipulate that when a cadre is restructured for the first time, the same cannot be treated as a promotion. Therefore, MoD may take into consideration all these facts and approve the genuine demand of the Staff Side. The official side agreed to study the Judgments and accordingly, refer the case to DOP&T.</p> <p>➤ <u>Current Status at MoD, D(Civ.I):</u></p> <p>(1) The pay structure of the workshop Staff was considered by the 7th CPC. It was held that there is full parity among all workshop Staff in the Central Government. This parity is in harmony with the required qualifications and job profiles. As such, it may not be proper to disturb the structure and movement of workshop Staff as provided in the restructuring order dated 14.06.2010 issued by MoD.</p> <p>(2) The Concerned administrative Divisions that have received the Hon'ble CAT orders on this subject may furnish the action taken to defend/implement these orders of Hon'ble CAT.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action:D(Civ.I)</p>
08	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Higher Pay Scales for Storekeeping Staff (pending since 8.02.02)</u></p> <p>The Staff Side had stated that duty of Store Keeping Staff in MoD is tough/hazardous in comparison to their counterparts in Ministry of Railways. However, pay scale/grade pay of Store Keeping Staff in MoD is comparatively less than their counterparts in Ministry of Railways. Hence, the Staff Side insisted to take up the case with Ministry of Finance to grant higher pay scales for storekeeping staff. The following efforts were made by the concerned administrative divisions, at MoD :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>D(Air.III):</u> The demand for up gradation of Pay Scale at par with the Storekeeping staff of Ministry of Railways was considered by 6th CPC in para 7.10.24 of Chapter 7.10 observed that duties and functions attached to the post are not commensurate with those existing in Railways. Hence, the higher pay scale cannot be

	<p>extended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRDO: The case for up-gradation of pay scales of Store Officer in the pre-revised pay scale of Rs.6500-10500/- to Rs.7500-12000/- with grade pay of Rs.4800/- and placement in the pre-revised pay scale of Rs.8000-13500/- with grade pay of Rs.5400/- in PB-3 on completion of four years was taken up with MoF, Deptt of Expenditure. The proposal has however, not been agreed to by MoF, Deptt. of Expenditure on 04.02.2009 (vide IC U.O. No. 7.10/12/2009-IC). • Navy HQ: (a) General Secretary, CDRA had raised a demand to MoD for up-gradation of pay scale of Storekeeping Staff of Mod at par with Storekeeping Staff of Railways. (b) The above demand was referred by MoD/D(Civ.I) to MoF who did not agree to the same. This position was also communicated to the General Secretary, CDRA. <p>➤ Current Status at MoD, D(Civ.I): The demand was considered by Ministry of Finance and by the 7th CPC also in detail. However, the commission has uphold that considering the job profiles and educational qualification, the upgrade is not justified. The point may be treated as closed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action:D(Civ.I)/Concerned Divisions</p>
09	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Non-Implementation of Four Grade Structure for Supervisory Staff in MES (pending since 16.01.06)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Federations have already discussed this demand with the E-in-C in a meeting held on 28.09.2014. E-in-C has agreed to consider the demand. It was decided to wait for the decision of E-in-Cs Br in this regard. • MoD/D(Works-II) returned the proposal saying that the necessity of Chargeman should be considered in the changed scenario. Hence comments were asked from CEs Command. A number of Commands are not in favour of Chargeman and same is the view of CDRA also. The point may be treated as closed. <p style="text-align: center;">Action:D(Works-II)/DS(Works)/JS(C&W)/DDG(CP), Army HQ</p>
10	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grant of CSD Canteen Facilities to the retired Defence Civilian Employees.</u></p> <p>➤ <u>The matter has been resolved.</u> Item may be dropped.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Action: D(Mov)/DDDGP(CP), Army HQ</p>