

Public Accounts Committee

Record of Meeting

Date: 12th November 2012

Meeting No: 14

Present	Deputy T. Vallois, Chairman Senator S. C. Ferguson, Deputy R. Rondel Deputy G. Baudains Mr S. Haigh Mr I. Ridgway
Apologies	Mr J Mills
In attendance	Mr M. Robbins, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p>1. Records of Meetings</p> <p>The records of the meetings held on 8th, 15th, 16th and 26th October 2012 and of 2nd November 2012 were approved and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
<p>Item 6 15.10.12 512/17</p>	<p>2. Matters Arising</p> <p>Lime Grove House: failure to acquire for use of Police Headquarters</p> <p>The Committee agreed that it was more appropriate for all the members of the Committee to be present for decisions relating to the aims of the review. The item was deferred to the meeting of 10th December 2012. Senator Ferguson reminded the Committee that she felt conflicted and would not be part of the review process.</p> <p>Agenda</p> <p>It was agreed that 'Carry Forward' tasks were to be an agenda item in the future.</p>	<p>MR</p> <p>MR</p>
<p>Item 4 15.10.12</p>	<p>3. Comptroller and Auditor General.</p> <p>The Chairman gave an oral update on the progress of the recruitment of a new Comptroller and Auditor General, informing the Committee that the process had been dealt with by an outside, independent recruitment agency and that interviews were to be held on 30th November 2012.</p>	
<p>Item 5 15.10.12</p>	<p>4. Shadow Tourism Board</p> <p>The Committee had responded to the Minister for Economic Development by stating that the subject was outside the remit of the Committee and that the matter had been passed on to the Economic Affairs Scrutiny Panel for their consideration.</p>	<p>MR</p>

	<p>It was recognised that P.170/2010 required the PAC to respond to an area that was outside its remit. This needed to be changed and the Committee agreed that a proposition was to be brought to the States to remove the PAC requirements in P.170/2010.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the inclusion of financial and manpower implications within propositions placed before the States and agreed that any change contained within propositions inevitably involved financial or manpower implications. The suggestion that any change in policy, law or protocols have no impact on financial or manpower implications is erroneous and therefore should not be permitted to be stated in propositions.</p>	
<p>Item 7 15.1012</p>	<p>5. Printer Contract</p> <p>Following the previous circulation of documentation from the Treasury and Resources Department relating to the printer contracts, the Committee recognized that there were significant problem areas including inefficiencies of time and cost, the lack of decision making processes and other basic errors which had plagued this initiative. The poor corporate governance shown may have stemmed from a lack of power, control or engagement from the Central Procurement Unit. Those failures had allowed significant savings across the States to be lost.</p> <p>The Chairman was awaiting additional documentation from an outside source.</p> <p>The discussion broadened to consider the Central Procurement Unit and it was agreed that it was this area that was to be reviewed by the Committee, which included the printing contract, the original business case for the Central Procurement Unit and various other areas of concern. Scoping documents were to be drafted.</p>	<p>TV</p> <p>MR</p>
<p>Item 7 17.09.12</p> <p>512/15</p>	<p>6. Compromise Agreements.</p> <p>In relation to the recommendations within the Committee's report, a response from the Privileges and Procedures Committee Sub-Committee had been received which requested the Committee supply examples of impact assessments which the Sub-Committee could examine. It was agreed that there were numerous examples on Google and elsewhere and that a template and examples were to be sent.</p> <p>The Committee went on to discuss the regularity with which reports attached to propositions in the States contain statements that there was no impact on finances or manpower as a result of the content of the proposition. This was considered to be unlikely to have been the case as change inevitably brought impact in one, or both, of those areas in one form or another.</p>	<p>MR</p>
<p>Item 1 02.11.12</p> <p>512/16</p>	<p>7. Financial Report and Accounts 2011.</p> <p>The Committee discussed an early draft of the report and recognised that the document did not contain the findings of the Committee at this stage. Areas of particular interest continued to be the grants and Transitional Area Payments. Overall, there appeared to be little incentive or drive for the States to succeed and this message was to be stated in the report.</p> <p>The Chairman had requested every department be asked a series of</p>	<p>MR</p>

	<p>questions relating to 'carry forwards'. This had been done and the responses were being awaited prior to that area of the report being drafted.</p> <p>It was agreed that the date for publication of the report was the end of November 2012. Drafting was to continue.</p>	<p>MR</p> <p>MR</p>
	<p>8. Any Other Business</p> <p>The Treasurer of the States had invited Mr Haigh to visit the Treasury and Resources Department to provide him with a familiarisation tour of the Department. It was agreed that this would be a useful visit and one that was to be accepted. However, the Committee maintained that officer support was not required and that Mr Haigh was to undertake the visit alone.</p>	<p>SH</p>
	<p>9. Future Meeting</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the next scheduled meeting was to be at 12.30 pm on Monday 10th December 2012 in the Blampied Room of the States Buildings.</p>	