Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

Record of Meeting

Date: 23rd July 2014

Meeting No: 184

Present	Senator S.C. Ferguson, Chairman
	Deputy J.G. Reed, Vice-Chairman
	Connétable D.W. Mezbourian
	Deputy R.J. Rondel
Apologies	Deputy T.A. Vallois [Co-opted for Item 1 under Standing Order 138(5A)]
Absent	
In attendance	Mr. W. Millow, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	1. Records of Meetings	
	The Panel approved the records of its meetings held on 17th, 20th, 25th, 26th and 30th June and 2nd, 9th and 10th July 2014, as well as the private records of the meetings held on 26th June and 10th July 2014. The records were signed accordingly.	
25/06/14	2. Population and Migration	
Item 2	The Panel recalled that it had received advice from the Chief	
513/36	Statistician in respect of when Jersey's Labour Market 2013 report and Jersey's Resident Population 2013 Report would be published. It was noted that information on the granting and removal of licences and on the post-implementation review of the <i>Control of Housing and Work (Jersey) Law 2012</i> was still awaited from the Chief Minister's Department, notwithstanding that the request had been followed up by the Scrutiny Office.	
26/06/14	3. Fiscal Policy Panel	
Item 1		
513/1(40)	The Panel, recalling the meeting it had held with the Fiscal Policy Panel (FPP) on 26th June 2014, agreed to request confirmation from the FPP of what improvements, if any, in the collection and presentation of data the FPP would like to see.	WM
	The Panel noted that the FPP would publish its 2014 annual report on 24th July 2014, on which date a presentation would be provided for all States Members.	
10/07/14	4. Public Sector Pensions	
Item 2	The Danel noted that Degulations origins from the Draft Dublic	
513/42	The Panel noted that Regulations arising from the <i>Draft Public Employees (Pensions) (Jersey) Law 201-</i> were unlikely to be ready to be lodged in time for the Panel to review the Regulations before the elections in October 2014. Consideration was given to what work, if	
	any, the Panel could feasibly undertake. It was agreed to request that the Panel's expert advisor be asked to complete a short report to act as an end point for the Panel's work and to provide a basis on which the Panel's successor could undertake work on the Regulations. It was	WM
	also agreed to request an update from the Public Employees	WM

	Contributory Retirement Scheme (PECRS) Committee of Management and the Joint Negotiating Group on their positions in respect of the	
	Regulations.	
09/07/14	5. Draft Charities Law	
Item 1		
	The Panel noted that its report on Draft Charities (Jersey) Law 201-	
513/43	(P.108/2014) had been presented to the States on 11th July 2014, after	
	which the Assembly had debated and approved the draft Law on 18th	
	July 2014. It was further noted that the Ministerial Response to the	
	report was due to be presented on 22nd August 2014. Consideration	
	was given more generally to the situations which arose in which	
	Ministerial Responses to Scrutiny Reports were presented to the States	
	after the relevant debate (to which the relevant Report referred) had	
	been completed. Noting that this was undesirable, the Panel agreed to	WM
	advise the Chairmen's Committee of its concerns in this regard.	
	6. Legacy Report	
511/1(46)	Consideration was given to a draft legacy report for the Panel's	
	successor. The following amendments were agreed:	
	4. Further affects should be used to seems that a seems in C. C.	
	1. Further efforts should be made to ensure that a proper indication of	
	departmental work programmes was provided by Ministers, with the	
	general principle underlying this measure that there should be 'no surprises.'	
	2. The Panel's successors should take a tough line in instances when	
	a meeting with a Minister had been arranged for some time but was	
	then postponed or cancelled at the last minute.	
	3. With the transfer of responsibility for financial services from the	
	Minister for Economic Development to the Chief Minister, it was	
	anticipated that responsibility for Scrutiny of that area would shift to	
	the Panel's successors (rather than the successor Economic Affairs	
	Scrutiny Panel).	
	4. It should be underlined that the modes of cross-Panel working which	
	had been used during the review of the Medium Term Financial	
	Plan (MTFP) had been successful and underlined for use again for	
	such reviews in the future.	
	5. The Panel's successors should be made aware of imminent work to	
	be undertaken by the Executive on the development of a long-term	
	vision and a population policy.	
	6. Consideration should be given to the appointment of advisors for	
	reviews that took into account whether a fresh approach would be	
	beneficial.	
	7. Questioning training would be beneficial, with follow-up training to be provided.	
	Potential review topics for the Panel's successors included Andium	
	Homes and its use of monies loaned by the States; and Fort	
	Regent.	
	9. Informal meetings with the FPP should be held more regularly, if	
	possible, to ensure a good working relationship was established	
	with the FPP. In that regard, the Panel agreed to ask the FPP	WM
	whether there were any changes which the FPP wished itself to	
	make to the series of meetings between the Panel and the FPP.	
	The Panel agreed the legacy report, subject to the amendments	
	identified. It was further agreed that the Chairman would oversee any	
	final amendments required and the dispatch of the legacy report to the	
	Chairmen's Committee. In that latter regard, the Panel was advised	

	that legacy reports would be provided to the Committee for its meeting on 28th August 2014, after which the legacy reports of all Panels would be consolidated into one document and presented to the States.	
	7. Future Meetings	
	The Panel noted that its next scheduled meeting would take place on 3rd September 2014.	
	8. Extradition Law	
513/1(41)	The Panel noted receipt of correspondence from the Chief Minister in respect of proposed amendments to the <i>Extradition (Jersey) Law 2004</i> . It was further noted that the Chief Minister had asked whether the Panel would like to review the proposed amendments or whether it would be content to receive a briefing on them. It was also noted that the Chief Minister had asked for the Panel's view on whether the proposed amendments should be lodged for debate in September 2014 or whether, in light of the impending elections, lodging should take place once the elections had been completed.	
	The Panel agreed that there was insufficient time for it to undertake a review of the proposed amendments. It was nevertheless agreed that the proposed amendments should be subjected to review, albeit it would be for the Panel's successors to do. Noting that the implication of this agreement was that it would be preferable for the proposed amendments to be lodged once the elections had taken place, it was agreed to advise the Chief Minister accordingly.	WM
10/07/14	9. Draft 2015 Budget	
Item 1	The Panel, recalling the advice and information it had received during	
513/44	its public hearing with the Minister for Treasury and Resources on 18th July 2014, considered lines of enquiry for its review of the Draft 2015 Budget. It was agreed to contact JT, the Jersey New Waterworks Company and Jersey Post to request their views on the proposals contained in the Budget. It was also agreed to request a written submission from the Managing Director of The Mortgage Shop, given comments he had been reported to have made in the <i>Jersey Evening Post</i> .	WM WM
	Consideration was given to the various parts of the proposition of the Draft Budget. It was agreed that the Panel's expert advisors would be requested to consider the financial forecasts used to develop the Draft Budget and how they compared to the forecasts used in the development of earlier Budgets. It was subsequently agreed that the Panel's review would also consider the following questions:	WM
	 What rules were currently in place in respect of the use of various funds from which the Draft Budget proposed to make transfers to the Consolidated Fund? What use was due to be made of £250 million which the States had borrowed for the Housing Project? What had happened in relation to an investment of the Currency Fund which had previously been made to the States of Jersey Development Company (SoJDC)? How much previously allocated capital expenditure had in fact been spent? How did the provisions of the proposition compare to what the States had previously agreed in earlier Budgets? 	

- 6. What changes to the use of the Strategic Reserve would be made if the Draft Budget were adopted?
- 7. How certain was it that Part (k) of the proposition could be delivered?

Consideration was given to whether, procedurally speaking, Parts (i) and (j) of the proposition needed to be debated in September 2014 and it was agreed that advice on this matter would be beneficial.

WM

The Panel considered the timetable for the review. It was noted that it would be challenging to realize the anticipated timetable, whereby the Panel's report would be presented at least two weeks before the beginning of the debate on the Draft Budget. It was nevertheless agreed to aim to keep to that timetable. It was noted that responsibility for developing the main body of the Panel's report could in due course be delegated to the Chairman and those Panel Members who would be available at the end of August 2014.

Consideration was given to a draft question plan for the Panel's public hearing with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce on 24th July 2014. Amendments to the question plan were agreed, which the Scrutiny Officer was requested to enact.

WM

It was noted during the Panel's discussions that both the Chairman and Deputy R.J. Rondel held shares in Jersey Water.