Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

PUBLIC MEETING

Record of Meeting

Date: 9th January 2008 Meeting Number: 55

Present	Deputy P J D Ryan, Chairman Connétable J L S Gallichan Connétable D Murphy Deputy C Egré
Apologies	Deputy R Le Hérissier
In attendance	Miss S Power, Scrutiny Officer

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
1.	Minutes	
	The Panel approved the minutes of the 13 th December 2007.	
2.	Matters arising	
Item 6	Finance Sub-Panel Membership –	
13.12.07	The Panel noted that Connétable Hanning had been contacted, and agreed to become a member of the Finance Sub-Panel, in addition to Deputy Ryan (Chair); Connétable Murphy; and Deputy Le Hérissier.	
3 .	Resource Implications of the Draft Freedom of Information Legislation	
Item 6 13.12.07	a. Privileges and Procedures Committee (PPC) –	
	The Panel welcomed Connétable Gray, Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee; Deputy Gallichan, Vice-Chairman, Privileges and Procedures Committee; and Anne Harris, Deputy Greffier of the States to the meeting to discuss the Panel's review into the Draft Freedom of Information Legislation. The Panel noted that at the last PPC meeting, the Committee had agreed that as a result of the concerns expressed during the second consultation exercise on the draft legislation, it had felt unable to continue proceeding with the draft legislation. The Panel further noted the request from the Committee for the Panel to review the effectiveness of the existing Code of Practice on Public Access to Official Information, rather than the proposed review into the resource implications of the draft legislation.	
	It was noted that the Code of Practice was originally introduced as a temporary measure in January 2000, and had been assumed to be a precursor to the introduction of a Freedom of Information Law. The Panel was provided with figures outlining the number of applications that had been made under the Code of Practice since its introduction; however it was agreed that the use of such figures was minimal, as a result of the different methods likely to be used by different States Departments when logging requests for information.	

The Panel thanked the members of PPC for attending the meeting. b. Proposed Review - The Panel discussed the request from PPC to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, rather than the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Legislation. The Panel agreed that to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, and whether Freedom of Information Legislation is needed to replace the Code, is a corre function of PPC. and not the Panel. The Panel reiterated its agreement to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, and whether Freedom of Information Legislation is needed to replace the Code, is a corre function of PPC. and not the Panel The Panel relaterated its agreement to review the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Law is strongly agreed that if PPC were to decide not to bring a draft Law to the States then this review would not be an appropriate use of the Panel's time. The Panel therefore agreed to delay its review in the therefore agreed to delay its review in the freedom of Information Law is necessary, and requested for a letter to be sent to PPC outlining the Panel's position. SP 4. Item 7 13.12.07 a. Terms of Reference - The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. SP 5. Scoping Document - The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. SP SP 5. Hern 3 SP SP 5. Item 4 Security of the States Annual Business Plan. SP 5. Item 5 Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan. SP 5. Item 7 The Panel Indeed a letter from the Chai		1	
SP 4. Item 7 Event Precode of the context from PPC to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, rather than the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Legislation. The Panel agreed that to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, and whether Freedom of Information Legislation is needed to replace the Code, is a core to review the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Law, and agreed that it would still be willing to do so, however it was strongly agreed that it would still be willing to do so, however it was strongly agreed that it would still be an appropriate use of the Panel's time. The Panel therefore agreed to delay tis review into the resource implications of the draft Law, until after PPC had decided whether a Freedom of Information Law is necessary, and requested for a letter to be sent to PPC outlining the Panel's time 7, 13.12.07 SP 4. Item 7 Level Playing Field Review SP 5. Soping Document - The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. SP 5. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings - The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and it necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel and provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22 ^{cd} January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to the sent to the Chief Minister - SP 1		The Panel thanked the members of PPC for attending the meeting.	
 of the Code of Practice, rather than the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Legislation. The Panel agreed that to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, and whether Freedom of Information Legislation is needed to replace the Code, is a core function of PPC, and not the Panel. The Panel the Panel returned the agreement to review the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Law, and agreed that if VPC were to decide not to bring a draft Law to the States then this review would not be an appropriate use of the Panel's time. The Panel therefore agreed to delay its review into the resource implications of the draft Law, until after PPC had decided whether a freedom of Information Law, is necessary, and requested for a letter to be sent to PPC outlining the Panel's times, and agreed this document subject to one amendment. 4. Level Playing Field Review a. Terms of Reference – The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. b. Scoping Document – The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and i necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel serve will be resperimented that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22rd January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letter shad been received. 5. Struttiny of the States Annual Business Plan. the avan to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister for the 31rd January, and requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister Separtment, removing this item. 5. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of t		b. Proposed Review –	
Item 7 13.12.07a. Terms of Reference - The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. b. Scoping Document - The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. c. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings - The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to 		of the Code of Practice, rather than the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Legislation. The Panel agreed that to review the effectiveness of the Code of Practice, and whether Freedom of Information Legislation is needed to replace the Code, is a core function of PPC, and not the Panel. The Panel reiterated its agreement to review the resource implications of the draft Freedom of Information Law, and agreed that it would still be willing to do so, however it was strongly agreed that if PPC were to decide not to bring a draft Law to the States then this review would not be an appropriate use of the Panel's time. The Panel therefore agreed to delay its review into the resource implications of the draft Law, until after PPC had decided whether a Freedom of Information Law is necessary, and requested for	SP
 13.12.07 a. Terms of Reference – 		Level Playing Field Review	
b. Scoping Document – The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. c. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings – The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and if necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel recalled that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22 nd January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letters had been received.SP5. Ittem 3 13.12.07Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officier to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first breifing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1 st SP6. Item 4Report on proposed Waterfront DevelopmentThe Development of Counts of the protection of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan Stealue of the first briefing session on the		a. Terms of Reference –	
b. Scoping Document – The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment. c. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings – The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and if necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel recalled that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22 nd January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letters had been received.SP5. Item 3 13.12.07Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1stSP6. Item 4Report on proposed Waterfront DevelopmentThe DevelopmentThe Panel and the functional divisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest and scheduled for the 1stSP		The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment.	en
 c. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings – The Panel agreed that given the sensitivity of this issue, it wished to write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and if necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel recalled that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22nd January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letters had been received. 5. Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister's Department, removing this item. b. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st February. 6. Report on proposed Waterfront Development The panel merce of the fore the development The panel merce of the fore the development 		b. Scoping Document –	38
SpSp5. 13.12.07Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been around the therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st reprused.SP6. Item 4Report on proposed Waterfront DevelopmentThe Development of the letter be a first because of the second for the 1st becoment on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st becoment on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1stSP		The Panel approved this document subject to one amendment.	SP
 write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and if necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel recalled that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22nd January, and requested for this to be postponed until responses to the letters had been received. 5. Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a letter. b. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st February. 6. Report on proposed Waterfront Development 		c. Witnesses to be invited to Public Hearings –	
Item 3 13.12.07a. Letter to the Chief Minister –The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister's Department, removing this item.SP b. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1stSP6. Item 4Report on proposed Waterfront DevelopmentThe Danel exemption be for the potential for its point be been and the definition of the potential for its point be been and the definition of the potential for its point be been and the potential set of the potential advisers for the potential for the 1stSP		write to individual companies offering the opportunity to provide comments to the Panel in writing, and if necessary in confidence, before holding any Public Hearings. The Panel therefore requested for a letter to be drafted to be sent to all Financial Services companies. The Panel recalled that a hearing had provisionally been arranged with Jersey Finance for the 22 nd January, and requested for this to be postponed	SP
13.12.07a. Letter to the Chief Minister – The Panel noted a letter from the Chairman to the Chief Minister outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister's Department, removing this item.SPb. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1stSP6. Item 4Report on proposed Waterfront DevelopmentThe Development		Scrutiny of the States Annual Business Plan	
 outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the letter to be sent to the Chief Minister's Department, removing this item. b. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser – The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st February. 6. Report on proposed Waterfront Development The Panel answer Waterfront Development The Panel answer the defense of an explanate development The Panel answer the defense of the potential device and a state development 		a. Letter to the Chief Minister –	
 The Panel noted that one of the potential advisers for this review had been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st 6. Report on proposed Waterfront Development The Development of the deaft ensert and proposed for the deaft ensert of the first of the proposed for the deaft ensert of the proposed for the first of the proposed for the deaft ensert of the proposed for the first of the proposed for the deaft ensert of the proposed for the		outlining the Panel's Review into the States Annual Business Plan. It was noted that the letter had included the risks identified in the Corporate Risk Register as one of the issues the Panel wished to provide comment on during the course of its review, however it had been advised that this issue fell within the remit of the Public Accounts Committee. The Panel therefore requested for a revised copy of the	SP
 been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1st February. Report on proposed Waterfront Development 		b. Finance Sub-Panel Adviser –	
Item 4		been in touch to confirm their interest in this role. It was requested for the Scrutiny Officer to respond thanking them for their interest, and inviting them to the Island to meet the Panel, in advance of the first briefing session on the States Business Plan scheduled for the 1 st	SP
	-	Report on proposed Waterfront Development	
		The Panel approved the draft report, and requested for it to be arranged	

	to be presented to the States at least one week after the presentation of the GST Report on the De Minimis Waiver.	SP
7.	Department Business Plans	
Item 13 13.12.07	a. Chief Minister's Department –	
	The Panel noted that a meeting had been arranged with the Chief Minister on the 5 th March, to discuss the Chief Minister's Department's Business Plan in addition to the six monthly progress against initiatives report. It was requested for the question plan for this meeting to be placed on the Panel's agenda for the 8 th February.	SP
	b. Treasury and Resources Department –	
	The Panel discussed a summary paper prepared on the Treasury and Resources Department's Business Plan, and agreed that the Minister for Treasury and Resources should be invited to the Panel Meeting on the 9 th April to discuss this document in more detail. It was agreed that as a result of the Panel's heavy work programme, this was the earliest opportunity to hold this meeting.	SP
8.	Panel expenditure	
Item 5 13.12.07	The Panel approved an estimate of £16,310.00 to cover the costs of its reviews until the end of December 2007.	
9.	Civil Partnerships The Panel noted a consultation paper on Civil Partnerships (R.111/2007) forwarded to the Panel on behalf of the Legislation Advisory Panel.	
10.	Annual Report	
l	The Panel's section to be included in the 2007 Annual Report was noted and approved.	
11.	Current Reviews	
	The Panel noted an update summary for its current reviews. The Panel received a final draft of its report into the Review of Goods and Services Tax: De Minimis Waiver, and following several amendments approved this report for presentation to the States on the 11 th January 2008.	
12.	Forthcoming Legislation	
	The Panel noted the items of draft legislation within its remit scheduled for debate by the States within the next month.	
13.	Questions to Ministers	
	The Panel noted the arrangements for questions without notice to Ministers at future States sittings.	
14.	Future Meetings	
	The Panel noted the following meetings:	
	1 st February 2008 (10am) Briefing for all States Members on the 2009 Business Plan	
	6 th February 2008 "What is Scrutiny?" conference	
	8th February 2008 (9.30am) Full Panel Meeting (to replace meeting originally scheduled for 6 th February)	
15.	Any other business	

P.194/2007 had been lodged by the Council of Ministers on the 19 th	
December. It was noted that the Public Accounts Committee may be	
reviewing this issue, however the Panel agreed that it would consider	
forming a Sub-Panel to review the formation of the Jersey Enterprise	
Board, which would be constituted as follows: Deputy Egré (Chair);	
Connétable Murphy; Connétable Gallichan. If this review were to	
proceed, Deputy Reed would also be contacted to see if he wished to	
be a member of the Sub-Panel. The Panel requested for confirmation	
of the date for the States Debate on this proposition, following which it	SP
would consider whether it was minded to proceed with a review.	

Signed:

Date:

.....

.....

Chairman Deputy P J D Ryan