

CHAIRMEN'S COMMITTEE

Meeting of Chairmen held on 27th January 2006

Present	Deputy R C Duhamel, President Deputy F J Hill Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier [arrived during item 2] Deputy G P Southern Deputy S C Ferguson Deputy J.G. Reed Deputy P J D Ryan
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs K. Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager Mr. D. Filippini, Assistant Greffier of the States [Item 5 only] Mr. I. Clarkson, Scrutiny Officer Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer Mr. M. Haden, Scrutiny Officer [Items 4 & 5 only] Miss S. Power, Scrutiny Officer [Items 4&5 only]

Ref. back.	Agenda matter	Action
1.	<p>Independent Members of Chairmen's Committee</p> <p>The President welcomed Deputies R.G. Le Hérissier and J.G. Reed as the independent members to the Chairmen's Committee.</p>	
2.	<p>Vice-President</p> <p>The Committee agreed that Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier would be Vice-President of the Chairmen's Committee.</p>	
3.	<p>Previous Minutes</p> <p>The Minutes of 20th December 2005, 10th and 17th January 2006 were signed as being an accurate record of the meeting.</p> <p>17.01.06 Item 5</p> <p>NOTE: The Committee agreed that the following sentence of the minutes of 17th January 2006 should read -</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The Chairman of the Social Affairs Panel advised that the Social Security Minister would attend its meeting on 23rd January 2006" to read -</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"The Chairman of the Social Affairs Panel advised that the <u>Housing Minister</u> would attend its meeting on 23rd January 2006".</p>	
4.	<p>Sexual Offences (Jersey) Law 200- (P.196/2005),- referral back to Scrutiny</p> <p>The Committee noted that the above had been referred back to the Corporate Services and Social Affairs Panels at the States sitting of 18th January 2006.</p> <p><u>Corporate Services Panel.</u></p> <p>The Committee considered a scoping document and related proposed statement to the States. The Committee</p>	

considered the opportunity which had arisen from this to consider the constitutional matters within Europe and other countries. Subsequent to consideration of potential overlap with the Social Affairs Panel and the need to maintain clarity of boundaries, the Committee approved the statement. It was noted that the lead officer for the review would be Miss Sam Power with support from Mr. Mike. Haden.

Social Affairs Panel.

The Committee was apprised of a meeting between that Panel and Mr. Luke Small, Youth Reform Group. It was noted that Mr Small had a case pending in the European Court of Human Rights.

The draft statement of the Panel was approved.

President's Statement

The Committee agreed that it would also be appropriate for the President of the Chairmen's Committee to make a statement following the aforementioned in the States to explain that when reports are to be debated in the States, they must give details of all background work and make all reports available for perusal.

It was noted that the three statements needed to be finalised and with the Assistant Greffier of the States by noon on Monday 30th January 2006.

Documents attached

Aforementioned statements to States

5.

Budget

The Committee welcomed the Assistant Greffier of the States who outlined the following points in respect of the financial position -

1. 2006 budget - the PAC did not currently have a budget as the budget allocation of the Comptroller and Auditor General would be kept separate.

2. 2005 underspend - a carry forward of outstanding money could be requested towards the end of February 2006. It was noted that there were competing demands for carry-forwards and any request should be specific and substantiated. The Committee was advised that there was a current underspend of £400,000 for Scrutiny, although the move of the Scrutiny function back to Morier House and other related matters would impact on this amount. There was £30,000 underspend for PAC. Although there appeared to be no apparent competing demands at present, the Committee noted that the amount of carry forward awarded was not usually more than 3 per cent of the underspend.

It was noted that there was insufficient financial data

	<p>available regarding the cost of the Scrutiny process in full now that four Panels were in operation. It would only be at the end of 2006, that sufficient information would be available to determine the true cost of the scrutiny function. It was determined to be essential that sufficient financial funds were available to permit the Scrutiny function to be undertaken in necessary depth and efficiency.</p> <p>It was agreed that the financial allocation for 2006 would be divided as follows -</p> <table data-bbox="437 506 1034 667"> <tr> <td>PAC</td> <td>£40,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corporate Services</td> <td>£80,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Economic Affairs</td> <td>£80,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Affairs</td> <td>£80,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Environment</td> <td>£80,000</td> </tr> </table> <p>It was agreed that the Assistant Greffier of the States would report back to the Chairmen’s Committee in respect of the 2005 underspend and related carry-forward request as appropriate.</p> <p>The Committee also agreed that a running total should be maintained on each review undertaken including staff costs.</p>	PAC	£40,000	Corporate Services	£80,000	Economic Affairs	£80,000	Social Affairs	£80,000	Environment	£80,000	DF
PAC	£40,000											
Corporate Services	£80,000											
Economic Affairs	£80,000											
Social Affairs	£80,000											
Environment	£80,000											
6.	<p>Corporate Services Panel: update report</p> <p>The Committee noted that the above Panel was streamlining its work programme for 2006 and the Fiscal Strategy/GST would be likely reviews.</p> <p>There had been consideration of the fulfilment industry but this might require the formation of a Sub-Group being formed which combined Corporate Services and Economic Affairs Panels. It was agreed that the former Panel would scope this review and liaise with the Economic Affairs Panel.</p> <p>The Chairman, Economic Affairs Panel stated the need for that Panel to determine its work programme in line with the Economic Development Department and that the fulfilment industry might come within the top six areas to review.</p>	PR										
7. 10.01.06 item 1	<p>“Livelink”</p> <p>The Committee recalled that Mr. W. Ogley, Chief Executive had undertaken to investigate the possibility of Scrutiny members having access to “Live link”. To date nothing had been forthcoming and it was agreed that arrangements should be made for Scrutiny members to be shown how this system operates.</p>											
8. 17.01.06 item 1	<p>Public engagement</p> <p>The Committee agreed that it would delay the distribution of a leaflet to the public and that a “drip-feed” approach was more effective. Other means of reaching out to the public were considered namely, insertion of information at</p>											

	<p>the front of telephone directory or/and in other journals.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the position of Manager of the Communications Unit was currently advertised and agreed that once that post had been filled it would be beneficial to invite that person to a Chairmen's Committee.</p>	
<p>9.</p> <p>17.01.06</p> <p>Item 1</p>	<p>Website</p> <p>The President apprised the Committee of a meeting with the Greffier of the States in respect of updating the Assembly and Scrutiny website. He explained the necessity to consider the promotion of more "exciting" material and presentations in order to connect with the public. The President also suggested the inclusion of sound-bites, TV-on line and film-form excerpts assisting raise the awareness of the scrutiny function.</p> <p>The Panel Chairmen agreed that their Panels would undertake some research into websites of other jurisdictions and county/borough councils and determine ways in which the Scrutiny Website could be improved. This in consideration of financial and manpower resources.</p> <p>On a related matter, it was noted that the portal for the Scrutiny Website should be on the same level as that of the Chief Minister's Department.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Social Panel: status</p> <p>The Committee considered the appropriateness of a division of the Social Panel into two separate Panels. The Chairman of that Panel explained the following issues which would arise if the Panel were divided -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two members of the existing Panel would move onto the other Panel 2. States members currently not engaged with either Ministerial or Scrutiny work expressed an interest in joining the Social Panel at the outset, with the exception of one. 3. The officer allocation would be one officer per Panel. 4. The Panel itself had no inclination to divide and believed that although it would be a very heavy workload, that it would be manageable. 5. Review topics had been more or less determined and scoping was underway. <p>The Committee considered that it was essential to bid for both more members and more staff in the future and that it was important to consider these bids with urgency.</p> <p>There was consideration of the formation of Sub-Panels to overcome concerns that areas of the Social Panel's remit would not be covered, however, there was also concern that Sub-Panels created other considerations regarding</p>	

finance and staffing issues.

The officers withdrew from the meeting to attend another meeting at this point.

Signed

Date

.....

.....

President, Chairmen's Committee