

# STATES OF JERSEY



## GOVERNMENT PLAN: ASSESSMENTS OF PLANNED EFFICIENCY SAVINGS (P.88/2019) – SECOND AMENDMENT

---

Lodged au Greffe on 30th September 2019  
by Deputy G.P. Southern of St. Helier

---

STATES GREFFE

GOVERNMENT PLAN: ASSESSMENTS OF PLANNED EFFICIENCY SAVINGS  
(P.88/2019) – SECOND AMENDMENT

---

**PAGE 2, PARAGRAPH (a) –**

For the words “Public Accounts Committee” substitute the words “Scrutiny Liaison Committee” and after the word “undertake” insert the words “, commission or oversee”.

DEPUTY G.P. SOUTHERN OF ST. HELIER

**Note:** After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

**THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –**

- (a) to request the Scrutiny Liaison Committee, throughout the life of the Government Plan, to undertake, commission or oversee detailed 6-monthly assessments of the planned efficiency savings, specifying the expected impact on the ongoing delivery of public services, by Minister, Department and CSP priority, accompanied by a comparable comprehensive review of the real impact of the previous 6 months’ efficiencies; and
- (b) to agree that –
  - (i) the Council of Ministers is requested to bring forward a proposition each year, in advance of the Government Plan proposition, seeking the Assembly’s endorsement of the efficiencies contained in the current Government Plan, based on the assessments outlined in paragraph (a);
  - (ii) in the event that the Assembly does not adopt such a proposition, endorsing the efficiencies, the Council of Ministers is requested to omit the proposed efficiencies for the subsequent calendar year from its next Government Plan proposition.

## REPORT

My concern in lodging [P.88/2019](#) was to ensure that the Government Plan was subject to rigorous and effective scrutiny. My initial thought, given the difficulty of amending the Plan itself, which is tightly drawn against the [Public Finances \(Jersey\) Law 2019](#), was to request the Public Accounts Committee (PAC), with or without assistance from the Controller and Auditor General (CAG) to undertake such scrutiny of the Efficiency Savings proposed.

I was quickly and forcefully informed that such an approach was not advisable or appropriate, on the following grounds –

1. The CAG has autonomy to decide what topic he/she investigates.
2. The PAC can only examine spending in retrospect it is not empowered to examine proposed spending/savings in the future.
3. The PAC may not have the budget to carry out this task.

Following discussion with the Chair of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee, I believe that it is more appropriate to charge this Committee with the task of organising the vital task of assessing the impact of the proposed £100 million efficiency savings over the life of the Plan.

### **Financial and manpower implications**

It is envisaged that the costs of the review can be contained in the current Scrutiny budget.