

STATES OF JERSEY



OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE STATES ASSEMBLY AND ITS COMMITTEES ('HANSARD'): INTRODUCTION

Lodged au Greffe on 17th June 2003
by the Privileges and Procedures Committee

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSITION

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

to refer to their Act dated 28th September 2001 in which they agreed to form a Privileges and Procedures Committee which would be responsible for the production of a Hansard-type transcript of States' proceedings; and to their Act 26th March 2002 in which they agreed that the Committee, in consultation with the Greffier of the States, should bring forward proposals, including resource requirements, for the approval of the States, concerning the establishment of a service for the recording and transcription of States proceedings and, should the States so decide, for the recording and transcription of the proceedings of Scrutiny Committees, and the Public Accounts Committee; and

- (a) to agree that an official report of the States Assembly should be introduced with effect from 1st January 2005, subject to the necessary funding being made available;
- (b) to agree, in principle, that an official report of oral evidence to Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee, once established, should be introduced;
- (c) to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee to keep the style of the official report under review, and to refer significant changes to the States for approval;
- (d) to request the Privileges and Procedures Committee, in conjunction with the Finance and Economics Committee, to take the necessary steps to obtain funding within the resource allocation process to enable the establishment and operation of the service as set out in paragraphs (a) and (b) above.

PRIVILEGES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

Note: The Finance and Economics Committee's comments are to follow.

REPORT

1. Background

- 1.1 The States adopted P.122/2001 of the Policy and Resources Committee (“Machinery of Government: proposed reforms”) on 28th September 2001. On 27th November 2001 the Policy and Resources Committee presented to the States the associated Implementation Plan, an extract of which appears at Appendix A. The Privileges and Procedures Committee was charged with bringing forward a report regarding the production of a Hansard-type transcript of States’ proceedings and set out some indicative costs.
- 1.2 The Privileges and Procedures Committee, with assistance from the States Greffe, has undertaken research on how ‘Hansard’ type reporting is undertaken in other jurisdictions, and the President, former Senator C. Stein and the Executive Officer undertook a visit to the Scottish Parliament on 12th and 13th June 2002. A summary of the Committee’s findings is attached at Appendix B. In its first report to the States (presented on 22nd October 2002) the Committee gave its preliminary views on the establishment of a ‘Hansard’ type transcript service, attached at Appendix C.
- 1.3 Links have been established with the British-Irish Parliamentary Reporting Association (BIPRA) and a States Greffe representative has made a number of visits in order to see how the parliamentary record is produced in other jurisdictions. Through discussion with colleagues elsewhere a better understanding is being developed in the States Greffe of the various processes involved in recording, transcribing, editing and publishing parliamentary proceedings.

2. What kind of report is required for the States?

- 2.1 The terms of reference of the United Kingdom Official Report which appear in Erskine May’s ‘Parliamentary Practice’ and are some 90 years old, read as follows –

“the Official Report is a full report, in the first person, of all speakers alike, a full report being defined as one ‘which, though not verbatim, is substantially the verbatim report, with repetitions and redundancies omitted and with obvious mistakes corrected, but which on the other hand leaves out nothing that adds to the meaning of the speech or illustrates the argument’.”
- 2.2 The Privileges and Procedures Committee, in January 2003, considered the style of official report (‘the record’) that would be appropriate for Jersey. It considered the degree of editing which was desirable, having considered the types of record kept elsewhere, and noted an excerpt from a speech made by Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier which, with his consent, had been treated in 3 slightly different ways to illustrate how a record might be affected. This is attached at Appendix D. The degree of intervention in the record remains the subject of lively debate, and the Committee has decided in the first instance that substantially verbatim reporting of proceedings would be appropriate for Jersey. Thus, only hesitations and redundancies would be omitted, with even obvious mistakes remaining uncorrected so as to maintain the ‘flavour’ of the speech. This will inevitably reduce the editing work required to produce the final version thereby keeping costs to a minimum.
- 2.3 States Minutes formally recording decisions will continue to be required as the official record. Therefore it will not be necessary to transcribe the entire meeting of the States, but to record only questions and answers, statements and debates in this way. Where debates arise as Members discuss the future arrangement of States business, the Committee recommends that, on such occasions, the Bailiff or any Member may request the States to agree that such debates should be transcribed in the record where they consider that they should form part of the official report. In other cases, a digital audio copy of any exchanges will be held, and could be referred to or transcribed at a later date, if necessary.
- 2.4 The Privileges and Procedures Committee recommends that the style of the official report should be kept under review in the light of experience as the service is operated. As a parliamentary record, it is important that Hansard accurately and fairly reflects proceedings, and it may be found that some light

editing is required. Any proposal to make significant changes in the style of the report would be referred to the States for approval.

3. How can a member correct the official report?

3.1 Following publication, Members would have the opportunity to ensure that any misinterpreted words could be corrected. This would occur immediately in the case of the website copy, and corrections would appear in a subsequent errata sheet, to be produced a month after initial publication, so as to reduce the number of correction sheets issued. For the avoidance of doubt, Members would not have the facility to change the report, only to correct incorrectly transcribed interventions. In some other jurisdictions where the record is prepared overnight, Members may be invited to provide the Official Report Editor with a copy of their speeches to assist in the transcription of proceedings by in-house staff, and are able to review their typed interventions in the record at the end of the day on which they were made. It is not envisaged that States members would be invited to approve in advance the textual content relating to any contribution they may make during the proceedings.

4. Will the official report be printed?

4.1 It is envisaged that the report would be available on the States Assembly website, allowing Members, the media and the public to search electronically for topics or individual Members' contributions. The format of the electronic copy could be designed to enable immediate access to particular debates, and the copy would be uploaded to the website by States Greffe staff as soon as it becomes available. An official printed and/or digital copy will be kept for Archive purposes; thereafter, if required, individual copies will be printed on demand for sale in the States Bookshop, or for distribution to Members who prefer a paper copy. By not automatically printing and distributing publications already available free of charge on the internet, savings are envisaged both for the States and members of the public.

4.2 The Privileges and Procedures Committee believes that a new, improved search engine should be made available for the States of Jersey website. Such a facility was not included in the original project owing to cost (in the region of £20,000). Up-to-date costings for this project are not yet available but the Committee will undertake further research into this issue as part of its work on the provision of information to the public.

5. How will the report be transcribed?

5.1 The Jersey Legal Information Board undertook a Digital Recording Pilot Implementation under the aegis of the Judicial Greffe for the Courts, and this has been extremely successful. A summary of the findings of the pilot are attached at Appendix E.

5.2 Appropriate and cost-effective solutions exist to outsource transcription, minimising the impact on staff numbers within the public sector. The Committee decided that it would be inappropriate to create new public sector posts to deal with transcription, and recognised that the ability to maintain a fully trained team of staff working variable hours in the current local labour market would not be feasible. The variable nature of the number and frequency of meetings of the States is such that it would be extremely difficult to employ a fixed number of permanent staff as they would be either unable to keep up in busy periods or under-occupied in quiet periods and recesses. The Committee confirmed that it would support the outsourcing of the transcription work required to produce the first draft which would then be refined by the Official Report Editor, who would be appointed by the States Greffe.

5.3 Currently, the system operated by the Judicial Greffe is that a copy of certain Court proceedings is transferred to compact disc (CD) and forwarded to an appropriate approved provider, together with a glossary of names, or French used, to be returned after 5 days, transcribed. In the case of Court transcription, the level of additional in-house checking required depends upon the provider used. The content of States debates is typically denser than exchanges in Court, where the delivery of utterances tends to be slower and more deliberate. Any transcription of States business will require in-house checking and the amount of time devoted to this depends upon the experience and the quality of work

returned by the transcription service used. For transcription of States meetings, it is anticipated that in-house checking will be required by the Editor to remove redundancies, to check French titles, to cross-check transcription in the case of overlapping interventions and in particular to insert references to procedure relating to, for example, the consideration and approval of legislation which is not clear from an audio recording. The time required to prepare the brief for the reporting service, presence in the Chamber throughout debates and checking work cannot yet be calculated with any certainty, but one full-time post has been included for reference.

5.4 The aim would be to produce a verbatim transcript before the next scheduled States meeting. This will normally be within 2 weeks of the original recording (which is a similar timescale to that currently achieved by the Judicial Greffe in respect of transcripts of court proceedings), but occasionally within one week, as States meetings are sometimes scheduled, or additional meetings agreed, one week later than the preceding meeting.

5.5 In reaching this decision the Committee considered the timescales within which Members would wish the official record to be available, and noted the cost implications of an overnight service, a one week service and a 2-week service. Outline costings received show that for an overnight service to be provided the costs rose by approximately 50 per cent; a one week service will cost approximately 25 per cent more. It is to be noted that in order to achieve a next day service, the House of Commons employs 20 staff; the Scottish Parliament employs a total of 37 staff. The reasoning for an overnight service for the House of Commons is that the report should be available for the next meeting day of the House. In the context of the States Assembly, as mentioned above, the next meeting date is normally 2 weeks hence, rather than the following day. The Committee does not consider that a next day service is necessary, or that the resource implications could be justified, and therefore recommends that the record be available by the next States meeting.

6. Costs of the Parliamentary Record Service for the official report of the States Assembly

6.1 It is the intention of the Committee to take advantage of the preparation already undertaken by the Jersey Legal Information Board, and the experience gained by the Judicial Greffe in the acquisition and use of digital audio recording equipment. It is also important that any equipment installed in the States Chamber is compatible with systems being used by the Judicial Greffe in the event that the States Chamber is required to be used as a Court when the States are not in session and Scrutiny Panels are not using the Chamber. While there are temporarily slightly different arrangements, when the Royal Court returns to the States Building following refurbishment, the States Chamber will again be used from time to time for this purpose.

6.2 A comparison of the costs of a service using an outsourced provider, and using Jersey-based outworkers, is attached at Appendix F. The figures are based on an average of 40 States meetings per year, with 34 sessions requiring to be prepared within 2 weeks and 6 within one week, in order to be available for the next States meeting. Costings have been obtained from 2 Court Reporting Services approved by the Lord Chancellor's Department and a member of the States Greffe staff has visited both. However, tenders against specific criteria would be invited at the time such a contract is let.

7. Timing of the project

7.1 It is hoped that, subject to the availability of funding, equipment can be purchased in 2004 to allow for a period of piloting and testing prior to the system going live, during which time the present (analogue) tape recording equipment will continue to be used, with a view to introducing the service fully with effect from 1st January 2005.

Recommendation A: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) an official report of the States be introduced with effect from 1st January 2005 using digital audio recording technology to replace ageing analogue equipment;**

- (b) the report include transcripts of questions and answers, statements, consideration of public business and, where appropriate, consideration of individual items arising from consideration of the arrangement of future business;**
- (c) the report be substantially verbatim;**
- (d) the Privileges and Procedures Committee to keep the style of the report under review and to refer substantial changes to the States for consideration;**
- (e) the report be produced so that it will be available before the next scheduled States meeting, i.e. within a normal target production time of 2 weeks, although there will occasionally be a production time of one week;**
- (f) the method of report transcription to meet business need, and produced in the most cost-effective way, using outsourced staff wherever appropriate.**

8. What kind of report is required for Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee?

- 8.1 The States asked the Committee to consider whether Scrutiny Panel and the Public Accounts Committee meetings should also be recorded and transcribed. It is useful to draw on experience relating to the procedure of Committees of Inquiry, where minutes of business meetings are prepared in the normal way by a Committee Clerk, but the hearing of evidence is recorded on analogue audio tapes, stored in an archive, and subject to the procedure of the individual Committee of Inquiry concerned, access made available to the public or witnesses (that is those persons may listen to a copy) at a later date on request. Should the Committee require excerpts of those tapes to be transcribed, this has either been carried out by the States Greffe for small requests, or outsourced where more significant sections are required.
- 8.2 The Committee believes that Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee should adopt a similar practice in relation to recording and transcribing meetings. While the business meetings could be minuted by an officer, evidence taken in oral hearings should be recorded digitally, with the facility, subject to the Panel's budget, to have all or part of the evidence prepared and published where this is considered necessary. As stated in the Committee's report and proposition on the establishment of Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee (P.79/2003), suitable premises will need to be identified for hearings and permanently equipped with recording equipment and appropriate furniture, and be fully accessible to members of the public including those with special needs. It is considered that ground floor accommodation within Morier House, once vacated by the Viscount's Department, may be appropriate. The costings that follow do not include provision for rent and services of premises for scrutiny hearings as these are included in Appendix Five to P.79/2003.
- 8.3 It is envisaged that while some Scrutiny hearings will take place in a dedicated Scrutiny meeting room, others may go out to different locations, for example, at a Parish Hall, in order to meet the requirements of new working practices for scrutiny. It would be appropriate, then, for certain equipment to be portable. It must be noted that when used in another location, skilled personnel will be required to set up and to remove the equipment, adding to resource implications. Scrutiny Panels may also choose to make use of the equipment installed in the States Chamber.
- 8.4 Similar hourly costs would apply to the recording and transcription of such meetings as would apply to recording and publication of the record of States Meetings, with the exception that the checking of transcripts could be undertaken either by the Official Report Editor or the Scrutiny staff, although any substantial transcription would require more checking which would impact on the amount of time available for Scrutiny Officers to carry out research and prepare policy reports, and this should be borne in mind. Costs would rise if any Panel decided that it required its report to be prepared within a shorter timescale than 2 weeks, as costed in this report.
- 8.5 Estimated equipment and revenue costs for providing a recording and transcription service for Scrutiny

Panels and the Public Accounts Committee are shown in Appendix G.

Recommendation B: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) **the facility for an official report of Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee, once appointed under the new Machinery of Government, be introduced using digital audio recording technology for optional use;**
- (b) **the report include transcripts of oral evidence;**
- (c) **the report be substantially verbatim;**
- (d) **the report be produced within the timescale that meets the Panels' business need within budgetary constraints;**
- (e) **the report be transcribed in the most cost-effective way, using outsourced staff wherever appropriate.**

9. Funding

9.1 It is important to ensure that sufficient funding for the above initiatives is available so that they can commence on time.

Estimated initial equipment costs –

| | |
|--|---------|
| States Chamber..... | £20,750 |
| Scrutiny Panels and Public Accounts Committee..... | £22,800 |

Estimated annual revenue costs –

| | |
|--|----------|
| States Assembly..... | £148,000 |
| Scrutiny Panels and Public Accounts Committee..... | £152,825 |

Recommendation C: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) **the Privileges and Procedures Committee, in conjunction with the Finance and Economics Committee, takes the necessary steps, within the normal budgetary cycle, to secure funding with a view to commencing recording and transcription of the States proceedings from 1st January 2005;**
- (b) **the support of the Finance and Economics Committee be sought in order to secure capital funding in advance of January 2005 in order to purchase equipment and conduct a pilot during the autumn session 2004.**

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation A: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) an official report of the States be introduced with effect from 1st January 2005 using digital audio recording technology to replace ageing analogue equipment;
- (b) the report include transcripts of questions and answers, statements, consideration of public business and, where appropriate, consideration of individual items arising from consideration of the arrangement of future business;
- (c) the report be substantially verbatim;
- (d) the Privileges and Procedures Committee to keep the style of the report under review and to refer substantial changes to the States for consideration;
- (e) the report be produced so that it will be available before the next scheduled States meeting, i.e. within a normal target production time of 2 weeks, although there will occasionally be a production time of one week;
- (f) the method of report transcription to meet business need, and produced in the most cost-effective way, using outsourced staff wherever appropriate.

Recommendation B: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) the facility for an official report of Scrutiny Panels and Public Accounts Committee, once appointed under the new Machinery of Government, be introduced using digital audio recording technology for optional use;
- (b) the report include transcripts of oral evidence;
- (c) the report be substantially verbatim;
- (d) the report be produced within the timescale that meets the Panels' business need within budgetary constraints;
- (e) the report be transcribed in the most cost-effective way, using outsourced staff wherever appropriate.

Recommendation C: The Committee recommends that –

- (a) the Privileges and Procedures Committee, in conjunction with the Finance and Economics Committee, takes the necessary steps, within the normal budgetary cycle, to secure funding with a view to commencing recording and transcription of the States proceedings from 1st January 2005;
- (b) the support of the Finance and Economics Committee be sought in order to secure capital funding in advance of January 2005 in order to purchase equipment and conduct a pilot during the autumn session 2004.

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT: PROPOSED REFORMS**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – extract**

27th November 2001

“HANSARD

In adopting P.122/2001, the States agreed to ask the Privileges and Procedures Committee, once formed, to be responsible for “...*the production of a Hansard-type transcript of States’ proceedings...*”. The planning for the implementation of this proposal is being undertaken by the States Greffe which is currently considering the following 4 issues –

- what type of equipment will be required?
- how will the transcription take place?
- what format(s) will be used for the production of the transcript?
- what areas of States work will be covered by the Hansard service?

Although some very approximate costings are set out in this report it is intended to provide more details of the resource implications of the various options by the end of January 2002 once further information has been received from suppliers and other jurisdictions.

The current tape recording equipment in the States Chamber dates from the late 1980s and, irrespective of whether or not a recording service were being introduced, it is now coming to the end of its useful life. The present system requires the presence of an officer from the States Greffe in the Chamber at all times to ensure the correct operation of the equipment, to change tapes and to record the names of speakers in a log related to the tape ‘counter’ to assist with finding particular parts of the tape.

It is now recognised in most jurisdictions that there are insufficient trained stenographers to rely on this method of ‘instant’ transcription for the production of a record of meetings. Although some Hansard staff at the House of Commons still use stenography, the majority of the staff at Westminster now rely on tape recordings which are subsequently transcribed through audio typing.

For Jersey it is proposed that modern digital recording equipment be introduced, capable of producing a digital audio recording which will have advantages in the dissemination of the recording. In addition the digital recording can be electronically ‘tagged’ to identify the name of the speaker which is of great assistance during transcription as the transcriber does not need to recognise the voices of the speakers or attempt to follow a complicated log completed by hand. This system of ‘tagging’ has been viewed in the Welsh Assembly (albeit alongside video recording as well as audio recording) and is now in use in Royal Court transcription after the recent installation of digital recording equipment by the Judicial Greffe. The ‘tagging’ would be placed on the digital recording by an operator in the Chamber who would simply press an appropriate key on a console or keyboard corresponding to the speaker. When the transcriber receives the digital recording the sound is accompanied by the name of the speaker appearing on the computer screen.

The experience gained during the recent Royal Court pilot shows that the digital system has considerable advantages over analogue recording methods and gives great flexibility in undertaking the transcription because the digital data can be transferred electronically to any remote location and transcribed by a person with a PC loaded with the appropriate software. It is estimated that the installation of the digital equipment and software would cost approximately £30,000 with a software cost of some £1,000 per PC used for transcription. As mentioned above, more precise costings will be available early in 2002.

It is not planned, at this stage, to introduce video recording of States proceedings. Although these have become commonplace in many jurisdictions it is an extremely expensive service to operate and requires a full television

production facility in the Parliament. In some jurisdictions (for example the House of Commons) there is a buoyant market for the television coverage with a subsequent recovery of cost through payments from broadcasters. There is no evidence that any real market would exist in the Island apart from a few minutes coverage during CTV and BBC local news programmes.

Visit to Scottish Parliament

The experience of the Scottish Parliament has demonstrated that whilst a Hansard service could be conducted either 'in-house' or by outside agencies, 'in-house' arrangements work better for Scotland.

In producing the Scottish Official Report, every effort is made to retain the atmosphere of the debate, with limited minor editorial changes being made, as necessary, in order to aid clarity. For archiving purposes, only CD-Rom capture is used in Scotland (no paper), although it is recognised there that, as technologies improve, that method might soon become obsolete.

The Official Report in Scotland is produced overnight, with outside printers being used (affording it priority over other official publications) in order to achieve the tight deadline for publication. Members of the Scottish Parliament are able to see their respective speeches in print, once they have been transcribed, prior to publication.

Digital recording in Scotland represents the same level of cost as sound capture on cassette tapes but is considered to be more user-friendly. The Parliament's transcription and editorial staff are required to have high standards and knowledge and understanding of the topics under discussion. Recruitment and selection is thorough, with sub-editors being responsible for management of the teams and also for quality control.

Extract of First Report of the Privileges and Procedures Committee, presented to the States on 22nd October 2002

“Transcription costs

- 2.112 The Privileges and Procedures Committee will be investigating the establishment of a ‘Hansard’ type transcript service for the States as part of a second phase of its work and, at that stage, a final recommendation will be made, after consultation as to whether or not the proceedings of Scrutiny Panels should be recorded and transcribed in full.
- 2.113 The Committee nevertheless considers that Scrutiny Panels will probably wish to record all oral evidence given to them and may then wish to receive a transcript of some or all of this evidence. It is common practice in other jurisdictions for all evidence given before Parliamentary, Select or Scrutiny Committees to be transcribed. For the purposes of this report it has been estimated that each Scrutiny Panel will wish to transcribe some 100 hours of oral evidence each year. There will be an initial capital sum required to purchase the necessary recording equipment for the rooms to be used for this purpose. The management of the transcription service itself will be undertaken in conjunction with the transcription of the proceedings of the Assembly.”

Extract of the speech by Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier in the debate on the Jersey Heritage Trust: amendments to constitution (P.37/2002) considered by the States on 4th March 2003

Word for word including hesitations

“Aah, thank you Sir. It’s more uh with sadness than uh anything else that I stand up uh on this proposition ‘cause I had mine following I hope fairly soon when we get the comments from Education, Culture, Leisure, Sports and uh et al. Um Senator Lakeman said did mention the lack of trust and there was a bit of a play on that word. But for those of us who have been acquainted with the situation clearly something did break down at an early point in the Mont Orgueil development. I don’t wish I’m desperately trying not to ascribe blame, although I know it has been ascribed by various people, but something did break down of that there’s no doubt and it’s been very difficult to rescue the situation. I have tried to behind the scenes and quite frankly have got uh not very far and I know one or two senior members have also tried and again have got not very far. So I think, Sir, even though uh um Deputy Baudains, Sir, finds himself in a situation which we often do the right sentiments but the wrong proposition um I think his sentiments do need um examination. I think his diagnosis may be correct that something has gone uh badly wrong, and while some of his evidence may, by Senator Vibert, Sir, been proven to be inaccurate I don’t think this contaminates the rest of his evidence and I don’t think this um necessarily invalidates his general point. Er, there has been a history I’m afraid of um allegations of people not listening, and there has as er the Deputy of Grouville said, there has been various experts and er I don’t know how many members were there last night when two of the major experts I was there it was a fairly heavy session when Doctors Rodwell and Dixon two of the key players outlined um their view of the history and why they had acted as they had acted. Um it’s a very deep argument, it’s very detailed and it’s very easy to get diverted. And also very hard for sort of untangle all of the various emotions that have unfortunately arisen.”

Removing hesitations and redundancies

“Thank you Sir. It’s more with sadness than anything else that I stand up on this proposition ‘cause I had mine following I hope fairly soon when we get the comments from Education, Culture, Leisure, Sports and *et al.* Senator Lakeman did mention the lack of trust and there was a bit of a play on that word. But for those of us who have been acquainted with the situation, clearly something did break down at an early point in the Mont Orgueil development. I’m desperately trying not to ascribe blame, although I know it has been ascribed by various people, but something did break down, of that there’s no doubt, and it’s been very difficult to rescue the situation. I have tried to behind the scenes and quite frankly have got not very far and I know one or two senior members have also tried and again have got not very far. So I think, Sir, even though Deputy Baudains finds himself in a situation which we often do, the right sentiments but the wrong proposition, I think his sentiments do need examination. I think his diagnosis may be correct that something has gone badly wrong, and while some of his evidence may, by Senator Vibert been proven to be inaccurate I don’t think this contaminates the rest of his evidence and I don’t think this necessarily invalidates his general point. There has been a history I’m afraid of allegations of people not listening, and as the Deputy of Grouville said, there has been various experts and I don’t know how many members were there last night when two of the major experts, I was there, it was a fairly heavy session, when Doctors Rodwell and Dixon, two of the key players, outlined their view of the history and why they had acted as they had acted. It’s a very deep argument, it’s very detailed and it’s very easy to get diverted. And also very hard to untangle all of the various emotions that have unfortunately arisen.”

Lightly edited

“Thank you Sir. It’s more with sadness than anything else that I rise to speak on this proposition because I had mine^[1] following, I hope fairly soon, when we get the comments from the Education, Sport and Culture Committee. Senator Lakeman did mention the lack of trust and there was a bit of a play on that word. But for those of us who are acquainted with the situation, clearly something did break down at an early point in the Mont Orgueil development. I’m desperately trying not to ascribe blame, although I know it has been ascribed by various people, but something did break down, of that there’s no doubt, and it has been very difficult to rescue the situation. I and also one or two senior members have tried, behind the scenes, and quite frankly we have not got very far. So I think, Sir, even though Deputy Baudains finds himself in a situation, which we often do, the right

sentiments but the wrong proposition, I think his sentiments do need examination. I think his diagnosis may be correct that something has gone badly wrong, and while some of his evidence may have been proven to be inaccurate by Senator Vibert, I don't think this contaminates the rest of his evidence and I don't think this necessarily invalidates his general point. There has been a history of allegations of people not listening, and as the Deputy of Grouville said, there have been various experts (I don't know how many members were there last night when two of the key players – Doctors Rodwell and Dixon – outlined their view of the history and why they had acted as they had acted) – it's a very deep argument, it's very detailed and it's very easy to get diverted. It is also very hard to untangle all of the various emotions that have unfortunately arisen.”

Digital Recording Pilot Implementation conducted by the Judicial Greffe

Brief summary of findings

In October 2001, the relevant JLIB Project Board carried out an evaluation of the project and concluded that the pilot had been successful even though it had taken longer than anticipated in order to gain experience in the use of the system.

Transcription of the recordings from a variety of minor hearings and 2 assize trials (of 3 and 5 days' duration respectively) were outsourced to a court reporting service in the United Kingdom and this allowed the many benefits of handling the recording and transcript digitally to be achieved. The cost and speed of this service were considered to have been significantly better in comparison with the analogue equivalent.

Evaluation by reference to the system criteria identified by the Project Board and staff involved indicated that the criteria in respect of the following areas had been met – sound quality; written log; security/audit trail; sound capture; recording method; transcription; installation, commissioning and training; support/repair and spares holding. In addition, the criteria for computer network environment, audio streaming and portability had been partially met.

The project demonstrated a number of benefits, including increased efficiency, ease of access and faster production of transcripts. Any suitably equipped computer on the States network was able to be linked to the court proceedings for the purposes of remote listening. Improved security of data resulted from the inclusion of the audio files in the Judicial Greffe's overnight data back-up routine. The need to store bulky analogue tapes was eliminated, with storage space and risk of theft or loss reduced. In comparison with analogue recording, the cost of consumables was reduced by approximately 70 per cent and the cost of outsourced transcript reduced by approximately 40 per cent.

STATES ASSEMBLY

Costs of the proposed Parliamentary Record Service

Number of States meetings per year

Investigations through the British-Irish Parliamentary Reporting Association (BIPRA) have indicated a 'typing factor' of 8 for the House of Commons (9 for the Scottish Parliament): therefore one hour of speech requires 8 (or 9) hours of audio typing/input to achieve first draft stage. The approximate costs contained in the Implementation Plan assumed that there would be 30 States Meetings each year (25 scheduled for 2003 and an allowance for an additional 5). However, in 2000, there were 34 meetings, in 2001 there were 36 meetings, and in 2002 there were 45 meetings of the States, so it will be necessary to be able to fund transcription in unusually busy sessions. The number of States meetings days is a matter for the States, and arises from States' business need. The alternatives are that basic funding should therefore be estimated for 35 meetings per year, with a mechanism to obtain additional funding for exceptionally busy years but this is procedurally difficult as the budget cycle does not easily support guesstimates of when busy years might occur. These have traditionally occurred in the third year of the life of an Assembly as policies come to fruition. For the purposes of this report the Committee has worked on the basis of an average of 40 States meetings a year.

BIPRA visits

Continuing the links established with the British-Irish Parliamentary Reporting Association (BIPRA), a member of the States Greffe has attended 2 of the Association's meetings in order to see how the parliamentary record is produced in other jurisdictions. Through discussion with colleagues elsewhere a better understanding is being developed of the various processes involved in recording, transcribing, editing and publishing parliamentary proceedings.

Outsourcing

Experience relating to the Courts has shown that transcription can be outsourced economically and reliably to a court reporting service, and it is to be hoped that the same could apply for States' meetings. Although none of the Parliaments or devolved legislatures in the British Isles currently uses outsourced transcription to a company, and there is therefore no experience to draw on from those legislatures, the Committee was encouraged to learn that the new London Assembly has adopted outsourcing as its means of transcription. In March 2003, an officer of the States Greffe, as part of a BIPRA meeting, visited the new Assembly building ('City Hall') at The Queen's Walk, SE1 and discussed with the Committee Services Manager the recently introduced arrangements for recording the Assembly's proceedings. A demonstration was provided in one of the ground floor meeting rooms where recording facilities were installed of the Assembly's "Prism" logging software, as applied during the recording of proceedings. It was emphasised that the time of each log was associated with the record of the speaker indicated and the first few words of their opening remarks. Thus the timed segments remained associated with that particular speaker, irrespective of the way in which the recording was divided up automatically by the software. In the London Assembly's case, the court reporting service used (which is one of the two already contacted by the States Greffe) also provided a member of staff to attend the meetings and to prepare the lognotes, which is a significant advantage. In the absence of such a link officer, careful attention will need to be given in Jersey by the Official Report Editor to the preparation of a comprehensive brief to be followed by remotely based staff. Investigation could be undertaken to establish whether any of our BIPRA colleagues had capacity to undertake transcription on behalf of the States Assembly, subject to cost, and assurances that appropriate priority was given to that service. However, the experience of the Judicial Greffe has been mainly positive, and a similar route is therefore recommended.

Experience of recent Committees of Inquiry

The Committee of Inquiry into Honorary Police Election Procedures and the Committee of Inquiry into their Current Allocation of Residential Properties by Housing Trusts supported by the Housing Development Fund

elected to have all of their evidence transcribed from audio cassettes. For the former, a total of 32 x 45 minu cassettes were transcribed locally. Not all were outsourced, but those that were cost £200 per hour to transcribe, for a 10-day turnaround service. As this type of work was unfamiliar to the Jersey-based provider, careful and time-consuming checking was required by States Greffe staff as the quality of the transcription was generally poor.

Transcription Turnaround Period

For the normal pattern of States meetings scheduled every fortnight, a 6-day turnaround period will be required for the transcription service, to leave time for checking and publication. In order to provide a transcript when the States meets on a weekly basis a 2-day turnaround period will be necessary.

It has been assumed that a 10-day turnaround will be sufficient for the purposes of Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee. These bodies may on occasions decide that they require a quicker turnaround period. It will be for them to make this decision taking into account the availability and appropriate prioritisation of funding within the budget set aside for their purpose.

CAPITAL COSTS FOR STATES ASSEMBLY

| Estimated equipment costs as at January 2003 – | £ |
|--|---------------|
| Recording equipment, software, installation and commissioning | 11,200 |
| Touchscreen technology for the control of recording system and lognotes | 950 |
| Automatic log taking system, development | 5,000 |
| 2 personal computers, software, installation and commissioning | 3,600 |
| TOTAL | 20,750 |
| <i>Optional website facility (see note below).....</i> | <i>5,000</i> |
| <i>The above estimates do not take into account any need to upgrade/purchase a server. If this were required, the cost would be approximately.....</i> | <i>8,000</i> |
| <i>Improved search engine for States Assembly website.....</i> | <i>20,000</i> |

Note. The secure website facility would allow the digital recording to be uploaded in Jersey to a secure site which the transcription company would access through the internet. This would avoid the need to send CD-ROM copies of the data and save time (the electronic files of data created by digital recording are currently too large to be sent by e-mail).

ESTIMATED REVENUE COSTS, AS AT MARCH 2003 –

A. Outsourced (United Kingdombased) – overall annual cost £148,000 – £157,500

Costs of outsourcing to an approved Court Reporting Service in the United Kingdom would be, as follows –

for transcription of each 8-hour day of recording –

£2,350 for a 2-day turnaround

£2,100 for a 6-day turnaround

£2,000 for a 10-day turnaround.

Outsourcing to a high quality provider has the advantage that fewer internal staff will be required. Once received electronically, the high-quality text can be edited to the required standard and a final ‘Official Record’ version

produced. As in the GLA example already referred to, this would require a detailed log of speakers associated with each recording, together with a glossary of terms relating to the subject matter under discussion. As a legislature there are additional elements to be considered for the Assembly – detailed guidance will also be required as regards procedural matters (particularly in relation to legislation), to be provided to the reporting service to assist it in producing a potentially high-quality draft report. In addition, guidelines and contemporaneous information would be required to deal with incidents of over-speaking, where a member attempts to interject or interrupt during the proceedings. In other jurisdictions, the person preparing the draft report sits in the Chamber while his/her section is actually spoken; in Jersey an Official Report Editor will need to be present and supply the relevant information in the form of a brief to accompany the recording. The Reporting Service is responsible for ensuring that response times and levels of accuracy are maintained, and the Official Report Editor is responsible for quality assurance.

TO RECEIVE THE REPORT BY THE NEXT STATES MEETING –

Using transcription turnaround times that will result in the official report being published in time for the next States meeting as recommended by the Committee –

| | £ |
|--|----------------|
| (a) 6-day turnaround: £2,100 | |
| Assuming 34 days per annum at upper rate | 71,400 |
| (b) 2-day turnaround: £2,350 | |
| Assuming 6 days per annum | 14,100 |
| Maintenance contracts | 2,000 |
| Transcription equipment | 1,500 |
| Consumables and archiving | 500 |
| Equipment replacement costs, annual | 3,500 |
| Official Report Editor one FTE post, circa | 50,000 |
| Office | 5,000 |
| TOTAL | 148,000 |

**OR TO RECEIVE THE OFFICIAL REPORT WITHIN 7 DAYS,
ADD £9,500 = 157,500**

SCRUTINY PANELS AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Costs of proposed recording and transcription service

The following costs assume that the equipment for digital audio recording for the States Assembly is already in place, and that each of the 4 Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee decide to have 14 days of evidence transcribed each year (total of 70 days) –

Estimated equipment costs as at January 2003 –

| | £ |
|--|---------------|
| Fixed equipment and software for one permanent Scrutiny meeting room | 11,200 |
| Portable equipment/FTR Reporter Desk | 8,000 |
| 2 personal computers, software, installation and commissioning | 3,600 |
| TOTAL additional expenditure | 22,800 |

Estimated additional revenue costs as at February 2003 –

TO RECEIVE TRANSCRIPT WITHIN 2 WEEKS –

| | £ |
|--|----------------|
| A. Outsourced (United Kingdom based) – | |
| Outsourced transcription costs per day of recording | |
| 10-day turnaround £2,000 | |
| Assuming 70 days per annum | 140,000 |
| Maintenance contracts | 4,000 |
| Consumables and archiving | 1,200 |
| Equipment replacement costs | 5,625 |
| Setting up/taking down portable equipment on 10 occasions per year | 2,000 |
| TOTAL | 152,825 |

OR

TO RECEIVE TRANSCRIPT WITHIN ONE WEEK ADD £24,500 = 177,320

Note In Appendix Five of P.79/2003 (Machinery of Government: establishment of Scrutiny Panels and Public Accounts Committee) the cost of transcription shown above (£140,000) is listed separately. The remaining annual cost shown above for maintenance contracts, etc. (£12,825 of the £152,825) would need to be met from the funds listed under the heading ‘Ancillary costs’ in Appendix Five of P.79/2003. The costings in P.79/2003 do not take account of the requirement for a possible one week turnaround as shown above.

[1] *Proposition of Deputy R.G. Le Hérisier regarding Mont Orgueil development strategy: appointment of independent expert (P.19/2003 lodged “au Greffe” on 18th February 2003).*