

STATES OF JERSEY



MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: ESTABLISHMENT OF MINISTERIAL BOARDS AND REVISED SYSTEM OF SCRUTINY (P.120/2010) – SECOND AND THIRD AMENDMENTS (P.120/2010 Amd.(2) AND Amd.(3)) – COMMENTS

**Presented to the States on 11th October 2010
by the Chief Minister**

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

As noted in the 'Financial and manpower implications' section of the report which accompanies the Proposition P.120/2010 – Machinery of Government: establishment of Ministerial Boards and revised system of Scrutiny – the working party indicated that the revised structure being proposed must be managed within existing resources and must not lead to any overall increase in resource requirements for the States.

I fully concur with this intention and would urge Members to bear this in mind when considering the Amendments to P.120/2010, given the current backdrop of reducing States expenditure going forward.

The working party agreed that in order not to increase resource requirements this could mean the redeployment of some 5 posts and associated financial resources from the current Scrutiny team to provide support for the proposed Ministerial Boards.

The Second Amendment to P.120/2010 lodged by the Deputy of St. Peter proposes that the current Scrutiny posts are retained within the Greffe in order to provide a minuting service and some other administrative support for Boards (for example, collating and copying Ministerial Board Agendas, etc.).

The Third Amendment lodged by the Deputy of St. John seems to suggest that any spare capacity from retaining the 5 posts that would not be needed for Scrutiny and/or Ministerial Board work would be redeployed to provide research support for States Members. This would be an entirely new service which does not exist at present and would consequently act to increase resource requirements.

Approval of either of these Amendments to P.120/2010 would certainly have resource implications for States Departments. Departments would be required to organise Agenda papers and background research information for Ministerial Board meetings and to support Board members who will be making requests for information to departmental officers.

The working party had hoped that the transfer of some or all 5 posts from the Greffe could go some way towards helping to offset these additional requirements; however, if both Amendments are adopted there will not be any transfer of staff from the Greffe, albeit that Departments would not have to undertake the minute-taking function at meetings of Ministerial Boards as this would be undertaken by the Greffe. Consequently, Departments would still have to undertake most of the work in preparing administrative arrangements for Ministerial Board meetings.

It is difficult to quantify the resource and manpower implications if these amendments were accepted, but undoubtedly additional resources would be required. Up to 5 FTEs may be required in respect of the Deputy of St. John's amendment and the equivalent of at least 3 FTEs across departments unless any staff retained at the Greffe could be seconded full-time to departments to undertake the necessary work.

I therefore urge States Members to reject the Second and Third Amendments to P.120/2010.

I stress that my membership of the working group looking at Senator Breckon's proposals represented my own views and not those of the Council of Ministers. Ministers are free to make up their own minds on the Proposition itself, but the Council of Ministers is of the view that the resource implications are such that the Second and Third Amendments should be rejected in any event.