

**2.12 Deputy S. Power of the Minister for Education, Sport and Culture regarding an extension to the contract period for the proposed amphibious vehicle service to Elizabeth Castle:**

Would the Minister inform the States whether the contract period for the new proposed amphibious vehicle service at Elizabeth Castle was extended from 5 to 10 years and if so whether this was notified to all tender parties and announced publicly?

**Senator M.E. Vibert (The Minister for Education, Sport and Culture):**

Again, may I ask that as my Assistant Minister started if she will finish, Sir, thank you.

**2.12.1 The Deputy of Grouville (Assistant Minister for Education, Sport and Culture):**

The opportunity to express interest in the amphibious service to Elizabeth Castle was advertised in the *Jersey Evening Post* by the Jersey Heritage Trust and a draft agreement sent to the 5 respondents to the advertisement to enable them to prepare submissions. All received identical information and all those who expressed formal interest were considered by a sub-group of the Jersey Heritage Trust on a like-for-like basis. The submissions were for a 5-year contract and the decision to proceed with the preferred operator was taken on the basis of those submissions alone. The terms of the agreement with that operator preserved the commitment to the original submissions; that is to say the tender sum, the vehicles to be acquired by the operator and the level of service required by the Trust. In concluding, the Trust chose to consolidate its position with an agreement which covered a further 5-year period under the terms favourable to the Trust and of course favourable to the public and to visitors requiring access to Elizabeth Castle. The Trust has the option to terminate this agreement giving 12-months' notice at any point after the conclusion of the fourth year while the operator is committed to providing access to the castle at an agreed price for a 10-year period. The Trust is confident that these arrangements were fair to those who expressed an interest in the service and that they constitute an improvement on the previous arrangement in terms of ensuring long term access to Elizabeth Castle.

**2.12.2 Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

What were the costs of entering the castle last year? I do not remember exactly, although I do remember going, but what were the costs in relation to getting into the castle having taken an amphibious service and what are they likely to be this year? What will be the difference, if any?

**The Deputy of Grouville:**

I have absolutely no idea and I cannot see how that relates to the question that was asked.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

In defence of my question, Sir, the question does not necessarily have to relate to the question that was asked as long as it is on the topic. But, in defence of my question it does relate to the answer that was given in as much as having taken on board the criteria and the operator as set out in the Deputy's answer...

**The Bailiff:**

It was a perfectly proper question or I would have disallowed it. The Assistant Minister has told you she has absolutely no idea.

**Deputy P.V.F. Le Claire:**

My question therefore is, having no idea would she be able to get back to us with the answer?

**The Deputy of Grouville:**

Yes, I most certainly will when the new operator is here and we will be able to tell the Deputy exactly how much it will cost him to visit Elizabeth Castle.

