

IC/SC/007

PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

(22nd Meeting)

19th December 2012PART A

All members were present, with the exception of Senator Sir P.M. Bailhache and Deputy M. Tadier, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable A.S. Crowcroft of St. Helier, Chairman
 Senator S.C. Ferguson
 Connétable L. Norman of St. Clement
 Deputy J.A. Martin
 Deputy K.L. Moore

In attendance -

M.N. de la Haye, Greffier of the States
 I. Clarkson, Clerk to the Privileges and Procedures Committee

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Part A and Part B.

- Minutes. A1. The Minutes of the meeting held on 14th November 2012, having been circulated previously, were taken as read and were confirmed.
- Meeting dates for 2013. A2. The Committee agreed to meet on the following afternoons in 2013 –
- 10th January
 - 7th February
 - 14th March
 - 25th April
 - 23rd May
 - 13th June
 - 11th July
 - 5th September
 - 3rd October
 - 14th November
 - 9th December

The Committee Clerk was authorised to take the necessary action.

- States Members' Remuneration: Proposed Increase for 2013 (P.127/2012). 1240/3(73)
- A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A1 of 29th October 2012, recalled that on 3rd December 2012 Connétable S. Rennard of St. Saviour had lodged '*au Greffe*' a proposition entitled: 'States Members' Remuneration: Proposed Increase for 2013' (P.127/2012 refers).
- The Committee considered and, following minor amendments, **approved** a comment to P.127/2012 that confirmed its opposition to the proposition on the following specific grounds –

- (a) the States should not be directly engaged in the setting of their own

rates of remuneration;

- (b) the Review Body had followed the terms of reference set by the States; and,
- (c) the Committee was not aware of any exceptional circumstances that would warrant setting aside the recommendations of the Review Body.

The Greffier of the States was requested to make the necessary arrangements for the comment to be presented to the States.

Facilities
review:
Members' IT
provision.
465/1(169)

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 20th June 2012, recalled having agreed that States Members' IT requirements should be reviewed.

The Committee considered a report entitled: 'States Members' IT Provision,' the purpose of which was to confirm the outcome of a consultation with States Members regarding their IT requirements and to recommend a revised specification for Members' principal IT device.

The Committee was advised that a project group had been formed to review Members' IT requirements in 2012. Research undertaken by the group had included a programme of interviews with 15 States Members, supplemented by additional informal interviews with a further 12 Members. Arguably the primary finding was that a majority of States Members make minimal or no use of the 14-15 inch widescreen laptop they were given as a default device. This was because the device was thought to be a poor fit for the way they worked. Common criticisms included the following –

- (a) that the device was too big, too heavy, slow to turn on and had insufficient battery life;
- (b) that many Members already possessed a desktop or laptop computer at home that could be utilised for at least some States business using secure remote access;
- (c) that existing security measures were frustrating;
- (d) that a lack of internet connectivity in key States buildings was proving restrictive;
- (e) not all States Members benefited from Blackberry mobile devices and neither were Blackberries universally popular with those who had them; and
- (f) taken as a whole, the existing IT provision was not helping some Members to reduce their reliance on hard copy documentation.

On the basis that Members would continue to receive only one standard IT device, the prevailing view was that the principal device to be offered should meet or align closely with the following specification -

- (i) be robust, under 1kg in weight and no larger than a sheet of A4 paper, with a battery life of not less than 8 hours;
- (ii) have a good quality screen that allows for easy resizing of document text;
- (iii) be capable of being put into silent mode easily;
- (iv) have WiFi and, ideally, 3G mobile data connectivity, with the latter being easy to switch off when entering the States Chamber so as to prevent radio interference on recording equipment;
- (v) be capable of connecting automatically and securely to WiFi

- access points in key States Buildings;
- (vi) open and edit a full range of Microsoft Office documents and PDF files;
 - (vii) allow documents received in PDF format to be annotated and any annotations saved for later reference;
 - (viii) provide full internet connectivity;
 - (ix) enable Members to operate private and shared calendars efficiently;
 - (x) provide sufficient security without being excessively obtrusive or technical;
 - (xi) offer a quiet touchscreen keyboard, perhaps with the option of adding a mechanical keyboard for working with larger documents;
 - (xii) be supported by a ready-made electronic filing structure that would enable swift and reliable access to and archiving of agendas, minutes, reports and other necessary documentation;

Provision of a tablet-style device as the default option for Members was thought likely to yield immediate benefits, not least in terms of the scope for improved communication and data access, better diary management and scope for reduced hard copy documents in circulation. Members' also suspected that the scope for positive impact would be magnified by provision of a suitably secure wireless infrastructure in key States buildings, a States of Jersey controlled cloud storage system and remodelled training arrangements for Members.

The Committee was advised that various other jurisdictions were known to be trialling tablet devices in the context of pilot projects designed to measure the scope for more efficient working and reduced reliance on paper. These included the UK House of Commons and the Northern Ireland Assembly. Any significant developments in this area would be reported to the Committee.

The Committee **endorsed** the proposed specification for Members' principal IT devices and agreed that, in the first instance, the Chairman should write to the Chief Minister requesting that the Information Services Department re-evaluate the application of existing resources and confirm the extent to which the specification could be delivered within budgetary and operational constraints.

The Committee Clerk was authorised to take the necessary action.

Public
Elections
Review Sub-
Committee:
update.
465/8(1)

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. B3 of 14th November 2012, received an oral update from the Chairman of the Public Elections Sub-Committee regarding production of the Sub-Committee's draft report.

The Chairman advised that the Sub-Committee was presently engaged in reviewing the process of registration and, in particular, the question of when it might be feasible to move to a register based on the new population database, which was being compiled in accordance with the Register of Names and Addresses (Jersey) Law 2012. To that end, relevant enquiries were being made with the Population Office.

The Committee **noted** the position and agreed that it should review the Sub-Committee's draft final report in February 2013.

Standing
Orders and
Internal
Procedures
Sub-
Committee:
update.
465/4(11)

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 27th September 2012, received an oral progress report from the Chairman of the Standing Orders and Internal Procedures Sub-Committee.

The Committee was advised that the Sub-Committee intended to meet again in January 2013 to finalise its report and to consider correspondence recently received from the Public Accounts Committee regarding impact assessments.

The Committee noted the position.

Machinery of
Government
Review Sub-
Committee:
update.
465/1(182)

A7. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A3 of 14th November 2012, received an oral update regarding the work of the Machinery of Government Review Sub-Committee.

It was reported that the Sub-Committee's draft interim report had been considered by the Chairmen's Committee on 18th December 2012. The prevailing view was that greater clarity was required regarding the implications for Scrutiny arising from the proposal to establish Ministerial Boards. It was further recommended that the Sub-Committee seek views on the report from each of the Scrutiny Panels and from the Public Accounts Committee directly. In this regard, the necessary meetings were being arranged between 7th and 15th January 2013.

The Committee **noted** the position.

Electoral
Commission:
final report.
1240/22/1/10
(6)

A8. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A1 of 11th April 2012, noted the intention of the Electoral Commission to present to the Committee its final report at the Committee's next scheduled meeting.