# STATES OF JERSEY

# STATES STRATEGIC PLAN: ANNUAL DEBATE ON PROGRESS (P.27/2011) – COMMENTS

---

**Presented to the States on 10th March 2011**
**by the Council of Ministers**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

## COMMENTS

**1. Annual Performance Report and Strategic Plan Progress Report**

(i) Deputy Le Claire's Report to the Proposition confuses the Annual Performance Report with the Strategic Plan 'Progress Report'. The original States Question 5858 on 30th November asked: *'Will the Chief Minister be publishing progress against Strategic Plan initiatives again in January 2011?'.*

(ii) The Annual Performance Report updates a wide range of economic, environmental, financial, social and value-for-money indicators. Specifically, it monitors: (a) outcome key performance indicators (kpi) and trends related to strategic objectives (metrics with a short contextual narrative); (b) progress by Departments against the key objectives and success criteria set out in the Annual Business Plan (narrative); and (c) value-for-money kpis (inputs/ outputs) and trends related to department/service level performance (metrics). Data for many of these kpis is only available annually and much of it is not available by the end of the following January.

(iii) The 'Progress Report' reports progress against Delivery Plans, is published annually after the year end, and specifically describes – using narrative – activity, what has been achieved and what is being planned. It is structured by Strategic Plan Priority, which may involve more than one department, and other agencies. It is not structured 'by Minister'.

(iv) Under the previous Strategic Plan, progress reports were more straightforward because the plan included specific tasks against which progress could be assessed as red/amber/green ('RAG' rated). The current Strategic Plan is higher level and more focussed on priorities and objectives rather than tasks and therefore not suitable for 'RAG' rating.

(v) The Progress Report as at 31st December 2010 was presented to the States on 1st February this year.

(vi) The only reports published in January of any year have been the progress reports referred to in (iv) and (v) above.

(vii) Annual Performance Reports were published in June 2008 (for 2007), September 2009 (for 2008) and February 2011 (for 2009).

(viii) The 2009 Annual Performance Report was delayed because of CSR. It was decided early on to postpone production of the 2009 report with the intention of including the 2009 data in the 2010 report.

(ix) However, towards the end of 2010, the Comptroller and Auditor General (C&AG) requested that the 2009 report be produced as a baseline to enable him to take over publication of the 2010 report (see below). Consequently, the 2009 Report has now been completed and made publicly available on the gov.je website.

**2. 2010 Annual Performance Report**

(x) The C&AG has indicated that, from 2010, he will be publishing the Annual Performance Report independently (although this will need to be done with the assistance of States Departments who will provide the data).

(xi) The format and content of the report will be decided by the C&AG, but is as yet undetermined. However, the C&AG has indicated that it is likely that there will be changes to the published document: partly as a result of a review of the indicators contained within it and partly to make sure that it concentrates on data which should be reliable at the expense of narrative comment.

(xii) The C&AG has also indicated that he intends to consult publicly on his plans for the Annual Performance Report before producing the 2010 document.

(xiii) It therefore follows that that the 2010 report will not be available within 30 days if the Proposition is adopted (14th April), nor is it likely to be in the current format.

(xiv) Notwithstanding the above, it would be very difficult to produce the Report in its current format by the end of January each year for the following reasons:

– Much of the information is not available by the end of January – particularly the information that relies on the Statistics Unit. Using previous years' data would result in the report being more than 12 months out of date – although with a very small number of indicators where data is only available post-June, this is unavoidable.

– Departments are still finalising the financial information for the previous year during January.

– The workload on departments is already very high during January because of the year end – the same people produce much of the information.

**3. Satisfaction with the work and progress made by Ministers**

(xv) The Strategic Plan priorities are, almost without exception, cross-cutting and involve a number of departments and other agencies. It is therefore difficult to see how individual Ministers' overall performance can be linked directly to the Annual Performance Report. The Annex, which relates to individual departments, mainly focuses on value-for-money-type indicators, and is not specifically linked to Strategic Plan objectives.

**4. The Council of Ministers therefore opposes the Proposition on the basis that:**

– Deputy Le Claire has confused the Strategic Plan Progress Report against Delivery Plans and the Annual Performance Report.

– The C&AG has taken over publication of the Annual Performance Report, and will produce the 2010 report.

– The content, format of the report and timing of publication will be decided by the C&AG in due course.

– The proposed timescales for production of: (a) the 2010 report; and (b) future reports, are unrealistic and will in any case be determined by the C&AG.

– Strategic Plan objectives are, on the whole, cross-cutting, thus involving more than one Minister. This would make it difficult to assess performance by individual Minister by relating it to the Annual Performance Report.

In the light of the above, it is recommended that the Proposition be withdrawn, but otherwise rejected.