

# Chairmen's Committee

## Record of Meeting

Date: 24th April 2012

Present	Deputy T.A. Vallois, President Deputy S.G. Luce, Vice-President Senator S.C. Ferguson, Deputy J.M. Maçon Deputy J.H. Young Deputy K.L. Moore
Apologies	
Absent	
In attendance	Mrs. K. Tremellen-Frost, Scrutiny Manager

Ref Back	Agenda matter	Action
	<p><b>1. Minutes of previous meetings</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meetings of 13th, 14th and 21st March 2012 and 2nd, 10th and 11th April 2012 having been approved were accordingly signed. The Part B minutes of 13th March, having also been approved, were signed.</p>	
	<p><b>2. Panel Activity Reports</b></p> <p>These were noted.</p>	
<p><b>21.03.12</b> <b>Item 2</b> <b>510/1(68)</b></p>	<p><b>3. Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP)</b></p> <p>The Committee considered its previously agreed process of Scrutiny of the MTFP and considered the possibility of main Panels determining different outcomes than those of the Corporate Services Scrutiny Sub-Panel. Consideration was given to the possible consequences of this, however, it was determined that there may need to be an acceptance of different outcomes.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the President was scheduled to meet the Chief Minister the next day with the Assistant Minister, Treasury and Resources and the Treasurer of the States in attendance and it was agreed that Senator Ferguson and the Scrutiny Officer should attend for the MTFP item. The intention was that Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel would draw up draft Terms of Reference for the Panels which would provide standardisation across Scrutiny but which would not restrict Panels from exploring other areas.</p> <p>It was also noted that the meeting with the Chief Minister, Assistant Minister of Treasury and Resources and the Treasurer of the States would consider not just the process but the timing of the debate. Given the importance of the MTFP, it was intended that a request would be made by the President to delay the debate on the MTFP, perhaps to coincide with the budget debate, in order to allow scrutiny more time to undertake thorough work on the subject and not be restricted to the summer recess which would make it problematic.</p>	<p><b>TV</b></p>

1444/1(61)	<p><b>4. Strategic Plan 2012 -2014: Amendment by the Health, Social Security and Housing Scrutiny Panel</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the Health, Social Security and Housing Scrutiny Panel had, on 16th April 2012, lodged an amendment to the draft Strategic Plan "<i>Draft Strategic Plan 2012 (P.28/2012): Amendment</i>". The Committee noted that the amendment had been accepted by the Council of Ministers on 25th April 2012'</p>	
1444/1(61)	<p><b>5. Strategic Plan 2012-2014: status</b></p> <p>Consideration was given to the status of the Strategic Plan in that it was a high-level vision of the way forward but with no real specific focus of how it could be achieved and it was not measurable. The Committee expressed concern in respect of this high level approach as it raised the question of whether funds had then to be found to implement the Strategic Plan or whether the Strategic Plan would have to be amended to fit within the budget.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Medium Term Financial Plan was very important in terms of implementation of the Strategic Plan and that this should be robustly scrutinised.</p>	
02.04.12 Item 1 512/1(40)	<p><b>6. Public Accounts Committee [PAC] work programme</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the planned work programme of the Public Accounts Committee for the year. It also noted that the PAC would be following up recommendations which had been made in the reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General which was a major part of its remit.</p> <p>Consideration was given to a review of the Bus Contracts and again it was noted that the PAC were following up recommendations which the Comptroller and Auditor General had made on this. It was agreed that the Chairman, PAC would communicate with the Chairman, Environment Scrutiny Panel at an appropriate time.</p>	
1013/6(486)	<p><b>7. Housing Transformation Programme</b></p> <p>The Committee considered correspondence received from a Scrutiny Member suggesting the importance of Scrutiny of the Housing Transformation Programme which overlapped possibly three Panels namely: Corporate Services, Health, Social Security and Housing and Environment. The Committee was advised that the Environment Panel was not convinced that this Programme crossed over into its remit as suggested. The Chairman, Health, Social Security and Housing Panel apprised the Committee of its vast work programme due to the planned release of two major White Papers later in the year. It was already considering forming Sub-Panels to be able to undertake the work.</p>	
516/27	<p><b>8. Camera Surveillance: Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel – scoping document</b></p> <p>The Committee noted a scoping document on the above planned review by the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. The Committee was advised that it was planned to start the review in the Autumn 2012 and that the reason for preparing and approving the scoping document now was to permit it to undertake some work</p>	

	<p>in identifying an adviser so that (s)he would be available and ready to start when the Panel was ready to start its review. The Committee approved the scoping document and requested it be advised when the review was to start.</p>	
	<p><b>9. Work progress report: quarterly</b></p> <p>The Committee, with an aim to fulfil its terms of reference of oversight of Panel work considered an overview report of work undertaken by Panels in the first quarter. It was noted that all Ministers would soon have attended a quarterly hearing with relevant Panels and that each Panel had a review underway. The Committee agreed that at this stage the work being covered was appropriate across various Departments.</p>	
<p><b>13.03.12 Item 5</b></p> <p><b>516/32</b></p>	<p><b>10. Introduction of Tasers Review: Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel: concerns about radio advert</b></p> <p>Some concern was expressed about an advert on the Taser Review which had been broadcast by Radio 103FM as it has appeared to have been “sensationalised” and was provocative. It was recognised, however, that Radio 103FM reached out to a different audience than other media outlets.</p>	
<p><b>21.03.12 Item 1</b></p> <p><b>510/1(42)</b></p>	<p><b>11. Webcasting</b></p> <p>The Committee recalled its previous decision at the meeting of all Scrutiny Members that the President should meet the relevant media representatives to ascertain whether they would take clips from visual webcasting material of Scrutiny Hearings and if so what quality they would require.</p> <p>The President advised the Committee that the meeting with the media had been disappointing as their opinion had been that it would be of extremely limited use to them.</p> <p>The Committee considered the possibility of audio-streaming as not just was this a more financially viable option but it would cater for a section of society which had difficulty with the written word. It was noted that work was already been undertaken on this.</p> <p>The Committee noted, however, that audio-streaming would not overcome the issue of some members of the public wishing to film. Following a discussion about a range of possibilities to deal with this matter and whether or not to invite a member of the public to a Committee meeting to put forward the point of view from his perspective, it was agreed to ask for advice from the Data Protection Commissioner and H.M Attorney General about any perceived risks in permitting members of the public to take visual footage and whether a protocol and/or signing onto the Data Protection Register would be sufficient to permit members of the public to take visual footage under the same conditions as the media.</p>	<p><b>KTF</b></p>
<p><b>10.01.12 Item 13</b></p> <p><b>510/1(3)</b></p>	<p><b>12. Training: questioning skills</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the feedback received on the questioning training had been very positive and the general reaction of Scrutiny Members was that the training had been extremely beneficial and good value for money. It was agreed that</p>	

	<p>a means should be found to provide the training for those Members who had wished to attend but had been unable to do so. It was also agreed that refresher training should be arranged for October/November of this year.</p> <p>In respect of the hearing preparation template which was signed up to by many Members on the training days, it was agreed that this was useful for guidance only but should not restrict the Panels in any way.</p>	
<p><b>13.03.12 Item 7</b></p> <p><b>510/1(71)</b></p>	<p><b>13. Legislative Scrutiny</b></p> <p>The successful outcome of discussions between the President and Chief Minister and subsequently between the Scrutiny Manager, Acting Chief Executive and Law Draftsman was noted. The legislation programme had now been sent to Scrutiny and was being circulated to Panels.</p>	
<p><b>510/1(45)</b></p>	<p><b>14. Hearings: process</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the revised process for Scrutiny Hearings was being implemented in the main by all Panels and the Public Accounts Committee</p>	
<p><b>510/1(3)</b></p>	<p><b>15. Visits to other jurisdictions</b></p> <p>The Committee noted reports from the Public Accounts Committee on two visits to London, one as part of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association [CPA] Westminster workshop for Public Accounts Committees and the second on a private visit to Westminster to observe the United Kingdom Public Accounts Committee. It was noted that the first of these had been attended by Deputy S. Pitman as representative of the Public Accounts Committee, however Deputy Pitman had then not attended the second visit. Deputy Pitman had been offered the opportunity of contributing to the report on the CPA visit, however, nothing had been received and the report had been compiled by the officer who had attended with Deputy Pitman.</p> <p>A visit to Westminster by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel and the benefits of the visit were also noted.</p>	
<p><b>13.03.12 Item 10</b></p> <p><b>510/3(5)</b></p>	<p><b>16. Newsletter: Scrutiny Matters – reminder of dates</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the first of two Scrutiny Matters newsletters was being distributed during the week.</p>	
<p><b>510/1(15)</b></p>	<p><b>17. Financial Report – first quarter</b></p> <p>The Committee received the first quarter financial report and noted the estimated and actual expenditure to date. The Committee was advised that “other” included such matters as training, visits, name blocks and such like. The Committee noted the likely year end underspend.</p>	<b>KTF</b>
	<p><b>18. Future meetings</b></p> <p>The Committee noted that the date of the next meeting was 22nd May 2012</p>	