

Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

Record of Meeting

Date: 30th October 2013

Meeting No: 115

Present	Senator S.C. Ferguson, Chairman Deputy J.G. Reed, Vice-Chairman Connetable D.W. Mezbourian
Apologies	Deputy R.J. Rondel
Absent	
In attendance	Miss S. McKee, Scrutiny Officer Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p>1. Records of Meetings</p> <p>The Panel approved the public records of meetings held on 10th, 11th, 16th and 21st October 2013 and the private record of the meeting held on 21st October 2013.</p>	
<p>16/10/13 Item 2 513/36</p>	<p>2. Population and Migration/Long Term Plan</p> <p>The Panel received an update on the status of work. The Panel noted receipt of information it had requested from the States Chief Statistician in regards to the Names and Addresses Register. It was agreed that the Panel would re-visit the response during its post-implementation review of the <i>Control of Housing and Work (Jersey) Law</i> in 2014.</p> <p>The Panel further noted receipt of a letter received from Senator P.F. Routier MBE, Assistant Chief Minister, which provided an outline of what the Interim Population Policy should contain and the timescales in which it should progress. The Panel agreed that the timetable that had been provided for the development of the Policy would not provide sufficient time to carry out an in-depth Scrutiny of the work. Furthermore, in order to provide an exact indication of how much more time would be required to undertake a thorough review, the Panel agreed that it would require more information of the Policy content. In this regard, the Officer was requested to draft a response to Senator Routier broaching these issues and requesting further information.</p> <p>It was suggested that it would be beneficial if the Panel met the Assistant Chief Minister and Director of Corporate Policy in private to discuss the Policy and its development. The Panel agreed that, once it had received the further information that it had requested, such a meeting would be arranged. The Officer was requested to enact the necessary arrangements.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that the Statistics Unit's year-end population figures were due to be produced in June 2014. The Officer was requested to provide a list of other statistical information that was due to be produced in 2013, that might be relevant to the Panel's work on</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p>

	<p>the Interim Population Policy.</p> <p>The Panel recalled previous information it had received from the Chief Minister's Department in regard to the Long-Term Plan. The Panel further recalled the Chief Minister's decision to defer the detailed development of the Long-Term Plan to the new Council of Ministers taking office in 2014. The Panel agreed to request a further update from the Department in regard to the work that was currently being undertaken on the Long-Term Plan and how this work fitted in with the Long Term Revenue Plan.</p> <p>The Panel recalled its request for detailed information regarding the exemption contained within the <i>Control of Housing and Work (Jersey) Law</i> which meant that a person could work in Jersey for a period of 10 days or less in any 12 months period without needing to obtain a registration card. The Officer was asked to follow-up on this request.</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> <p>SM</p>
<p>16/10/13 Item 4 513/37(4)</p>	<p>3. Public Finances Law Amendments</p> <p>The Panel recalled that at its last meeting consideration had been given to the timescale for the presentation of Ministerial Responses. It was noted that the Ministerial Response to SR10/2013 had been presented four weeks after the relevant debate. It was further recalled that the Panel had agreed that it would be extremely beneficial if Ministerial Responses could be presented to Panels and States Members prior to the related debate, to help inform the debate. The Panel was advised that although it would be very helpful to receive Ministerial Responses in advance of a debate, procedurally the Minister was not under any obligation to do so. It was noted that the only requirement in respect of Ministerial Responses within the Code of Practice was that they were presented within six weeks of the presentation of the relevant Scrutiny Report.</p> <p>In considering what action to take, the Panel agreed to ask the Chairmen's Committee to consider this issue at its next meeting. The Panel was advised however that this issue had previously been discussed by the Chairmen's Committee. At that time, the Committee had agreed that its Chairman would broach the subject at her next meeting with the Chief Minister, the outcome of which is awaited. Despite this, the Panel agreed the matter should be raised again with the Chairmen's Committee. The Officer was asked to request for this subject to be included as an item on the next Committee meeting.</p>	<p>SM</p>
<p>16/10/13 Item 3 513/1(41)</p>	<p>4. Work Programme</p> <p>The Panel considered its Work Programme for the remainder of 2013 and 2014. It was noted that although the Panel was due to undertake a review of the Interim Population Policy later on in the year, it had capacity to start another review alongside its current work on the 2014 Budget.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that provision had already been made within its Work Programme to undertake a review of the Modernisation Programme. It was further recalled however that during previous discussions the Panel had agreed to undertake such a review in 2014 given that it wished to increase its scope. Despite this, it was agreed that Modernisation Programme was the Panel's next priority and, if the subject was broken down into manageable areas, it would be possible to begin work as soon as possible. In order to assist the Panel in</p>	

	<p>deciding the first area to review, the Officer was requested to obtain a detailed timetable from the Department and an electronic copy of the PowerPoint slides that were shown during a States Members Briefing on Public Reform.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that it had previously agreed to make provision within its Work Programme for a review of the States Employment Board (SEB). The Panel now agreed that, rather than reviewing this subject as a separate piece of work, it would consider SEB and Human Resources as part of its review of the Modernisation Programme. For future reference, Connétable D.W. Mezbourian formally announced a conflict of interest on this subject as she was a Member of the States Employment Board. As a result, it was further agreed that, if the review of this area of the Modernisation Programme coincided with a Health, Social Security and Housing Sub-Panel review of the new hospital, then Connetable Mezbourian would sit on that Sub-Panel as a representative of the Corporate Services Panel.</p> <p>The Panel recalled that at the last Quarterly Hearing with the Chief Minister he had suggested to the Panel that it arrange a visit to the Department of Social Security to receive a presentation from its staff about its recently implemented Lean Programme. Subsequently, the Panel had requested the Officer to look into this matter. The Panel confirmed its availability to visit the Department on 15th January 2014 at 9:30am. The Officer was requested to confirm this date with the Department and send out meeting requests to Members.</p> <p>The Panel noted a number of other subjects, to those that had already been discussed, in which the Departments were currently undertaking work, such as Foreign Policy and Freedom of Information. The Panel agreed that it would be mindful of such work when considering its own Work Programme for 2014.</p>	<p>SM</p> <p>SM</p>
<p>24/10/13 Item 1 513/40</p>	<p>5. 2014 Budget</p> <p>Consideration was given to draft Heads of Report. The Panel considered the lines of enquiry it had pursued and requested amendments to be made to the Heads of Report. The Heads of Report were approved, as amended. The Panel identified a number of questions, which the Scrutiny Officer was requested to investigate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much income was expected to be obtained with the introduction of the Long-Term Care Charge? 2. What figures were available in respect of capacity within the construction industry? 3. Were higher childcare allowances in respect of children in nursery education applicable to all taxpayer or only those assessed at the Marginal Rate? 4. How was the proposed reduction in the Marginal Rate of Income Tax a first step towards the implementation of independent taxation? <p>During its deliberations, the Panel was advised that the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel was likely to provide it with a note on the Budget proposal to increase Income Tax allowances for individuals with children in higher education.</p> <p>The Panel was advised that its request that the Fiscal Policy Panel</p>	<p>WM</p> <p>WM</p>

	<p>consider the economic impact of reducing the Marginal Rate of Income Tax from 27% to 26% had been forwarded by the Scrutiny Office.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the timetable for the Panel's review. It was recalled that the Minister for Treasury and Resources had asked whether the report could be presented two weeks before the debate on <i>Draft Budget Statement 2014</i> (P.122/2013), namely 19th November 2013. The Panel was advised that this represented an earlier deadline than had initially been planned but that it might be feasible, notwithstanding that the Panel had yet to receive all of the information it had requested from the Department of Treasury and Resources and that, consequently, the expert advisors had not yet been able to furnish the Panel with their reports. The Panel was advised that the timetable for production of the report therefore remained challenging but that work would begin on drafting. The Panel agreed to pencil in a provisional meeting for 9:30am on 8th November 2013 in the event that progress on the draft allowed for a discursive meeting to take place. Following its consideration of the timetable for its Budget review, the Panel considered more generally the timetables to which it worked during its reviews and the impact that receipt of information from the Executive could have on those timetables. It was suggested that it would be beneficial if Ministerial propositions could be provided to Scrutiny five days ahead of being lodged. It was agreed to request that the Chairmen's Committee consider the matter.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that it would seek to amend the Draft Budget in order to ensure that additional income generated from increases in Impôts were placed in the Health Insurance Fund so that the sums would be expended on health matters. The Scrutiny Officer was requested to look into the necessary arrangements.</p>	<p>WM</p> <p>WM</p> <p>WM</p>
	<p>6. Future Meetings</p> <p>The Panel noted that its next scheduled meeting would take place on 13th November 2013.</p>	