

# ARMY SERVICE COMPLAINT (SC) CASE SUMMARY 1: PAY & ALLOWANCES PAY, ALLOWANCES, CASEWORK AND COMPLAINTS CELL (PACCC)

## FINAL DECISION LETTER ISSUED 2019

### DECISION BY DECISION BODY (DB)

#### Complaint

A Reserve junior non-commissioned officer (JNCO) alleged he had been unfairly prevented from qualifying for his Certificate of Efficiency (CoE) and annual training bounty despite completing over 85 Residual Service Days (RSD), including a course and a military competition. A PACCC Appeal was refused as 'no case' as there had been no error in processing attendance or payment.

#### Investigation

The investigation confirmed that although the complainant had exceeded both the Reserves Regulations and the unit's Training Directive regarding the minimum training required to qualify for his CoE and bounty, he did not complete the required days Annual Continuous Training (ACT) or course in lieu. The JNCO had applied for the necessary Assured Training Event and obtained his employer's consent to attend ACT but was subsequently not selected for the course. Due to work commitments, an alternative course could not be completed in the remaining training year (TY). The unit's training directive stated that *'Under no circumstances will retrospective authority be given for an alternative ACT'*. Also, there was significant delay in dealing with this complaint due to the location of the complainants / respondents.

#### Decision

The complainant had intended to complete all the mandatory training to qualify for his CoE. His commitment to the Reserves and willingness to engage in training was evident. He had also completed all the Military Annual Training Tests within the TY. The request for retrospective consideration of the military competition

and course to be considered as an alternative ACT was made only when the alternatives had been explored fully by both the JNCO and his unit and none were found. The DB **Upheld** the SC.

#### Redress

The DB directed the CO to authorise the complainant's CoE for TY17/18 and that the appropriate training bounty for TY17/18 be paid.

#### Service Complaints Ombudsman for the Armed Forces (SCOAF)

**Involvement:** No

### DETERMINATION BY APPEAL BODY

#### Appeal

The complainant did **not** submit an application to Appeal the DB's Decision.

**SCOAF Involvement:** An application for investigation of maladministration or substance was **not** made.