

CORPORATE SERVICES SCRUTINY PANEL

Overseas Aid Sub-Panel

WEDNESDAY, 7th FEBRUARY 2007

Panel:

Senator J.L. Perchard (Chairman)
Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville
Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin

Witnesses:

Deputy J.J. Huet of St. Helier
Mrs. T. Roberts
Mr. K. Syvret
Mr. L. Crapp
Mrs. K. Filipponi

Senator J.L. Perchard (Chairman):

Good morning, Deputy Huet and your colleagues from the Jerseys Overseas Aid Commission. Thank you for coming to see us this morning and being prepared to give evidence in our review. You are familiar, I believe, with the terms of reference of our review. I think we have sent you a copy. Firstly, may I introduce our little team here? This Sam Power who has been dealing with Kathy so far, the scrutiny officer, Constable Murphy and myself, Mrs. Anne Thomson from the Oxford Policy Management who is advising the panel, and Constable Yates. Perhaps you would introduce your team.

Deputy J.J. Huet of St. Helier:

Yes, by all means. You know Kathryn Filipponi; she is our one member of staff that we have that we could not do without. Mrs. Roberts, who has joined the commission as a non-States Member commissioner; Mr. Crapp who was obviously our executive officer for about 15 years and then became a commissioner and is still staying with us as an accounting advisor because he is spot on; and then Mr. Kenneth Syvret who was a Member of the States, who is a lawyer and is now a commissioner. We never let good people go in other words; we hang on to them in some way or another.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Welcome all of you and thank you for familiarising your team with this scrutiny note which really is a formality; if you are happy we will proceed now that you have familiarised yourself with that.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Well, I was going to ask you, Senator Perchard, would you mind if I made a small statement before we started because I feel that on behalf of the team it is only fair that they should be allowed to answer the things that have come to light. Rather than us rambling through and you trying to find the bits afterwards and then trying to flip-flap back again, would you mind? I know it might take 10 minutes but I thought 10 minutes is surely worth our time to be clear. Can I ask what happened to the other Connétable? Where is he?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I was supposed to give you his apologies. Constable Gallichan has had a bit of a trauma in the work place this morning and rang to say that he was going to be extremely late and has to leave early and extended his apologies to us all.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

So, the Overseas Aid Commission is extremely pleased that everyone wants to increase the overseas aid budget which at present is based on a percentage of tax until 2008 which means it can go up and down. Both Mr. Ken Syvret and Mr. Leslie Crapp have worked with Christopher Haws, the senior accountant at Treasury, to come to an agreement to carry on with the percentage or just set a yearly increase. I would prefer to see an extra, say, £500,000 per year which I believe the Minister would be agreeable to. When I was first president in 2000, working on the current formula, funding has increased from £4.1 million-odd to £6.3 million-odd, just over £2.2 million. If it had gone up by £500,000 per year it would now stand at £4.2 million, so it would be nearly double. While Jersey could immediately raise the budget to £21 million the goods and services tax - and I checked with Senator Le Sueur - would need to be increased from 3 per cent to 4.5 per cent, with all that extra revenue going to overseas aid or otherwise you could have 30,000 households in Jersey pay an extra £500 per household to raise the extra £15 million. I have to say that neither option has raised great support from anybody I have spoken to. I say that while we are always being compared to Luxembourg, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Belgium and the United Kingdom, you name it, all these countries pay VAT; they can do between 15 per cent and 25 per cent and this is going to be against our suggested 3 per cent. Additionally, all those countries also have death duties, capital gains and a high personal taxation; certainly not our 20 per cent that we have in Jersey. The current agreement ends in 2008. For 2009 onwards we need to decide which way we move ahead. The realistic options are either to establish a funding formula to fit in with the new taxation, have a set percentage increase or set amount. I do not believe it is possible to cut other department's budgets much further, certainly not to the tune that we are talking about. The submission of evidence received by the sub-panel, as issued on the website, proved very interesting reading and the commission welcomes any constructive opinions and the overwhelming support to increase the budget; it is very encouraging. However, I felt it was imperative to have the opportunity to respond to all letters received which made negative references to the current workings of

the commission. With the exception of one, all have had certain issues with the former Overseas Aid Committee and/or Commission in respect of past funding. For a number of consecutive years, one of the local charities was deferred funding due to lack of accountancy information requested in respect of their charity. Although this charity does now receive funding from the commission, at that time they were unable to produce audited or un-audited, accounts despite repeated requests. It is not acceptable then and it is not acceptable now for that information not to be readily available. I know that this upset one of the founder trustees of the charity but as we spend the taxpayers' money we need to ensure that a charity is properly structured and secure before releasing any funding to it. Another letter relates to emergency funding for which the commission receives many requests throughout the year. In 2006, the commission was approached by several agencies to provide funding to a country situated in the Middle East. Following reports through the media it appeared that funding was not reaching the intended recipients and taking into account the financial state of the country, the commission decided in this instance to look towards longer term projects for rebuilding the community within the area. The gentleman took our decision to the local media but I was happy to respond publicly about this issue and was delighted that every other local resident I spoke to supported our decision. Another local charity trustee who now heavily criticises the work of the commission first asked me a number of years ago to visit a school that he was providing funds to in Africa. I reported back that I was concerned that little change had appeared to the school itself although the headmaster appeared to be living very comfortably. The reply I received at the time was: "Well, as long as the money goes to Africa, it does not matter." I questioned the sustainability and the misappropriation of funds. While I believe the establishment of his current charity came after this event, I have always been very cautious of any application and looking closely at detailed costings, which often appeared to be inflated. This is not to say that though funding in the past has not been approved, it has not been until the issues of prices of materials submitted had been addressed. More recently, with such additional local support investing heavily in the funding of a health clinic and following the widespread activities funded by the commission in the surrounding areas, the Overseas Aid Commission is concerned at the reports that come back revealing doubts that the supposed clinic for the poor has now developed along the lines of a commercial business with occasional free clinics. The commission has been requested, and is currently considering, to take further action in respect of an investigation from the country's Ministry of Health. With reference to this health clinic came additional submission of evidence for the sub-panel's consideration and I feel that any submission from a locally based recipient of aid is not appropriate. In this particular case it is obvious that our explanatory booklet outlining our policies and procedures has not been referred to and the administration of grants is clearly misunderstood. Logic has also not been applied especially relating to the costs of administration. It is important to ensure that funding reaches most of those in need. In 2004, the previous Overseas Aid Committee responded with a grant of £500,000 to be administered through the Red Cross; Side-by-Side, launched a public appeal to assist communities in Sri Lanka and all funding, to my understanding, has been distributed only to government areas. The committee at the time responded directly to those areas not getting aid on the east coast as

confirmed by 2 Sri Lankan native consultants at our Jersey local hospital. Again, the committee was concerned on accountability, questioning with one of our UK-based agencies, further to reports, that money was being handed over to government officials in order that aid would be distributed. We had that confirmed by Oxfam; they paid \$1 million to get their trucks into Sri Lanka. Without the \$1 million they could not get their trucks in. The submission from Mr. Jean Le Maistre gave a good overview of the history of the Island's contribution towards overseas aid although it leaves the impression that since establishing the main principles and objectives during his time as president that little has changed. That is not so. The former committee and commission has developed further into new areas of funding and continues to review its policy annually. I believe Mr. Le Maistre has always had certain issues with the committee after losing his presidency following an in-house election by States Members, which the former Senator Ann Bailhache won, before my time this was. Three-year funding is a new concept since Mr. Le Maistre's time and as a relatively new concept needs time to establish so that the commission is satisfied it is moving forward in the right direction. Committing funding for a project running over a 3-year period needs careful consideration and monitoring and funding needs to be available to support shorter term projects. Mr. Le Maistre questions our method of the way funding is approved in respect of our grant aid applications. The commissioners are issued with all the papers relating to the agency applications for their review for 2 weeks prior to read, before the meetings are held annually towards the end of each year. Agencies are notified in July of the deadlines for their submission and they are advised to ensure they provide a detailed budget in respect of each project submitted, listing a full breakdown of components where necessary. Agencies are also requested to ensure figures are double-checked as a high percentage of applications in the past had to be returned to agencies for correction and re-submission which causes a strain on our administration resources. Agencies are advised that any submission received with accounting errors will immediately be rejected as the commission has to be confident of accurate costings when allocating public money. Where a request for funding is part of a larger project, agencies are informed that their outcomes must be clearly distinguished so that the commission is aware of which part relates to the funding requested and that it is important to stay within the guidelines laid down on the forms referring, when necessary, to our first edition booklet. With regards to narrative, the actual project description must be clear and the need, sustainability and anticipated outcomes properly addressed. This year, in addition to the application forms and executive summaries, copies of all agencies' summarised accounts were also requested and reviewed, and in many cases further information was requested. During the lead up to the meetings the commissioners read through all the applications individually noting any queries needing clarification. Agencies are advised that in addition to the commission considering applications for grants they are happy to discuss any particular problems experienced with previously funded projects by the Overseas Aid Commission or the previous committee, or other relevant matters. They are advised that it is particularly helpful to have maps to indicate the location of projects and photographs as the commissioners, having already read through applications, will be addressing queries raised that may need detailed answers. All agencies are advised that if they are not familiar with a particular project or

area to please bring someone with them who is. All agencies are made aware of the total amount of funding requested against that available and they know that competition is strong. There is normally 50 per cent that there is not enough money for. Commissioners judge each application on its own merit, taking into consideration the key points listed above. They look closely at the amount of funding requested that is to be utilised for administration purposes against those direct project costs considering the percentage involved. The number of recipients and local contributions is also taken into consideration although if it is for outreach to remote areas this might not always be the case. The commission during interview will clearly identify any areas of concern and advise that it is the responsibility of the agency to note these points for further reference. The commission does not use a scoring system as such, in that the agencies are not awarded points against their application or for their presentation. On the latter, while it is important if the commission have specific questions in respect of any one project, it is viewed positively if the agency knows the answer rather than having to refer back to a colleague. This does not necessarily have a negative impact on that application. Quite simply, a commissioner will look at an application and will decide (a) it is worthy of funding, (b) if funding is still available to revisit the application or (c) they are not happy with the application and that would usually be due to administration costs.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Sorry, Jacqui, what was (b)?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

(b) is if funding is still available, in other words if there is any left, to revisit the application.

Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville:

Is it possible for us to have copies of this? It would be easier for me to follow.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes, it is, by all means. Yes, I thought I would read it first to stretch everybody. The commission is aware that some outcomes such as the provisions of school desks and chairs may not score as high as other projects. However, this is merely a figure of speech when we say “score”. It is not because we are scoring them as such; it is are they good, is there enough funds? Providing all areas and projects fall within the commission’s remit they are considered equally. Approved programme funding for 2007 shows an equal split between project types plus a good geographical spread. Taking into account Mr. Le Maistre’s comments in respect of the present programme, it is questioned whether over 50 per cent of the annual budget should be spent in Africa. The agencies are invited to submit applications which prioritise the need in those areas in which they work. It would seem selective to request that submissions in respect of Africa are reduced so that funding throughout appears fair especially if the agencies advise that this is the area most in need. The commission is invited to visit many projects and I

do take the opportunity to do so as often as I can and always at my own expense. I would never impose on any agency that because Jersey has supported their programme they in turn should play host to us. Mr. Le Maistre makes reference that although our administration charges are low we do not take into account the administration costs borne by each of our agencies. We do, especially when looking at applications where administration costs are exceptionally high. Often we turn down the applications and insist the administration costs are reduced. It is important to ensure always that these costs are kept as low as possible so that the maximum funding is directed towards the aid itself. However, having served on overseas aid for many years I assume that this way of thinking was across the board for everybody and anyone previously involved in the committee's work. Needless to say, I was astonished when Mission Aviation Fellowship contacted me prior to Mr. Le Maistre's departure from the States to request whether Jersey Overseas Aid Committee would cover the cost of flights utilised by him and his wife. It was not within our remit and the matter was referred to Bill Ogly which I presume was later resolved. The level of disaster aid for 2005 may suggest the level of funding is down for the period. However, the committee at the time was not oversubscribed with other applications and a balance of £10,000 remained available at the end of the year. The tsunami affected many countries and with the policy of allowing a maximum of £75,000 per emergency per country it was, in fact, fairly allocated though it was in a lump sum to one agency rather than through individual applications and it reached all affected countries. I am surprised that little reference has been given to the development of funding now available for our local charities working overseas. Although Mr. Le Maistre indicates the level of support for Jersey charities which raises funds for overseas projects appears to have been maintained, he forgets to mention that since his time as president the funding available has dramatically increased through the establishment of a pound-for-pound grant and the more recent funding available up to a maximum of £20,000 for material grants.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Deputy, I am going to interrupt here. I do think you are deviating from the terms of reference. We are not here to listen to criticism of people that are not able to defend themselves and I would ask you to move on or wind up, please. I am not going to accept that. He is not here to defend himself.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

By all means. Senator Perchard, he has made that claim in his letter so we have a right, unless you are saying this cannot be transparent, to defend what he says otherwise it is not fair.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can you move on, please?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

You are only taking one side.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I am not. I am quite happy to receive the written submissions from yourself but I do not think it is a useful use of our time to spend time on ancient history.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

The report for the commission has been far more comprehensive over the years with more information and feedback than in previous years. On that letter that was sent to you, which you have all read, I was extremely disappointed at the comments about the composition of the commission and even more alarmed to receive copies of correspondence from the Jersey's Appointment Commission in which Mr. Le Maistre appears to be trying to undermine the integrity of the appointments process.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Deputy, I warn you, I will adjourn this meeting unless you can move on and discuss the terms of reference that we are here to discuss. I will receive your written submission and we welcome it. If you have issues with individuals please submit them in writing.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

That was not mine, Mr. Chairman, that was the Appointments Commission themselves who
[Interruption]

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I will adjourn this hearing unless we can move on and be more positive.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Basically, I wanted to answer the criticisms that had been raised by the letters and that is what this covers, nothing more. We have not answered any criticisms that were not put in a letter so that covers the letters of criticism and how, we hope you understand, we run it and how we place grants and what we do.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you very much for that. As Dan intimated after about 10 minutes, it would have been very useful to have had an advance copy of that. There is a lot of information in there and I gave up taking notes after 10 or 12 minutes because I could just not keep up. So we will reserve the right to recall you after studying that information; I think we have no choice. However, let us use our time this morning positively because we are all on the same side, Jacqui.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, it is always a pleasure. I have no objection but we have to reply to anybody that criticises us. We have to.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Of course. Constable?

Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin:

I am a little bit surprised though, Jacqui, because we are here not to criticise. We are not here to criticise any aspect of the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission. We are here to see what you do and I hope we are here to suggest and advise what we, the sub-panel, might think will improve things. We are where we are and we are not where we were last year so I would like to say that. You have more than answered half of the questions that we have written down here in great detail and we have been speaking among ourselves in very broad brushstrokes. We would be asking you how do you select recipients but we do not really want to know the infinitesimal detail of who has knowledge of the road or the state of the weather in a place where the money goes. We have to think in broad terms not in detail.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I would not like anyone to think that the money was not getting spent correctly.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

We are not criticising you at all.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I am just going to cover the letter you read out to start with and that is that I will defend your right to defend yourself absolutely. However, it would have been much better if we had copies of it before we started and any problems we had within that letter might have been discussed with you before we settled down. You have the right to defend yourself and no one is going to argue with that. I think we ought to really get on to the questions we have.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can I ask, Jacqui, for that letter to be made available to us?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes, you are welcome to have it. I have to say we were still working on it. Because all my people are volunteers and nobody gets paid we were still working at 7.30 p.m. last night on it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I am sure you were and it is a very powerful document and, if you can imagine, it has taken us back a bit

this morning.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I just felt that the committee must be allowed to defend itself.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Absolutely, and if we were to introduce any of the criticism that has been levelled at the commission in submission from others we will be as balanced as we possibly can in putting the alternatives. You seem to have given us plenty to work on. There is no witch hunt here, I promise you that.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Do you want me to kick off? I was very surprised with 2 lots of evidence that came in, firstly from Oxfam and secondly, Christian Aid, that Jersey Oxfam has absolutely no connection with UK Oxfam apart from writing out a cheque. Christian Aid write out cheques and send them through to Christian Aid in the UK. There is no feedback; there is no monitoring; there is nothing done from this end at all. I am very surprised that they themselves are willing to accept this situation and I am surprised that you do not bang their heads together and get them to work closer on a Jersey basis. In other words if you wish to improve our image to some extent, then let us have our name stamped on some of the things that happen. I know you covered part of that in your letter. The fact is we are literally a post box for money and that does not seem to me that it is correct that it should be used in that way. I think that Oxfam Jersey should have some input with Oxfam UK when they meet you and the same with Christian Aid. Those are the 2 that stick in my mind.

Mr. K. Syvret:

Like all organisations of this nature, Oxfam is a United Kingdom organisation and Christian Aid is a United Kingdom organisation. They have local branches. I work for Guide Dogs for the Blind, as you know, and we work on exactly the same basis. We have a central organisation in England that runs the whole organisation. We are here purely as a fund raising branch and I am sure the position is exactly the same between Oxfam UK, the main branch, and the Jersey branch; as it is, I am sure, for Christian Aid.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes, but Guide Dogs raises all its own money. Here we are talking about money being provided by JOAC (Jersey Overseas Aid Commission).

Mr. K. Syvret:

If I need any information I do not go to the people who fund the mainland, I go to the mainland to the organisation and ask the organisation. I think the problem here seems to be there is a lack of information being passed down or up, whichever way it is, a lack of a request up for information to

come down and a lack of liaison between what is the central office of Oxfam and the local branch. That is something for them to set up. We support the agency, Oxfam, and we support the agency, Christian Aid and they make their submissions. If either of those 2 organisations wish to have some Jersey input, I think it must come from them or the local organisation should approach us through their central organisation.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Well, it seems to me you are going right round the houses again, are you not? Surely it is going to be easier. I was hoping that you would say to me that, yes, you would talk to them and try and get them to do it voluntarily rather than have them at cross purposes with each other. But if you made it clear to them that you wanted them to work together, I am sure they would have to do it.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We can tell Oxfam that by all means.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

For the benefit of the recording, we cannot talk over each other because the recording cannot discriminate.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Can Mrs. Roberts reply?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Of course you can, Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think this is a really interesting point that has been raised and it is something that we have started to look at in the last couple of meetings because there are any number of organisations that have been approaching us obviously for aid and we have started to ask: "What is your structure? How does this all feed back to your parent organisation?" One of the things, certainly at the next meeting, we are going to ask people to give to us is a structure of how their organisation looks. So I think, yes, we do need to do more work in that respect.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether instead of the panel just jumping in with questions we might benefit by going through the suggested question sheet and then perhaps we can get to the nitty-gritty at the end.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The criterion for allocating aid I think is an area in our submissions that has been prevalent particularly with the locally driven charitable organisations. They are unsure of the criteria.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry, Mr. Chairman, could we read the question and then get answers?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, we can but I want to ask, as a result of the evidence that Jacqui just gave, if the policies are reviewed annually. Are recipients or potential recipients aware of the annual review and is there clarity, because there is some confusion?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I am not the brains of Britain but I find our leaflet pretty clear. It shows who can apply, how you can apply and who you apply to. The leaflet is there for anybody that requests it; we send it to everybody. I have to say, Senator, that some people do not seem to read it properly. We tell them that we have 50 to 60 agencies now. We cannot take on the world. There are 212 agencies in England alone. So we say to them: "If you want to become one there are a couple of ways you can join. You can either go through either Oxfam or Save the Children or Red Cross as a co-partner for few years and then if your projects stack up and they are quite happy with them, you could then come on the main list as people drop off." But you cannot just jump on to the main list because there are thousands of agencies that would be saying: "Can we jump on to the main list?" So we have a main list and we only add people now who come up with something completely new. We had one for mental health a couple of years ago and nobody else did mental health so we said: "Fine, we do not have an agency that is doing mental health." We took them on board. There are thousands of agencies who are doing HIV (Human Immunodeficiency Virus).

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But the criteria for allocating aid, and we have seen your leaflet, there is suggestion that it is unclear as to how you can become one of the recognised recipients.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Well, I have just said you can become recognised if you are offering something different that nobody else offers that we already have on our list, or if you go into partnership with, say, Oxfam. That is how people get on to our books; they go into partnership with another known agency that we trust and we are aware of all their policies. They come on with them, they get approved, it works well for a couple of years and then they stand to get on board. But they cannot just jump in over everybody else.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry, what was that question? I think we really ought to get some order in the proceedings.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Carry on, Constable.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

The Chairman is talking about the criteria for allocating aid and question 2 is the 1998 review of Jersey Overseas Aid made several recommendations for the distribution of grant aid which focused on demonstrating that the commissioner's decision making is transparent and open to public challenge. What has the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission done in response to these recommendations? We have been looking at that document there. That is the question. Would anybody like to give me a brief answer, please?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We have minutes on every meeting that we have and they are only ever A minutes; we have no B minutes. The minutes of every meeting that we ever have are open to public scrutiny. There is nothing hidden. It shows full transparency in respect of the commission's decisions and it is always available on request for public inspection. It has always been under A; we have never changed it.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Could I also add that quite recently you can see how every member has voted at the London meeting?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Would you like to carry on, Chairman? We are on question 3 now.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The 1998 review that the Constable made reference to did make a criticism. What has been done differently since 1998? It has evolved into a commission but what is different? Did you accept that criticism and, if you did, what are you doing differently?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I would say from my personal view, and I will let each person answer after me because they might have a slightly different answer, it used to be done by just a couple of people but now it is done by the whole commission. Every person on the commission assesses the grant applications. As I say, only 50 per cent can be approved because there is only enough money for 50 per cent of the applications, so 50 per cent are always going to be refused. Every commissioner reads the applications and uses those so it is completely clear and above board.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You are slightly missing the question the Constable asked. The criticism in 1998 in this report, which I am sure was of value to you, to the old committee, said they were concerned that the decision making was not transparent and open to public challenge. My point is 1998 is nearly 9 years ago. How have you evolved to ensure that criticism will not be levied again?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think the greatest difference is that you have a commission with lay members. I think that is a huge evolution. I think the fact that there have been decisions of the committee that have been challenged by members of the public, I think has to demonstrate that there is greater transparency. The fact that people can just go into a website and look at the minutes has to be transparent. How more transparent can you be?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So you are satisfied you have answered those criticisms?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think so.

Mr. K. Syvret:

I think one of the criticisms might be that transparency appears after the event in this case. It is probably one of the difficulties that you have as a searching question for us as to how transparency arises. It can only arise in our case, unfortunately, after the event because we have the applications and there they are; that is our papers for the London meeting in November. Each of the 3 lay commissioners are appointed a number of agencies which they question carefully and if I may show you, those are the papers I prepare for one agency only, going to London, and we ask all these questions. While we have read their presentation we ask these questions and as far as we are concerned -- and transparency must start with us; it does not start with the public, in effect, because we are the frontline people asking and putting the questions that we feel the public would wish to have answered. So we put those questions. Having put those questions then we make a decision on the A, B, and C scale as you have heard where we think this is a very good project and we must support it. It has everything: they have done their homework, the presentation is good, the administration costs are within certain guidelines we set ourselves and so everything is well. Then the whole thing goes in our minutes and our minutes are very detailed, including to the degree of saying how each commissioner felt and put his view forward and how he felt it should be granted or otherwise. That is a problem and I can understand what you are saying. Transparency appears after the event rather before but there is no other way we can do it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You are satisfied that that criticism has been answered by the commission?

Mr. K. Syvret:

I have come back to the commission after a gap of 3 years because I served on Overseas Aid for 6 years when I was in the States. Then there was a gap of 3 years and I have come back again. Frankly, there is a marked difference in the way in which the London meetings are conducted and the way things are done. I am absolutely convinced of that.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That answers the question perfectly. Moving on, we would appreciate more detailed information as to how grants are assessed. I did make notes, Deputy, as you were going along on the basic criteria that you insist on: proper accounting mechanisms and others. Can you tell us the criteria in some detail as to how you assess an application for a grant?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Would you like me to answer?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes, okay.

Mr. L. Crapp:

We get the application and first of all we have to look to see how it matches up with our criteria and they are asked in their application to set out things like sustainability or the need and everything else. It is their response to that that we look at and the questions arise; sometimes we question the sustainability and say: "Well, once this is up and running how is it going to carry on afterwards?" You do not just construct a new well; you have to make sure that someone is trained to maintain it and that they sort out that the cattle do not foul it and that sort of thing. So it is being assessed by looking at the detail of the application and its effectiveness and each one of the commissioners has to make his own judgment as to whether he thinks we are getting value for money, if you like, and that it really addresses the need. Very often -- most of these cases you would want to say yes to. When I have given my talk in the past to new States Members in the old committee days, I used to say the most difficult decision you have to make is to say no, and you know you have to say no to half these projects and that is extremely difficult.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can I just bring you back? Sustainability, of course, makes so much sense and accountability, that there is this proper, traceable route for the cash. What other criteria do you use?

Mr. L. Crapp:

There is the need because one of the other things, and it is something that we have to be careful with, is when people are doing local projects as opposed to the grant aid, because you go away, go on holiday, and you are taken up to this particular areas where you see the poor and you think you want to do something. But the poor that you see may, in fact, be quite well off compared with other poor.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But need is ...?

Mr. L. Crapp:

It is what is set out in here. We have got them to address specifically -- it starts off with, how we are going to do it, the sustainability, the reporting and a number of ...

Mrs. K Filippini:

The projected outcomes.

Mr. L. Crapp:

The projected outcomes. That is right.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Going back to your comment, Mr. Crapp. It is very difficult to say no, you mentioned, and that might link in with the criteria needed to prioritise. So you get 3 really necessary projects but you cannot afford, you can only afford 2. How do you make it out in your mind to say: "Sorry that one we cannot do?" It is a difficult question, is it not?

Mr. L. Crapp:

The answer is with difficulty. It is with difficulty. The other thing that we look at in particular is the contribution by the community and the way the community is involved.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The recipient community?

Mr. L. Crapp:

The recipient community. The projects that succeed have to be "owned by the community" and they are owned by the community if they are involved. It is them that ask the agencies, the agencies who deal with the people and we also look at how it is going to be done. Women's committees are the thing that gets things done in Africa, for instance, not the men's committees.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

One question really just for clarification. When you meet your agencies in London, and we are talking about the need for a particular thing in a village in Africa or India or what ever, it might be water or it might be a school or a clinic or something - I do not know how it works - are you dealing at this stage with major agencies? Are you dealing, for instance, with Oxfam at this stage? So you are talking to Oxfam, a major charity, about relatively small stuff? That is the fact of it. I was not sure whether you spoke to Oxfam in general terms and said: "We are going to give you £400,000 and do what you like with it." You are talking about specific projects with the major agencies?

Mr. L. Crapp:

This is the difference with Jersey Aid. Jersey Aid is project. You have to have the project. We are not going to give you money to get away with, you know.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am happy with that.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I am pleased that you are, Connétable, because it was suggested at one time in the States that maybe we should just give £1 million to Oxfam, a £1 million to Save the Children and we said then you have no guarantee it is going where it should go.

Mr. K. Syvret:

Most of these projects are prepared by the people on the ground where they are going to happen. That is generally what happens and then they are fed up to the main agency on the mainland who will then submit the application to us. Generally we ask for the person who is involved with that desk, and I think probably Anne will understand this. They have people who are responsible for the Africa desk or the Columbia desk or what ever. Those people come along and talk the project through to us and that is how we make our decisions. We have read the submission they have made; we have made our notes and we have our questions just as you have done for us. We prepare questions for the agencies to come along and, as I say, those are my questions I ask. We had one particular one in Columbia which I passed on because I felt they had got their sums completely and utterly wrong. You will understand, this as a farmer. They were asking us for hydroponics gardens and these hydroponics gardens measured 2 metres by 5 meters each; they were 10 square metres. The outcomes as far as they were concerned - and I will tell you at the outset we rejected it - was that they were going to make £100 per month of which £90 would be produced as income for the house and the other 10 per cent would produce food for the house. So it meant they were going to make £1,332 in Columbia. It was completely and utterly wrong; how they got their sums so wrong, I have no idea. This is the sort of detail we occasionally have to go into.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You have to drill down to it.

Mr. K. Syvret:

We have to drill right down to it, absolutely, yes and that is why it is useful to meet these people face-to-face. They can see these chaps are doing their work; they know what they are doing and they know what they are talking about so they come back to us -- I must say that after last year where we told them: "You have to get your sums right because if your sums are wrong and there are still some problems we will say to you, 'Take it back, get it right and we will look at it' but then you join the queue at the end of the queue. You are not in the position you were when you came the first time around." So we really are extremely focused on each one.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I do not think there has ever been any doubt that so much work goes into it. As Leslie said, it is not choosing the right ones; it is abandoning the ones that you cannot go with. I am just trying to understand the mechanisms you use. You do not use a point system. I have a list of 6 things here, and perhaps you might want to add to it, but the mechanisms you use is it just a gut feeling? When you are choosing A against B, once you have these criteria, how do you make the decision?

Mr. K. Syvret:

If it is going to benefit 1,000 people as opposed to 100 people that must mark up that particular application as meriting greater thought than the previous one, for the sake of argument. Correct me if I am wrong, but if we have helped an area in particular and this agency has come for 3 grants in the same area and there is one in a different area we might move to the different area to spread what Jersey is doing throughout the world really, in many respects. I think the Connétable of Grouville raised the point that "we like to see the Jersey mark on it". I am not frightfully keen on that. I am keen to see that the work is done, not the work has been done by Jersey and I think that is where our focus is in many respects, that the work for which these agencies are wanting the money is done. It is nice to receive plaudits, and we do get them, but that is not what we are focused on. We are focused on getting the work done.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am listening and we are answering the questions 7, 8 and we have not even done 4 yet. I think we need to try and structure the meeting and then we can go through it and we can bring in extra things at the end. The next question is what proportion of project applications are turned down. You can give me that in 3 words.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I can. One year was 47 per cent.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

One year was 47 per cent, one year was 48 per cent and one year was 49 per cent so we could have spent literally double what we had.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

A bit less than 50 per cent.

Mr. K. Syvret:

But that is on grant aid as opposed to local.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

And emergency. There is more than one pot, you see; there is grant aid, there is emergency aid and then there is work party aid and then there is local charities aid. There are quite a few pots that are on a percentage.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Are you happy with that? Do you want to explore the pots or have we got to go on to question 6, Constable? May I just remind you they are only guidelines.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, but these give us a feel for it. Are any of the funds allocated for overseas aid unused at the end of the year?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Very little, very little. One year we showed £50,000 but it was not really £50,000 because £40,000 of it was already promised so we were £10,000 over at the end of the year and I think that is pretty good on a budget of £5.5 million.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

On one year?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

One year.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Of the last how many years?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, the year before that was £33,000 we were over. I think I have got it written down.

Mr. K. Syvret:

I think looking back last year we said the highest we have ever been unallocated is 1.2 per cent.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Does that money get carried forward or does it go back into the States' pot?

Mr. K. Syvret:

It is carried forward; it stays in the budget. It is a minimal amount.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

But of the £1.2 million, £50,000 of it was already allocated to go into the Boxing Day tsunami flooding. There was £66,000 left over at the end of the year but £50,000 was going to go to the flooding so you are left with £16,000.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Generally speaking the committee probably spends more than its budget because money gets returned where sometimes you get favourable exchange rates which means that the agency has been able to complete a project at a much lower cost and therefore money comes back to the committee or there may be a civil uprising and they have had to pull out the country and the money is returned. So we do get money coming back.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

So that is carried forward?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes, that is carried forward. If it is not spent, we try and spend it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What is the mechanism for NGOs (Non Governmental Organisations) returning cash? How is that monitored? What mechanism do you use?

Mr. L. Crapp:

It is their report. We do not know what they get for their exchange rate but with all these things there is a huge element of trust because they are working in foreign countries. When you are dealing in some of these remote areas it is very, very difficult so you do rely on the agencies. In my own submission I said I recall one where the agency thought they had completed the project but they could not get a report from the field and so they just gave us the money back. There is goodwill created by doing that rather than saying: "We are holding on to the money" until they get the report and never getting it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Do the big NGOs always self-monitor or do they engage independent scrutiny, especially on bigger projects?

Mr. L. Crapp:

They do self-monitor; they have to because we would not give them money unless there was something to see how they monitored the funds.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, but self-monitoring may not give the necessary and accurate results.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes, but that is where Jean's comment on the administration was wrong because the administration is automatically there at the agency end because the agencies have to monitor it. The extra monitoring that we would have to do would be a duplication. I was in Bangladesh once and I happened to be in the Oxfam office and there were 2 accountants who had been working there for 2 months who were working for the EU (European Union) to check on the grant that they had given on a particular project. The administration there is incredible.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We have to rely on trust with our agencies. I do not think any of them have ever let us down. I have never had any reason to think that they have.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that one of the reasons when choosing a recipient, is that you can trust them?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So it is another reason or aspect when you are choosing recipients. I asked you earlier what the criteria

is. It is trust.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

That is why we ask them, if they want to start with us, to go in with one of our agencies. So if ABC from somewhere wants to come we say to them: "Who is working in your area? Oxfam is working in your area. Go into it with Oxfam for 2 or 3 years." They will have proved to Oxfam that they are reliable, they are trustworthy, they do use the funds where they are supposed to be used and then that means that if they have been trustworthy for 3 years they will be trustworthy carrying on.

Mr. L. Crapp:

We hold Oxfam, in that particular instance, responsible; not the individual little agency.

The Connétable of Grouville:

But this would account for, for instance, a school you mentioned in Africa which you went to visit and you were not happy about the way the money was being used. Subsequently the people from that charity came to look for more money and you said: "No."

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We did not say no -- No, we did not say no, but we were very careful with the costings because they always seemed to be inflated. That is the biggest thing, ladies and gentlemen, that one has to watch. If people are poor they are going to ask for money, obviously they are, but you have to make sure that we are getting value for money for our taxpayer. I was told that when I die they are going to put it on my gravestone: "This woman knows the price of a bag of cement" because I always say: "How much does cement cost in your country?" because it always give you an idea of what the rest of the costs are.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just before we move on to Constable Yates' next question I just want to clarify how many smaller agencies have been successful in getting on to your bigger list as a result of tagging on to a bigger agency? How many since you have been president of the Overseas Aid Committee and Commission Chairman, could you say? Could you tell us how successful they have been?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I would say that we need notice of that question for actual numbers but I would say on average probably 2 or 3 come on to the list and also a couple go off the list.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Per annum?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes. When I was the executive officer I think we had something on average of 70 applications from new agencies every year. So we would only take 2 or 3 of those.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Would it be difficult for you just to backdate 5 or 8 years and give us some indication of how the list has evolved and the reasons it has evolved?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Well, the reasons we have already stated. If you want something new it has to be that you are working in an area where --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Names and dates really. Not now but you could perhaps forward us any information. Thank you.

Mrs. K. Filipponi:

Interestingly, we have just had one agency that has come on our books at the end of last year which was TB Alert and they had done, I think, about 5 years co-funding with Sue Ryder Care and Leprosy Mission. When we took them on they sent us all the relevant information on their agency. We also got back-up confirmation from the existing agency that they were working with that they were really happy with the way things were going and whether or not they would give that guarantee that they thought they would be suitable for us to take on board.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I think there is a question about emergency assistance. How does the JOAC prioritise applications for emergency assistance?

Mr. L. Crapp:

If it is an emergency it is an emergency.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

So it prioritises itself?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes, it prioritises itself if you like and subject to the thing matching it is a first come, first served basis. It still has to match up to the criteria. That is why we do not do deal very much with DEC (Disasters Emergency Committee) who only do really major emergencies and they take too long to get off the ground. By the time they get off the ground, other agencies are already working there.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It might be appropriate to touch on the Middle Eastern countries and the emergencies they had last year, last summer, at this point because you have already touched on it. That is an emergency you decided not to support. I understand probably but perhaps you could just explain.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Emergencies come, as we have said, as they happen; 3 for each emergency, up to £75,000 for each country. The one that came from the Lebanon, when we looked at the media and reports that we were getting, nobody could confirm that the aid was reaching where it was supposed to reach and we thought that if it was not -- you should not send aid unless it gets to where it is going for what it is needed.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

In addition, I think that funding had been withdrawn by a number of European Union countries.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I can accept your answer, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Does an emergency cease to be an emergency if it happens at the end of the financial year and all the funds are allocated?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, I do not know how we do it but so far we have always managed to end up with just enough to scrape through. It has been pure luck because things have happened on Boxing Day; one was the flood, the one before that was the mudslide - I do not know if you remember that one - and that happened on Boxing Day. I was beginning to dread Boxing Day after 2 like that and it just happened that we had a little bit left there and they were really chuffed because we had a little bit extra and we gave them the little bit extra as well.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is there any relationship, or have you considered any facility, with the Treasury in the event that an awful tragedy happening and you had allocated all your funding for that year of having an advance on the next year's budget? Have you considered that? Would you consider that?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Well, I would go knocking on the door before we got to that extent, I think.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

On whose door?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

On the States' door if it was a big one. We have done that before. It has been done in the past.

The Connétable of Grouville:

You have been to the States before for more funding, have you not?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes, if it has been a very big one we have gone to the States and said: "Can you give us money?"

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Would you expect that on account for next year or in addition to, Jacqui?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

In addition.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I want it on record, really.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

In addition.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

In addition, but would you expect it in addition to or would it be on account?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, I would want it in addition to.

The Connétable of Grouville:

We all live in hope [Laughter].

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Oh, the Kosovo vote. I am sorry. I was trying to think in my mind which one we had done like that and we had come to the States and asked for money. It was the Kosovo. Do you remember the Kosovo? We came back to the States and asked them for extra money and they gave it.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I was just looking at the next 2 questions. We have question 8 which is with reference to a scoring system which I think we can say no, as you have told us no. Is there anything, as in question 7, about the meetings held in London with the NGOs? We have heard quite a bit about this. Perhaps the members of panel might think of another question? Could members explain more about the nature of these meetings and what function they perform in the aid allocation process? I think I have heard quite a bit.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I am happy with that. I am happy with the explanation.

Mr. L. Crapp:

What I would say is we certainly gain more information and sometimes having read the application you come to a provisional marking on it. You say: "Right, this is what I want to do" and when you get more details of it, you may not want to do it and vice versa so it is a very useful meeting.

The Connétable of Grouville:

In these meetings, do you ever meet the actual recipients? Do they bring them along or is it purely dealing with the agency as such?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

We have met with people who have been involved directly in the field. For example, I think at the last meeting Mission Aviation brought along a pilot who was flying to very remote areas taking in essential supplies. It was very interesting to get a first hand account of how Jersey's money had helped them to create an airstrip.

Mr. L. Crapp:

The actual recipient, the answer is probably: "No" because if you think we are helping the poor, there is no way they are going to travel.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What percentage of the Overseas Aid budget would you allocate at that London meeting?

Mrs. K. Filipponi:

Grant aid is about 85 per cent of the overall budget.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

It all goes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You like to keep 15 per cent back for emergency aid, do I assume that?

Mrs. K Filippini:

No, 10 per cent is our emergencies now.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We brought it down to 10. If we needed it to, we get money back from agencies. You cannot be rigid. You have to be flexible because what is happening in the world? You cannot be rigid.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But you have to go to London with a vision of how much you want to allocate and you are looking at 85 per cent, is that right?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes, that is correct.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, okay. So you have your buffer of 15 per cent which pays for your local projects and emergencies. Is that about right?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What would you say to those, and there may be and I suspect there is, that have accused the commission at those London meetings of having favoured recipients?

Mr. K. Syvret:

One against the other, do you mean?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Consistently favoured agencies.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We do not. We really do not.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

How can you satisfy those that are making that accusation?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I can tell you what has happened in the past because it is a question of the quality of the project and it is purely on the project. You do find that some agencies will suddenly find they give you a whole whack of very good projects and you want to do them. Another one, they keep on falling down on all the other things. British Red Cross came one year and complained and said: "Why have we only had £50,000 and Oxfam had £200,000?" or something like that. I just said: "Because you do not give us the quality projects that we need." They came back the following year with totally different projects and they ended up with about £120,000 and if Oxfam receive, shall we say, £300,000 or £400,000 one year they might end up by receiving only £100,000 the next. It is purely on the projects.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes. Right.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I will just pick up on what Mr. Crapp said. One year Red Cross came to us with a request to buy an office for them in India and to buy all the equipment and everything else and we had to say to ourselves: "How are we eliminating poverty by buying offices and computers and everything else?" This is what the decision is. Is it a good project?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thanks. It is a question that we want to put in the public arena.

Mr. K. Syvret:

Project focus, was it?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes. What time are we due to finish this session?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

12.00 Noon.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay, we are doing fine. Perhaps, are you happy, gentlemen, with the criteria and the way that the grants are allocated? Are we finished with that?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

We are, yes. We have gone through that, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes? You are happy.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

The 3-year programme, perhaps?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, we understand the commission has evolved its policy with regards to block funding. Can you tell us a bit about that?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

The 3-year one, we have started this. This is new. Obviously, we are watching it very closely to make sure it is working and some years we allow 10 agencies to put forward 3-year projects and again, it depends on what they are asking for for the 3 years. Some years some of them will be excellent. If they are, we try and fund them all and if they are not we do not. Again, it depends on the project. I mean, dare I say, Mr. Chairman, Senator Perchard, if we had double the amount of money we could go in for 5-year projects. We could go in for projects which are worth half a million, or £750,000. We would have no trouble spending any extra money with very little extra admin because we would just increase the amount of the grant and the length of the time of the grant.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What are the advantages as you see it with a block support of 3 years or extended support? Why is the commission moving in that direction?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

There are still a lot that are done in a year. If you talk about wellness clinics, sanitation, toilet blocks, they can all be done in a year. Schools. But some take longer to do. They take longer to put their infrastructure up and they need 3 years or even longer, sometimes, to do it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What type of project? You say you can have different projects. What is it, specifically, that needs a longer period? Is it because they are bigger projects? Or complicated projects? What is it?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Most of our one-year projects are really part of a much bigger scene as far as the agency is concerned

but then we say: “Right, you will be funding the water in this particular area and it consists of 5 villages or whatever.” They may, in fact, be doing 200 villages but our project is that much. So, with a 3-year programme it may be that by only doing water, they are doing health, they are doing education. Again, we have this part funding. So, what we have to be very careful of and tell the agencies is that we want whatever we are doing to be clearly identifiable and some of these projects that come in, you cannot really say: “Which is the Jersey part?” So, if you cannot tell us what the Jersey part is, we will not fund it. So, that is important.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that a disadvantage for the 3-year project?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Sorry?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that possibly a disadvantage with the 3-year block funding?

Mr. L. Crapp:

This is what we would prefer, something where we are financing the whole lot ourselves. I mean, there are some which are like that or we are doing it with the agency itself but the agency is putting cash in. We do not do salaries because once you become caught on salaries it goes year on, year on, year on. So, the agencies pick up the salary costs and they find funding for that. So, we have to have something which is definable.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

How do you balance the requests from agencies for a one-year project as a 3-year project? Do you find that conflicts? It must be another conundrum that you have to wrestle with when allocating funds?

Mr. L. Crapp:

Not really because we normally say we are going to do 3 3-year projects, like we normally do. But sometimes, as Jacqui say, there are such excellent projects that come along that you say: “Well, this is so good we want to do it.” So, we will do it. The committee does not work to a rigid discipline. They keep their flexibility which is so important on all these things.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is it widely known that you generally plan to do 3 3-year projects, or is it just a sort of in-house rule?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

That is more in-house.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I do not know if it is in the book or not, because what we do with the 10 is, people who do not have a project funded within 3 years come off the list and then we ask other agencies to come on.

The Connétable of Grouville:

You say you have flexibility within the organisation and that, I think, is commendable. But have you flexibility to the extent where you would say: "Okay, we allocate 10 per cent for emergency relief that would take up part of your 10 per cent to use it for a really, really good project?"

Mr. L. Crapp:

No.

The Connétable of Grouville:

No, you would not?

Mr. L. Crapp:

We would only take money from the emergency relief for grant aid when it has not used its budget because it is a most difficult thing to do. I mean, I suggested one year that -- I think it was August or July, that the committee reconsider the amounts it was giving and the number of agencies because we had a pot of money in the Emergency and Disasters Reserve because there had been no real disasters and that August and September, virtually all hell broke loose.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I do not want to move off the 3 years --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I was just looking ahead.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, I do not really want that just yet.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Question 10 is about 3 years.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, that is fine. Carry on.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

We heard a bit about your 3-year project and the next question is, does Jersey Overseas Aid Commission monitor the sustainability of any of the projects it funds, for example, by asking the NGOs for a report 3 years on?

Mr. L. Crapp:

The answer to that is no. You have to think of the number of projects we are dealing with but that does not mean to say we do not receive follow-up. First of all, you have the sustainability and once you have built a well, anyway, what is your follow-up report going to be? “Yes, it is still there and it is still functioning.” But you receive reports by people turning around and saying: “This clinic is now doing so much.” They just volunteer this information to you. But no, we do not check back on all these others. I mean, it would be quite an administrative job to do that.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Would it be possible to just say: “How is it getting on?”

Mr. K. Syvret:

We do not do it in a formal manner but reading through the applications from time to time, part of the reasons they put for the applications is: “You would recall that 3 years ago, or 5 years ago, you helped us with this project. We are now moving to another area, doing the same project, because that one was so successful.” The beauty of the London meetings, in many respects, is that you are face-to-face with these people. You have helped them in the past and you can put to them and say: “Well, we funded this one 3 years ago. What is the position now?” They will volunteer it, in many cases. Where it has been successful they will certainly volunteer it. We know these people. We remember them. We know their faces, in many cases, and so we can put it to them. But, as Les said, as for having a formal report back, I think it was Jean Le Maistre, when he was here, raised this very point that if we could do 5-year projects and even longer projects then we could appoint someone within the Island who would be a sort of ambassador - I think he used the word ambassador - who would go around and look at these projects. You would need to find somebody who would be able to do it, but that is not the point. I think the cost there, for an island of our size, would be prohibitive. Our money goes directly where it is needed and not in administration and I think we would be facing criticism if we did have someone, frankly, going around the world, even if only for a month or so, going around looking at the various projects. It would not be money well spent.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I do know the commission prides itself, and Jacqui mentioned it in her opening address, that you have very low administration. Tell me, we have had quite a lot of submissions that have said that they would

prefer Jersey's overseas aid policy to focus more on longer-term development with the view to try and not only provide short-term necessities but an economic structure that would require a 3 or a 5-year program. So, less projects but more intensively supported. Do you accept that as a valid criticism and would the commission consider moving in that direction?

Mr. K. Syvret:

They were all suggested in one area so there would be identifiable to the Island, I thought.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

There are various reasons as to why they wanted it but the word "scattergun" has been mentioned during our review. Less scattergun and more focused longer term - the word "sustainable" is usually tagged in there - development of areas. They were asking the commission to consider that as a viable way forward. What is the commission's view?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

It is a good question but if you give it all to one area it then causes a lot of bad feeling up the road.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Up which road?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Next door, you know. [Laughter]

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So sorry.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Not Hill Street?

The Connétable of Grouville:

I do not know which road we are up these days. [Laughter]

Deputy J.J. Huet:

This is the idea of being fair and not just giving it to one. But if you could get us a load more money, 5 years would be brilliant to do in larger amounts. It would be fantastic.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

How do you, as the commission - and you are the body - make an assessment that the scattergun

approach to aid as opposed to the intensively targeted approach to aid, why can you not make assessment that one will make more of a difference, do more good? Surely you should be driven by the option that will make a bigger difference?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We have asked the agencies this year, or last year, to - but they have to be very careful here because we do run into problems - do family planning because, well, Mrs. Roberts and I obviously both feel quite strongly about family planning and when I see in Africa that a lot of women have 8 children -- Kenya has managed to reduce theirs down to 5 because they have gone in for family planning. So, we have said to the agencies, we would really like you to put some family planning in your clinics because we know the demand is there. But the agencies are the ones that know where the poverty is. Not us. So, again, you have to trust your agencies. They come to you where they think the need is greatest. Do you have anything to add to that?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

No, I agree with that. I mean, I do not absolutely accept that it is a scattergun approach because I think we are very clear on the sort of projects that we want to become involved with. I have something here from the Brandt Commission and I know that has been mentioned and it is a basic development model and I think this is the model which we want to follow which is, food brings satisfaction, housing brings stability, health brings security, education brings opportunity and income brings sustained development. I think those are the principles by which we are guided when we determine whether or not to make a grant. I think, again, we also have to have maximum flexibility and we have to accept that the commission has to evolve. We have to look at other alternatives and, yes, I think as Jacqui said, we could go to more 3-year projects, more 5-year projects. But at the moment I think we have a very balanced approach to the way we use the aid grants which we have.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you. Silva?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

If I could cast my mind back a couple of days, I think the question arose where a one-year project might give you a clean water supply whereas a 3-year project may give you a clean water supply, maybe access to a clinic and also a bit of economic development which provided income and from income you then have the ability to self-help. I think that was the terms that we were talking about a couple of days ago. It is much as self-help as helping people to develop their own livelihoods, their own communities.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We are into it in a big way, into income generation. No one seems to have picked it up.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

Micro loans and that, we have a number of projects.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

This is interesting to us. You know, from what we have been talking about these last couple of days, it would tend to assume that a scattergun approach with small amounts widely spread around the world is not probably going to do the core thing of trying to get people on their feet.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I think you have to look at it in another way. I have been out there and if I was a woman there and I had a well that then gets put up close to my home where I live and instead of spending 5 hours a day going to collect water I can spend an hour a day, that leaves me with 4 hours a day to help educate my children and to grow my crops. Though one can say a scattergun, one cannot live without water. Water is the most important thing in the world and anything that can bring water to people has to be good.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Mrs. Roberts has gone on record as saying, as you completely refute, that there is a scattergun approach and that you are constantly monitoring the way that you allocate aid and I think that is all you need to say, really.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Can I just say --

Mr. K. Syvret:

You do not really want to work in a box, though. If ideas are coming out, and that is the whole purpose of this, really, to see if we are missing any ideas, whether people out there think there are other things we could look at. Certainly, we can initiate a debate between ourselves and look at a way, perhaps, of funding a small area with a larger amount and I think this is where some people would like us to focus. People are very keen, for example, that work be done in Kenya. Well, fair enough. We can look at that but we must look at the context of the thing in the whole. So, there is no question, we can debate it. There is no problem about it and we may even come to the same conclusion as they.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Can I just also comment because we do that in part because sometimes the agencies will come to us for a specific part of a large programme and to try and get our funding on board. Once they have this funding on board, it then unlocks money from EU and other things. So, they are very much -- it is not scattergun. Some of this is sniper fire. It is very targeted.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can you tell us how that sort of triggers the unlocking of other funds? That is interesting.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Because the EU may grant money but it only to be used, shall we say, on personnel. They will pay the nurses, they will do this, that and the other. This is not necessarily true, what I am saying, I am giving you an example, right? That is fine. You may have the building, and you may have that, but then you do not have any equipment and so they will come to us and say: "Can you get the equipment on? Can you take on the equipment?" If we take on the equipment then the project goes ahead. But very often they are looking at different sources all the time for funding. They know we will not do salaries so they go to other places for salaries and it works like that. So, it is sometimes amazing what our funding does to the agency.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Connétable?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Just looking ahead to a question at 11, which I think we are sort of half going into now which is - and I do not really want to --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I will just --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I have a few questions and time is sort of pushing on.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, these are questions. I will remind the panel that these questions are guidelines prepared by me and my 2 officers.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I do not quite understand the question. "Many larger bilateral donor agencies focus their assistance on a few countries and certain key issues such as AIDS (Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome) and therefore HIV AIDS." Has the Jersey Overseas Aid considered a greater focus on a limited number of countries and/or sectors? This could lead to greater association and identification between specific chosen countries and Jersey. What is a larger bilateral donor agency, please?

Mr. K. Syvret:

We did not know it was a question.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Perhaps you could explain the question and then we could answer it?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, I would like to explain. The Connétable is absolutely right, we have covered half of it about sustainable targeting and longer term, but we are also looking at specific causes. In fact, HIV and AIDS and water, particularly, sanitation, should we be developing a block policy on targeting specific needs rather than specific countries?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I think that has been answered by the President, with respect. We have said: "Right, it is what comes to us from the agencies."

Mr. K. Syvret:

The agencies, to a large degree, choose that for us because they can -- there are agencies that particularly target little children. So, by going into that area and helping that particular agency we are helping children and I think this is the point of the question here. Also, there are agencies that deal purely with women, promoting the position of women within the home and it certainly needs it in Africa from time to time. So, by supporting that agency, for example, then we are targeting that area. I am not saying the question is wrong at all. I think it is another point that we must consider. I am glad these things are coming up because that is something to think about as well. But through the wide range of agencies we have, with each one with their own focus area, for example, we are answering the question to some degree. Not wholly, I agree, but to some degree. But the point I made here when I was reading the question is that we do not do it for focus, really, or for kudos. We help for need. We look for need rather than recognition.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Would you like to go on to question 11, Connétable?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Did you want to do question 11?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Well, that really was question 11.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, that was 10.

Senator J.L. Perchard

I just want to be clear before we move off the subject that we have explored the areas with regards to the targeting of aid, the block targeting of aid, and the dilemma it causes the commission and I think we have had clarity from you there.

Mr. L. Crapp:

It does cover a very wide range because, whereas we say the outcomes and something might benefit 1,000 people, we would still look at situations like the deaf-blind. Now, you may get 1,000 deaf-blind people and that, on an individual basis, is much more expensive but that does not mean to say that the commission will not help them because the commission does.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Before moving on to the general aid budgets Jersey provides the commission, I want to talk turkey really with regards the ability of the commission itself, the makeup of the commission, to make these decisions. Are you suitably qualified? Did you get enough advice from people in the field? What skills does the commission need, and do you have them?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I believe I have a dream team. Full stop. I have a banker, a lawyer and an accountant and I have 3 people who have dealt with overseas aid for a long time and myself and 2 of my commissioners have all been on overseas aid projects. So, it is not for lack of experience in the field. My banker accounts for, what is the word? Accountability? Not accountability.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

Due diligence, and you really know your customer, know the agency that you are dealing with.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I will quote a case on that, Senator Perchard. One of the agencies wanted us to supply ambulances, which was fine. That is like a mobile clinic. Great. Then it was brought up: "What are you going to do with these ambulances once the project has finished?" The answer was: "We are going to give them to the Government." Now, I am no longer in banking and my other colleagues are not in banking but my banker that was in banking said: "You cannot do that. We are not allowed to give to that country at the

moment. There is a clause against them.” Now, we would not have known that, Senator Perchard, without having a banker on board. We then had Mr. Crapp, as the accountant, query some of the accounts from the agencies saying that somebody like Oxfam has shops that are run by volunteers so how can they get 24 per cent but spend 23 per cent on the running of the shop? That is, to us, not good management of funds but it is an accountant that picks that up and would ask those questions. Then I have the legal mind, and I have always said I have Mr. Syvret because he has been on board as a member and he has a brain and we need brains at the end of the day. **[Laughter]**

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Very useful, a brain. **[Laughter]**

Deputy J.J. Huet:

So, that is why I think I am very lucky with the team and I think between them we all seem to know an awful lot of people who we can always rely on, or call on. But I think we cover -- I mean, you could have 100 people and you might not have it but you have to have people that will make a decision. It is harder to say no than it is to say yes. So, we need clear-headed people.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What do you say to one of the submissions that says that the commission needs people who understand international development and are in tune with the basic knowledge such as the UN millennium goals? What do you say to that?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Well, the UN --

Mrs. T. Roberts:

We have copies of those documents. Certainly, they are very interesting documents. There was nothing in those documents that came as any surprise to any member of the commission because, I think, of our involvement with charitable development over many, many years. I think if you have lay people here who are totally unbiased, we do not come to the commission with a view as to whether aid should be given to a specific area. We come with an unbiased view when we look at applications and projects and I think that is extremely important.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So, you do not have any comment to make on that remark, or do you refute it?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think the people on the commission have the qualities necessary to be able to make the decisions which

they make.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you very much.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Can I just make 2 comments? One, I think experience of going on one of the work parties would be immense for commissioners. The other is, I think what we possibly lack at the moment, but I do not know if we need it, is medical advice. I think if one was going into a £500,000 project it could well be that the commissioners might wish to co-opt someone from the medical profession on a voluntarily basis.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I have to say that we have been extremely lucky with our doctors so far over here. They give a lot of their time free because, again, they are doctors who have been on overseas aid trips and believe in it and that is their way of repaying it back. They give their time to giving injections and to give talks to our volunteers and so forth and that is done voluntarily.

Mr. K. Syvret:

I think it is important to say that the commissioners that are on board now, and Leslie is on board as well, we all came without an agenda and that is terribly important that we come on to the commission without an agenda.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What mechanisms has the commission in place to regenerate and replace?

Mr. K. Syvret:

That is in within the law. I am doing a 2-year stint. Les has just finished a one-year and Toni does a 3-year. So, I am in my last year now.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

It rolls over.

Mr. K. Syvret:

It rolls over, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Okay. Anything else on the constitution of the commission? No?

The Connétable of Grouville:

I was just going to suggest that if Dr. Michael Marks would be locating himself down to Africa we might give him the money to give -- **[Laughter]**

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Well, he has offered while is down there to look into certain things. We never refuse any good offers.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Let us move on to the States voted budget and the proposals from the commission to the Council of Ministers which, I believe they are discussing tomorrow and ask you for an opinion on these many, many submissions and the well-known view that Jersey should be looking at 0.7 per cent of its GNI (Gross National Income) as its overseas aid contribution. Firstly, can you give us your opinion on that?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I think I did in this submission here, saying: "Well, we could use it." I mean, there has never ever been any doubt about it being able to be used. Not at all. I mean, we worked out if we had it how much staff we would need. We would need one extra person on staff. There is never a shortage of good projects for funding. We could always then increase, as I said before, to 3 years and 5 years to sort of half a million projects instead of £65,000 or £150,000. So, there are no problems about spending it. It is how the public -- you have to take the public with you. I know that people think it should be there but I do not think you can go there immediately. This money has to come from taxes. As I said, I think you have to take the public with you and I think the public, myself, would have a heart attack if you said tomorrow that you were going to put another £15 million into overseas aid.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Silva?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

When do you think it will happen, Jacqui?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

My preference - but that is just my preference and I am just one of the 6 - I worked out that if we had £500,000 a year and it was covered by cost of living - they normally do them for a 5 year sort of stint - then to me you would stand more chance of catching up. If it could be done maybe on a percentage like that over a 15-year period and roll it up that we are up there by 15 years, in 15 years' time.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I think your accountant might say that it could not be achieved in 15 years at that rate.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Probably not because things would have moved on so much. You do not know what other GNIs are or what our GNI is going to be.

The Connétable of Grouville:

There seems to be some discussion whether we are using the 0.7 per cent of GNI or the 2.4 per cent of taxation revenue.

Mr. L. Crapp:

The States' policy is taxation, not GNI. Someone else has mentioned GNI.

The Connétable of Grouville:

That is all very well, the 2.4 per cent, but what happens if tax revenues drop? What is your view on that?

Mr. L. Crapp:

My view is that, at the end of the day, although you should be giving something for Third World countries as a normal part you also have to take into account what you can afford, but there should be a certain amount which you do because, you know, someone who is on the same income as someone who has no children or someone has far more surplus cash than someone who has 2 children and one of them is handicapped. So, you have a situation with the States that it has to sort out its priorities and build in some surplus then it can certainly afford more. Now, the only way we are going to have that surplus is to increase taxation and that is the way your -- 2.4 per cent is going to come up. Now, you compare with Luxembourg - this is on the internet - the main taxes are income tax, municipal business tax on profits, wealth tax, VAT, capital gains tax. Their social security payments are 16.8 per cent for the employee. Taxation for a married man with 2 children once they earn up to - it is graduated clearly - and once they are earning £82,000 they are paying 38 per cent. You have a withholding tax of 20 per cent. No one has mentioned these figures that I am giving now. There is even the wealth tax is 0.5 per cent of your net asset value.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

On an annual basis.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Is that in France?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, Luxembourg.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Luxembourg, which you might be pleased to hear is it is based on the 1940 values of land and farms which in 1940 were probably valueless. **[Laughter]** But, I mean, it is highly taxed so, they have surplus.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

We had the Treasury Minister in yesterday and he took us through - some of the submissions that we have had are concerned as to why the Overseas Aid Commission would be pedalling the Treasury line on thrift and prudence with regards to taxation and not pedalling their own targets of increasing aid. There have been submissions that have suggested that you are doing the Treasury's work here. Do you accept that?

Mr. K. Syvret:

I can understand the reasoning behind that, to some degree.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But do you accept that?

Mr. K. Syvret:

No, I do not. No, I do not. Sorry.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That is fine.

Mr. K. Syvret:

Because politics is the art of the achievable and you must know that, and if we go and ask for £21 million, you know and I know and we all know that we will not get it. You know Derek Maltwood well, we meet on a regular basis, and he says: "Slowly, slowly catch your monkey." He is always saying that to me: "Ken, slowly, slowly catch your monkey." There are ways in which you can achieve your ends but there are ways that you can destroy it at a stroke and I think this is one of the worries which we have - I am speaking for the others as well - is that it is very easy to write a letter, - our Rector has written a letter in support saying: "I want to see 0.7." - But, you know, you cannot turn around to the people in 2009 and say: "Look we are going to put aside £x" before we do anything else, because our budget comes before anything else, we are very fortunate in that we are able to achieve it. To say: "Well, before you vote any money, £21 million is set aside for overseas aid." It is not the achievable. So, we

have to be responsible in 2 areas. We have to be responsible in the way which we allocate the money and we have to be extremely responsible in the way we request the money in order that it is in such a balanced way that those who are not necessarily great supporters of overseas aid see the argument that we are making and the reasoning behind our request so that we can achieve it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The point is there is a very powerful letter written to the *JEP (Jersey Evening Post)* with a lot of signatories which I am sure you probably have on your file. They want the commission and the States of Jersey to make a target for reaching the UN standard and they want you to pin a date to it. The question I ask you, and you refute it, is is the commission being too conservative and not being bullish enough? You have explained that you want a slowly, slowly catch a monkey.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I have the ones from 2002, from all the individuals, and a lot of them, I have to say, they do not say “immediately”. They say “gradually”. So, they are not saying -- I know they keep saying: “Well, this is the list of people that say” but they are not saying that this is the list of people that say “gradually”. It is coming over as the impression that this is the list of people who are saying “immediately” and that is not true.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I do have to come in here on the 0.7 per cent point because we have a list of countries here, on paper, who are giving more than we are percentage-wise but at the same time there is also a question of trade aid. How much of out-of-date medicines are being exported? How much dried milk that is surplus to requirements? How much old tins of bully beef, or whatever, are being included in that figure which we, obviously, without a manufacturing base cannot do anything to help with unless they want to take 500 tonnes of Jersey potatoes in May or June. But the figures are slanted, in my opinion. I do not agree with them and I am glad that you are taking a conservative view of achieving 0.7 per cent in a very short period of time. It is not going to happen, obviously, and I think you are quite realistic in that. But I would not trust these figures to be completely accurate.

Mr. K. Syvret:

They are putting their own valuation and I gladly raise the point, they are putting their own valuation on things which are sent over, let us say, the dried milk, for example, and things like that, ours is wholly money from our pocket. Wholly money from our pocket.

The Connétable of Grouville:

It would have been dumped, in other words.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

This question, I think, is directed at Mr. Crapp. All the figures we have been looking at comparing country for country by the GNI and we see that Luxembourg is a very, very highly taxed country and we are comparatively very, very low. Do you think the GNI is a fair comparison with which to construct a league table? I think this is quite important from your point view and perhaps you might sort of like to think about this and give us a --

Mr. L. Crapp:

If I could refer you to my personal submission where I do not believe in the league table. I was pointing out that you have a GNI which -- it takes lots of estimates to get to this GNI, but you have somewhere where we are going to have -- we are a low tax area. Only a very small proportion of our GNI is going to be going to the Government because a lot of the stuff we are not taxing. So, when you start taking the 0.7 of the GNI, you are taking proportionately a lot more of your taxation revenue out and it is a taxation revenue which Government runs its country or, in this case, the Island. So, it is going to be a disproportionate load on the Jersey taxpayer compared with someone in the higher tax area. Do you follow that?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes. In answer to my question, the GNI is not a fair comparison when you are comparing Jersey with Denmark or Jersey with Luxembourg?

Mr. L. Crapp:

No. I think you have to look at how much of that GNI goes to the Government before that Government can pay out money to Third World countries.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

But the GNI league table is not a fair comparison?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I do not think there is any perfect system. One of the other things is your GNI figures come out very late and, as I say, they are based on estimates. I prefer to go down the taxation route because a taxation route is measurable. You have the States' accounts coming out and you know definitely what the figure is and how the money can be based. So, I very much favour the taxation way to base the grant to Overseas Aid.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Yes, thank you.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But, of course, you recognise there will always be people that compare Jersey's contribution to GNI.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Yes, well if the taxation revenue is increased, and I am not saying from which source, but if that was increased, then perhaps you could go to I think a 4.2 per cent in my letter which is almost equivalent to the 0.7 of GNI.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Mr. Crapp will know that there was some confusion and we have been in correspondence as to the Overseas Aid's final terms of reference with regards to the States' policy on GNI. The Strategic Plan which I am holding in front of me, approved by the States of Jersey at the end of last year, under 5.2: "Continued development of the Island's international constitutional position and international profile indicated by overseas aid as a percentage of GNI." That is the policy of the States at the moment.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Has that been adopted as such?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes. This was the policy for the States of Jersey as approved in the Strategic Plan in the autumn of last year. So, we have a contradiction here which we need to iron out. Whatever the policy is, this is what, when I drafted my terms of reference for this review, made reference to. But we are happy to concede the point you made in our correspondence and withdraw it because it did not serve any purpose not to. But there is a conflict of policy. So, it is something we will highlight in our review and the commission will have to deal with, I suspect, as to what the policy is.

Mr. L. Crapp:

But if the States were to adopt that sort of policy, I still favour the means of achieving that would be to have your contribution measured as you are building up to it as taxation because that is something from a governmental point of view you can understand? That you are suddenly -- if you are trying to work in a bit of vacuum and do not know what the 0.7 is until you are half way through the year, it comes as a bit of a blow.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The commission have no real urge to meet this 0.7 target, to say that the Jersey Overseas Aid Commission contributes 0.7 of GNI? You do not see it as a priority? It is not important?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I would rather they achieve their 2.4 as soon as possible after 2008. It has not done that and the point is, we need to do it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Deputy, do you have anything on that?

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think, first of all, we have to ask the question whether or not in fact the 0.7 is going to be achievable by the UN because, in fact, most countries which have committed to this 0.7 per cent, their aid has dropped over the last 5 years. It has gone down from 0.35 to 0.21. So, one has to ask oneself whether or not that itself is achievable. Should Jersey do it? I think, probably, long term Jersey should do it. I think, you know, the debate is the period the time in which Jersey should be able to achieve a higher level of grant aid and I think I would agree with Jacqui. If you are going to go out you probably should go out at least over a 10 or 15-year period to be able to attain that level of grant aid.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I am relieved we are not being bombarded with: "Make it 0.7 or I will scream." I think it is very realistic approach and I commend that.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I just want to come up on what we have been discussing this last 3 or 4 minutes, or 5 minutes, and you realise that this 0.7 GNI is not going to happen within the next year or 2 or 3 or 5?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I would love to think that there was a fairy godmother but if I am very practical, which I think I am, I do not think so.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I think we have to sort of accept that it is not going to happen.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

That is going to upset some people.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It is going to put the figure up to £22 million and we just do not have the dough. I sort of picked up on a couple of things here and with the - it has been a very useful session because yesterday and the day before and today we have been talking to the Oxfam people, we have been talking to Side by Side and a couple of things came up and the pound for pound, I believe there is a capping on this at £3,500 at the

moment. Is that correct?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

That is correct. When that was put in for that -- I am going to let Mr. Syvret answer that one, when the £3,500 --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Just confirming, because I am a little naïve about --

Deputy J.J. Huet:

No, it was just to explain it.

Mr. K. Syvret:

I think our policy or our thoughts there were, yes, we do want to help them and at the time we set it at £3,500. It might have been an arbitrary figure but we set it at £3,500. I have a personal view that if you set yourself up as a fundraiser then you fundraise. You do not go to someone else and say: "Look, I want to raise funds to do this. It is a lovely idea. I want to do it but we need a bit of money to do it." So, if people set themselves up as fundraisers they must do their fundraising. But we understand that their purposes are the same, to a large degree, as ours and for which we have been given the responsibility of allocating money. So, we put £3,500 so if they raise £3,500 we would match the £3,500.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It is not a lot of money, though, is it?

Mr. K. Syvret:

It is not a lot of money, I agree.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

If I could continue --

Mr. K. Syvret:

So, I think it is another thing which perhaps we could review.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We will review it annually, I think.

Mr. K. Syvret:

It is not set in stone.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Can I say that it is an encouragement and, I mean, Help an African School Child several years ago was really looking and saying: "You should be supporting us more and more." I said: "We are just going to do this much and no more." So, they went out and fundraised and what a marvellous lot of fundraising they do and that is what it is. It just encourages people. We do not want to do the fundraising, you know, give them the money to stop them fundraising, and he has so many people involved.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am impressed with the sort of stature of the various people who have been in to see us and we were talking about Christian Aid and we have been talking about Oxfam and the way they raise a lot of money and they send it off to Oxfam UK and they say: "Thank you very much." But they do not have any feedback. They do not have any cause for satisfaction or celebration. So, they go out the next year and they do it again and they still do not get any feedback or cause for satisfaction or celebration. During the course of 2 or 3 days we have been doing this now, I was thinking -- you have a note in the Grant Aid Executive Summary, page 3, third bullet point, in regard to selection of agencies projects clearly defined and appropriate priority criteria et cetera, et cetera, and then it says: "However, within these guidelines we believe that the committee could have additional regard for agencies and issues which require support within the Island This could enhance the committee's accountability and its constituency promote the development and encourage fundraising by Jersey groups." I am impressed with the amount of money that these local agencies raise. I am sure, in fact, that they would like to be involved with the Overseas Aid Commission and I am sure that if they raised £50,000 you would put £50,000 on top of that and take that to Oxfam/Christian Aid as your and their joint donation and that yesterday seemed to be a good idea.

Mr. L. Crapp:

Then they would have --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

They would have the involvement of Oxfam. They would have the involvement on the ground in Kenya.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

What would it be spent on? I am sorry, I am a bit lost here. You have now got £50,000. Would we be allowed to say what it would be spent on?

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Of course.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Right. Okay, I am listening to you, but nobody has ever suggested that to us, ever.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I think the problem would be with the agency.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It must be Oxfam.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I would have thought if Oxfam --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It must be Christian Aid. It might be --

Mr. L. Crapp:

No. No, but what I am saying is that if you take Oxfam, just as an example, you have a Jersey branch of Oxfam. Now, Oxfam would, I doubt, allow a local branch to raise funds to do it in that way where they would lose control.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

They do that. But I am not saying that they --

Mr. L. Crapp:

I think that picture -- I mean, I was a founding member of the Jersey branch of Save the Children and, you know, there is no way we could do anything like that. Everything had to go to the UK.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am not suggesting that it did not go to the UK. You would have it, you would match the fund, take it to the UK, and give it to Oxfam.

The Connétable of Grouville:

We did discuss this earlier, I think. Mrs. Roberts said that she was working on the co-ordination of Oxfam, both ends, with the Overseas Aid Commission and obviously linking in with what you were saying. I think that might all come together at the same time.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

No, it is just, basically, it seemed like a jolly good idea yesterday, that is all.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Connétable Yates has set the background. Can I ask the question? Do the commission have a role to play supporting local fundraisers?

Mr. K. Syvret:

I think we have in that we can give them moral support. For example, when they bring someone over from the Oxfam or diabetes or whatever, we occasionally get an invitation to go along a meet the person involved and that we do, from time to time. We can encourage them that way. I take the point that Constable Yates is making that the problem which may arise - though I am not saying it will - is that the local people, having raised the money, may want some input as to how and where it is spent and that, I think, is a matter which we raised yesterday about the information passing from headquarters in the mainland - and we touched on it this morning - to the local branch. We do not want to be piggy-in-the-middle having one arguing it should be spent in Africa and another one arguing that it should be spent in India. So, those would have to be resolved between them but, I take the point that you are making you could increase the amount.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Try and ask a question, Silva.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am just trying to think. The submission yesterday said that they had no involvement with where the money was spent. They did not know where the money was spent.

Mr. K. Syvret:

They send the money wholly to there, yes, at the moment but if it comes via us then they may well --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

They would like to know where the money was spent.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

They should ask them. I cannot understand why they do not ask them. I would be asking somebody, if I had given them £50,000, where they had spent it.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I think that you cannot have the tail wagging the dog and, I mean, Oxfam has its own overheads and

everything else to meet. So, it is, to my mind, something for them and I do not feel that JOA (Jersey Overseas Aid) should really become involved in their local politics, basically. But, if there was to be a situation, as you suggested, then I think the commission should consider it.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It might be worth investigating.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Will the commission, in its annual review of its policies, consider upping the £3,500 limit and, secondly, will it consider allowing for block support as we have discussed earlier to locally driven projects?

The Connétable of Grouville:

What we are saying, if a local charity raises £50,000, finds a project somewhere and then comes to you and says: "We need £100,000, if we give you the £50,000, would you --"

Deputy J.J. Huet:

They are not an international agency, are they? I mean, Oxfam is. That is why we do it with Oxfam.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes. Jacqui, under your current policy you are not inclined to do that. My question was, would you in your annual review consider this driving request from some very active local fundraising agencies that do more than fundraise? They go and deliver and some of them are very successful. Will the commission in its annual review of its policies consider the request from what seems to be some very credible local initiatives?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We will always consider it.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

I think everything would always be considered. I mean, I think they would have to write a paper on it and submit the paper and I think then the commission would look at it.

Mr. K. Syvret:

I do not see any reason why not. I am sure --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just to get you to say that you are happy to look at it?

Mr. K. Syvret:

Let us see suggestions and we can either accept it or reject it.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

We have not received any so far.

Mr. K. Syvret:

Or amend it slightly, but they all meet the same rigorous questioning that we have for the other agencies. It is as simple as that. Absolutely.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But as we have re-established, currently your policies do not allow you to do that?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

It has not come up. They have never approached us to do that, so it does not come up.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I do not think we are prohibited.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

It is a new idea?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I do not think they are prohibited.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, just one at a time for the tape.

Mr. L. Crapp:

I do not think they are prohibited. I think that the commission could do it but no proposal as such has come forth.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you. I think we have covered that pretty well. We are fast running out of time but I would just like to cover one little point with you before we close, if that is okay, Jacqui? That is about your community work projects which is only a fraction of your budget, but just tell us about them and why you value them so highly?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

It is only a fraction of our budget but I have to say that it takes up the most time. It really does. It takes up more time than all the commissioners put together because you have to make sure everybody has medicals, references, they have to be interviewed, leaders have to be chosen, they have to have workshops and it is very time consuming work. But I do not think it can ever be -- of course, it would be cheaper to send 2 people, but that is not the idea. The idea is to involve the Island of Jersey and that is why I, myself, believe that Overseas Aid is so successful in Jersey because nearly every family in Jersey has sent somebody on an overseas aid project and when the kiddies come home or the older persons come home, there is no age bar on it, they involve the whole family. So, we are now going through -- I have people -- somebody rang me up last night saying: "Can my niece come with you?" I said: "How old is she?" And he said: "Well, 17." I said: "Well, she has to be 18." Now, that whole family -- and this why I think Jersey is so good with fundraising because all those people are involved.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Have been touched?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Involving the Island of Jersey, you said, and yet you draw the line at involving the Island of Jersey to community projects and not extending some of the very good fundraising initiatives and delivery of aid that Jersey projects have. Can you justify why you make a distinction there?

Mr. L. Crapp:

I did not understand.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I do not understand.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I will explain again. Involving the Island of Jersey and Jersey people, and you explained as community projects what they do, yet we have driven fundraising establishments on the Island delivering aid themselves overseas, involving the Island of Jersey. How do you see a distinction? What is the distinction? Why do you draw a line between --

Deputy J.J. Huet:

The work parties go everywhere, okay? They go to Africa, to Asia, to South America. They go

everywhere. You have to be very careful that you do not just concentrate aid just in one place only because that would cause a lot of resentment. Very often you will find that a charity has been set up to do just that, in just one place only and nowhere else, whereas the people, and the kiddies and the older people that are coming from Jersey, they are not just going to one place. I did find there had been a time that they were doing that and I do not think that is a good thing and we stopped doing it because of that. They were always going back to the same place all the time.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That is a bad thing?

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I think so because it makes us, as I say, up the road -- I know you laughed at my "up the road", but it makes up the road quite resentful that down the road is receiving all the aid.

Mrs. T. Roberts:

It also creates dependency.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Anything on that community work project, gentlemen?

The Connétable of Grouville:

No.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I would like to thank you for an interesting hearing and perhaps it did not get off to the best possible start but --

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I have to be defensive of my team.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Absolutely. We would appreciate a copy of the statement you made at the beginning and, as I said, Deputy, after studying that we may ask you back just to clarify a few points because it was a very complete statement.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

I have never been one for beating around the bush. I do not think -- it never hurts to tell the truth.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You are absolutely right. I thank you very much for your attendance and I want to endorse that we are on the same side here. We are achieving the same thing and the scrutiny function is doing exactly what it is there to do, looking at the policy of the States of Jersey and, in this case, the commission. I wish you every success.

Deputy J.J. Huet:

Thank you very much. If you feel brave enough for £21 million, please go ahead.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I declare our session closed. Thank you.