

STATES OF JERSEY

Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel Cultural Strategy Review

MONDAY, 11th OCTOBER 2010

Panel:

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier

Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour

Witnesses:

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust

Also present:

Ms. S. Power (Scrutiny Officer)

[14:00]

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman):

We will start the formal session. I would very much like to welcome you on behalf of the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. This is what you might call a health check of the Cultural Strategy. It was never intended to be, although we have been pulled in various directions, a deconstruction of the strategy and a rebuilding. It was just where is it at at the moment. Partly, of course, because of the issues that have inflicted your good organisation, so we wanted to see how things were moving along. We are not the Public Accounts Committee, so we do take a different sort ... well, I hope we take a different approach because they look at one area and we are obviously meant to look at the broader policy area. I am Roy Le Hérissier, Chairman, Deputy of St. Saviour.

Deputy J.M. Maçon of St. Saviour

Good afternoon. Deputy Jeremy Maçon of St. Saviour.

Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:

Deputy Trevor Pitman, Vice-Chairman.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Good afternoon, gentlemen. I am Clive Jones. I am Chairman of Jersey Heritage. I was made a trustee in 2005, became Chairman in December 2008.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Jonathan Carter, Director of Jersey Heritage.

Ms. S. Power (Scrutiny Officer):

Sam Power, Scrutiny Officer.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you very much. Now we have got the questions, which you have got as well. They are obviously fairly broad so we may well generate several supplementaries. First of all, can we kick off and say: can you outline your relationship? I do not mean your relationship in terms of your emotional health, so to speak, although we would be interested in that. More your relationship in terms of your formal constitution and your legal relationship with the department.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

We are an incorporated body incorporated under - I cannot remember the title of the law. Therefore the board of trustees functions rather more like a board of directors than trustees in the sense of the Trust (Jersey) Law. Our sponsoring department, if one wanted to call it that, has been previously the Education Committee and then Education, Sport and Culture Committee, now Education, Sport and Culture Department. Jon, would you like to expand on any of that?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I think that is a good summary really. We are an independent body receiving funding from the States,

with a constitution approved by the States.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Just staying on that question before we move to my good friend on the budgetary issue - even though we are not here as the P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee) - has that relationship proved to be one that has stood the test of time or would you now say perhaps it needs reviewing?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

The Comptroller and Auditor General referred to it as dysfunctional. That might be a little bit harsh, but it was probably not functioning as well as it could have done up until probably a year or so ago. I think the advent of the present Minister and the actions he took, having recognised some of the nature of the problem and needing to describe and define it in order to find out what the solutions to it might be, have completely changed that relationship.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I had an interesting visit at the National Trust just the other week and they were saying before this Minister there was no real relationship.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

That has been a consistent thing.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

I can lead into that. So how does the Trust allocate the annual grant received from the department?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

We have always, in fact, presented a business plan to the department setting out our aims and ambitions for the following year, reviewing the objectives of the last year. The form of the business plan follows from our constitutional objectives, which follow from the objects of association that were established in the law, which incorporated the Trust. So there is some continuity between our mission and how that devolves down to a budgetary level, which creates spending plans, which are given to departments and individuals within the Heritage Trust.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

The grant that you received is it fixed, is it flexible, how does that work?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Generally there has been a base level of funding. I think it is important to remember that we have earned pretty much going on for half of the total cost of running the service over the years, as a whole, including those activities which are not income generating. So, that has provided quite a good deal in terms of the public investment, in a sense. But obviously the amount of money available has therefore been subject to predictions about market forces. It has been a very competitive environment in terms of attractions and tourism, and has been, certainly after 1997, in a very steep decline for a few years and more or less bottomed out since 2003. But very subject to variation. So the overall level of funding available is a combination, not only of what the States grant is but of what money we are able to earn ourselves. Since sort of 2003 we increased our self-generated income by about 30 per cent in gross terms. Obviously costs have risen as well, but it is quite a complex picture, the amount of money available to the Heritage Trust. It depends not only on the level set by the States.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you think that the move to a service level agreement will help you in a sense that it will remove some of this uncertainty that you seem to be referring to?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I think it will go some way towards addressing the Comptroller and Auditor General's observation that effectively the States needs to decide how much heritage it wants to buy and then set up an agreement to buy it. I think the service level agreement is important to the Minister and his relationship with Jersey Heritage. It is important to the Council of Ministers, in relation to the commitments he has made to them about how Jersey Heritage will move forward. Therefore, I think, the service level agreement will help to define what the funding is for in relation to the level of services.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you feel, Clive, that your status as an arm's length organisation has somehow become compromised by recent events, or do you still feel, within a budgetary allocation, you have got a high degree of autonomy?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

That is a slightly difficult question to answer inasmuch as by virtue of the increased interest in solving the problems that we have, that the Minister has shown, it is perhaps only natural for us to wish to reciprocate by ensuring that the Minister feels comfortable that he is getting out of it what he hopes to have. The previous relationship, which was one where annually a cheque was written and no questions really were further asked, was perhaps less satisfactory, in a sense. I would not say it necessarily changes the fundamental nature of our relationship, but if it brings us closer together and working together, I think that is only a good thing.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

So you are not being micromanaged by the E.S.C. (Education, Sport and Culture) Department?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

No, not at all. E.S.C.'s approach has always been entirely constructive and very much designed to let us be part of the solution rather than simply sit back and be part of the problem.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Do you feel that your hand has been forced slightly though?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Forced in what direction?

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

With the service level agreement? Do you feel that it is just a combination of the way events have come around?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Do not forget we have always had a service level agreement. This is simply a revision, an updating and, in the nature of these things, an expansion of the earlier document. It does not surprise me because this, after all, is the mechanism by which the Minister can demonstrate to his colleagues in the States that in fact the money the States is giving us, including the increased money, is accounted for. I do not think we have a problem with that. It is not like some other bodies that I am involved with, where it is extremely important that we demonstrate our independence from the States, I think a degree of interdependence is right and proper in this case.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

One of the immediate action points of the E.S.C. Department outlined in the Cultural Strategy is to finalise financial arrangements to secure the long term future of Jersey Heritage Trust. How is this being progressed at present?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

As you will know, during the course of the last 12 to 18 months, again with the support of the department, quite a lot of work has been done in both analysing the financial structure and position of Jersey Heritage, as well as looking at its marketing potential in terms of what it can do to grow its self-

generated income. All of which then led to P.75, which was debated in the States some little while ago. Where we have got to since then is basically ... I guess we are waiting for the cheque, I suppose you could say.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Is it in the post?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I have no idea. Jon, would you like to suggest any observations? We have basically been focusing on reducing the size of the organisation to fit within the financial constraints that we find ourselves in and to get ourselves in a position then to move forward when the additional money arrives. I think it is important to note that we have made significant reductions in our cost base in the course of the last year.

I mean we took our cost base down 10 per cent during the course of the last year. We lost 18 F.T.E. (full-time equivalents), which meant 28 people went and a further 14 individuals saw their hours reduced as a result of, for example, rotating gardien hours at the sites, et cetera, so they will be earning less money. At the same time, 2 senior management posts went as well, and that is on top of one and a half senior managers who have gone in the last 2 or 3 years. So the organisation has stayed pretty flat while getting a bit smaller. That is really what we have been doing in the run-up to now, which is shrinking back so that we fit in the envelope.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

At the broadest level we said a couple of years ago, as you will recall perhaps, that we were about £1 million a year short of sustaining the current level of service, and there may have been some scepticism around that. There followed a long period of analysis, both of the costs to the service and of the potential and capacity that we may have to earn more by being more commercial. The outcome of that essentially was to agree that we were more or less £1 million a year short of a sustainable level of spending and that we were pretty much near the boundary of what was possible in terms of commercial activities from existing streams. The solution to that £1 million was approximately, in round terms, a

third of cuts of the sort that Clive has just been describing, a third of grant increase, which is what P.75 is doubtless the case for, and a third, which is a bit more of an unknown, of new fundraising areas. So this is areas beyond our existing commercial streams where we will go out, hopefully, with the States and, most certainly, with our heritage partners to look at areas where we can raise money for capital investment in the sites. One of the points we have been trying to make over the last couple of years is that there is really not much point in just providing additional revenue to prop up failing attraction businesses. If we cannot refresh and renew the sites to keep them viable and competitive, and receiving visitors who will pay to help sustain them, there is not a lot of point really. So I think the biggest success really has been establishing that case with the help of Economic Development for investment in the sites. Part of the grant increase includes an allowance for that. There is obviously considerable onus on us to go out and raise the rest, there are all sorts of challenges and opportunities in that, but that is around 3-way, and I think quite a balanced and fair solution to a significant problem.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

As a possible downside of cuts, how real is the damage that you end up with an organisation that is not fit for purpose for what you want to achieve because I know it is quite substantial what you are talking about.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

On the one hand you have the propensity of arts and culture organisations to Hoover up as much funding as they can get their hands on, and then a little bit more. On the other hand you have the risk of them contracting to a size where they cannot fulfil what they do. The shrinkage in service that we have had to propose in order to fit into this new envelope is not something that we do gladly, by any means. But it does mean to say that for 75 per cent of our visitors they are going to have as much access as they have always had, so the aim is to make the organisation continue to be fit for purpose, part of which is the rationale behind the capital funding to refresh what we have got, so that people are encouraged to come back. You talk to most people in the Island about the Maritime Museum or Jersey Museum, or whatever, or Elizabeth Castle and they will say: "Yes, I was there once, and I have never been back."

The question is we have to have something that brings them back. In the case of Jersey Museum it was Marilyn, and it is the sort of investment in refreshing what we do and doing newish things that cause people to come back and want to pay another £8 a time or whatever it is. I do not know if that answers your question.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Just on an issue of reorganisation, you said there had been these tremendous cutbacks in staff. To what extent were they offset by outsourcing?

[14:15]

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

We have outsourced a number of activities. I mean we have outsourced, for example, design, we have outsourced marketing, and we have outsourced our craftsmen. Now, it is early days, marketing seems to be working quite well. We have now hired a marketing agency to conduct our marketing activity, and that seems to be starting off okay. Design, we have not yet had a new exhibition to design for it since ... because Blam happened before the cuts, so therefore we will have to see how that works. Similarly, with the craftsmen. So it is early, but it was one of those necessary things.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

There are 2 areas of cutbacks in terms of staff: one is where we have just done less to save money. So we are doing less in the area of direct support for educational visits. We are doing less in terms of opening some sites. That is one area of change that added up to about £350,000 worth of saving. There is another area of change, which was outsourcing. A question that you asked earlier about mission displacement and risk to that, to a certain extent we need that flexibility to take account of that. There are still unknowns. We earn half the money. There is a market issue there. Who knows what may happen to the tourism industry. We need a bit more flexibility. So those outsources gives us a bit more light-footedness to react to any changes that may happen in our self-generated income. It certainly does

make us more secure. There is some mitigation to that risk. So 2 sorts of cutback.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Is the net result a net saving or are you paying more to agencies?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

In areas where we are doing less it is costing less to provide that service, so we close the Maritime Museum over the winter, we are saving a lot of money. In areas where we have outsourced we have not, at this stage, budgeted to spend less. We have budgeted to spend the same amount but to spend it in a way that allows us to turn it on and off over a very short cycle without redundancies. So, in that second area, we are planning to spend the same but it gives us some capacity to adjust spending down rapidly in response to any changes.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

You probably know, if you read the report of last week's sitting, that while the issues ... is there a fixed size pie; people who wish to avail themselves either of membership or of heritage activities? If there is, does that mean the more you do or the more you insist on doing, the more you will sort of displace other organisations? What is your view on that?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I think we will look at the evidence. I think there is anxiety about that, but I think that the fact of the matter is that when we increased our membership very significantly last year there was no parallel decrease in the membership of the other organisations. So I think that it is a legitimate anxiety but I think the evidence suggest that the cake can be made bigger.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

You deal with that by talking to each other and finding ways individually or collectively, but with the knowledge of everybody, to try to increase the size of the market. I do not think we should subscribe to

the idea that there is a finite spending out there. Ultimately there is a finite set of spending but we need to do the equivalent of inventing the mobile phone.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

The 2009 Statistics Unit survey of heritage use was quite interesting in that respect, there are people who visit sites quite frequently, several times a year. There are some people who visit once a year, some people who visit once every 5 years. Now that suggests that it is possible to move people from one end of that to the other. People said that more change at sites would encourage them to go more. I think that we would believe that with investment and change it is possible to move people along from once every 5 years to once a year to maybe twice a year. I think that it is possible to make the cake bigger, and the evidence so far supports that view.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

I should have mentioned, because I have got an interest because I am a member of the 2 others, I am on the council of one of those 2.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

We are happy to send you a form if you want to join.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Okay. If you could be so kind.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Just to touch on what you were talking about. Could you just speak on your relationship with the other organisations, the other heritage ones?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I have to say that personally over the last 12 months, I have spent rather more time worrying about how

we were going to move forward with Jersey Heritage and establishing a relationship with the Minister in that context, than I possibly have, and this may be something that I can be criticised for, in terms of the relationship with the other 2 heritage organisations. I corrected that on 29th September by taking my Mike Stentiford and John Clark to lunch, and I think we had a very good and sensible plain-speaking discussion of the type that I hope will continue. I have said to them it is my preference that if we can we try and do business by the 3 of us sitting down and talking regularly, either just the 3 of us, or with our respective senior officers, and spend less time writing long and tedious letters to each other. If we can achieve that we might actually find ways to move forward. So I am conscious that other priorities have intervened in the recent past and I am now trying to correct that.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Can I add to that? I think to a certain extent the differences between the organisations can be exaggerated by a general sort of maybe political, maybe media atmosphere. If you look again at the facts of the matter about how the organisations work together, I think it is very clear that the organisations work, and have worked, for many years very successfully, very closely together. You look at the relationship between the Société and the Heritage Trust in respect of the management of sites and collections, that has been extremely successful. If you look at things like the support that we have been able to offer the Société in terms of management of the dolmens, that is another really good example. We paid some years ago for the conservation plan for the dolmens, we got funding from the Development Fund for the signs for dolmens. We have produced online marketing for dolmens and leaflets, downloaded i-pod tours, we have run an event with the Société recently, for the fourth year running, to bus people around dolmens. So I think that there are many examples with the National Trust. Hamptonne has been quite a good example of a site that we have run, up to the recent troubles, very successfully for the National Trust. I think that you have got to look beyond the feeling to get the facts of the matter. In practical terms, I think the relationships have always been extremely successful. Clearly always room for improvement. One of the Minister's priorities is to work more closely together in a form of alliance to achieve one voice to address the public perception of the togetherness, and I think that we are very keen to do that.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you think - building on Deputy Maçon's question, as I said I have declared the interest as well - it is rather sad that one of the major areas where you chose to make cutbacks was the one in Hamptonne, where symbolically you all appeared to be working together?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It was regrettable but it was the product of analysis. I am afraid it was simply a question of where can we save money, where we are generating the least income, and questions such as that.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

And you came to the conclusion that the situation could not be retrieved in any sort of realistic way?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

The alternative would have been to cut somebody else somewhere. One of the issues, of course, with Hamptonne that is a source of some frustration is its relative inaccessibility compared with a number of the other sites. I know the Minister made something of the same comment when he appeared before you last week. So that is an issue. But, as you possibly know, the 3 organisations have worked up plans for self-catering accommodation in Hamptonne, which if we can get that funded will hopefully generate sufficient income to be able to plug that otherwise relatively modest gap, and go in some way towards ensuring that we can open it on a continuing basis.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I think in addition to that, the question also bears on the matter of the service level agreement, and the question of independence and decision-making. When you say what 'we', the Heritage Trust, decided, of course what was decided at the end of the day was this long period of analysis with accountants and with Economic Development's advisers, and it was established that a certain level of service and spending across the board only was possible with the available money. The question then that the

Comptroller and Auditor General suggested was put to the States, and indeed was put, was ‘what is the level of service that the States are prepared to support based on assumptions of how much the Heritage Trust can earn just after paying for the cost level?’ Now, it was therefore agreed, (that was not entirely independent of the Jersey Heritage), that £350,000 worth of activity had to go:- that within the great scheme of things the subsidy for Hamptonne partially, because there is still subsidy for maintenance for grounds and the building at Hamptonne, that the subsidy for the operation of Hamptonne would be one of the things which went, along with the subsidy for direct educational support opening the Maritime Museum in the winter, and opening Jersey Museum between Christmas and Easter. So it is one of a package of things that was agreed. What we have now established is that without that subsidy Hamptonne will have to be run on a basis where the opening helps pay for it on a day by day basis, and we are doing what we can to work with our partners to establish how that can best be done.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you for that. If we can move to question 4.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Indeed, another of the immediate action points for the E.S.C. Department were the issues faced with Jersey Archives to enable the requirements of relevant legislation and records management to be met. Could you tell us how this has been progressed?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

As I think the Minister will have told you, he intends to bring a separate proposition to the States in respect of funding the Archive. He has, in the meantime, asked us our views on where the archive should belong in related matters, and we have given him those views. I can summarise them by saying that the board of trustees and the Records Advisory Panel have both considered that the Archive is an essential part of Jersey Heritage and the cultural operations of E.S.C. That it is insufficient to regard the Archive merely as a repository but, instead, as a sort of cultural asset that is accessible to the people in the Island and to people who visit the Island. Genealogy and family history is one of the fastest growing

hobbies, certainly in the English speaking world, it has flourished and blossomed enormously over the last 2 or 3 years here, and it is a very good example, coming back to my mobile phone analogy, of finding ways to expand the pie so that people can participate in heritage and cultural types of activity. So it is argued that it is not merely a question of getting the stuff in, checking it, indexing it, putting it in a box and locking it in a vault. It is about giving people access to it as well. Broadly speaking that is the message that we have said to the Minister.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

But in terms of very basic stuff like extending the opening hours, that is going to involve more funding, is it?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

We estimate about £150,000 a year additional funding to resolve the current staffing shortages, which means opening and also dealing with the amount of material that has to be archived.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Can I just jump in there? Because the things like research and family history is obviously linked, I think you would acknowledge, is linked to programmes like the BBC of *Who Do You Think You Are*.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Absolutely, yes.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Therefore my question is, given that that stimulus has come from outside your control, when you were talking about reinventing the mobile phone, how do you envisage your success in things when the further that has been seen is from something external to Jersey.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Because, in fact, it was then picked up in Jersey by our sponsors, Appleby, who sponsored Family History days at the museum on Saturdays. It was then developed further into What Do You Know About Your Street, which has proved quite successful. Also keep in mind, this is not just the archive. This is also the States library. It is also the Société library, so we are part of a network of resources. Can I measure it? No, I cannot measure it, but you can measure greater numbers of visitors. You can measure greater numbers of inquiries. I do not particularly feel sorry if the stimulus in terms of family history came from outside or if it came from the moon, to be honest with you. What I like to see is people turning up and using the facilities.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Just slightly on that point, you mentioned 2 other agencies being involved. Are you happy that we are using our resources as well as possible in that regard?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Could you be a bit more precise?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Are you duplicating service or if somebody arrives on the Island from Canada or wherever and says: "I want to investigate family history" where should they be directed to?

[14:30]

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It is a mosaic, is it not? I mean there is an organisation called the Family History Forum, which brings together the Société, the States Library and Jersey Archive, and that is really predicated on the idea that it is a mosaic between archival resources and library resources, and I think that most people coming to Jersey will go to all of the organisations that are involved. The Channel Island Family History Society chose in 2004 to base themselves in the Jersey Archive because of the great visitor facilities it offers,

and I guess that is one of the reasons why ... I mean working with Family History Society is one of the reasons which drives genealogy interest to the library. But since the establishment of the Jersey Archive inquiries across the 3 organisations for genealogy have risen by over 30 per cent, so it is back to Clive and his cake, it has grown as a function of the Archive's participation in that activity, as well as the external cultural issues that you refer to. So I do not see there being any sort of duplication or organisational cross damage there at all.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We now come to another biggie question, which Deputy Maçon will read.

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

If I may ask, what are the current key issues facing the trust?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I mean we are in a period of transition at the moment. We have gone through a lengthy period of analysis. We have gone through crisis to analysis to agreement on what it is we should be providing and what that should cost. We are adapting, we are moving through the process of shrinking the organisation to deliver that, and starting in 2011 where hopefully the new funding model operates getting that money and spending it and delivering that, so that is the major challenge. It is not a small operating challenge when you have got rid of 18 F.T.E.s and 3 to 4 managers in the space of a couple of years, so I would not underestimate the amount of work that sits on the shoulders of Jon and his colleagues and all the people in Jersey Heritage in making this happen, but that is the key thing. The next thing is in terms of fulfilling the Minister's wish, which is I think anybody's wish, which is that the Heritage organisations work more closely together, and that clearly is one of the next challenges. It is not so much a challenge, it is the thing we should need to turn our mind to and just do a better job of. So that is the next thing to think about. The third thing is going to be fundraising. The additional funding, the capital element, may be underwritten by the States but it is really underwritten only on the condition that we satisfy them that we have done everything we can to raise a healthy chunk of that ourselves. We

must give that our best shot.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

In a way this is a bit of a churlish question to ask, given the troubles that you have gone through, but obviously when people talk ... particularly when they talk of culture they sometimes equate it with elitism and just sort of focusing on one part of the population. Do you feel you are reaching out to as much of the population as you could, in a diverse way of course?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It is very hard to give a definitive answer. I suppose the only answer is if there are elements within the better defined cultural relief that think you are being too low brow, then you are probably reaching out quite well.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you have that reaction?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It would not be the first time that I have heard it said, that we were more about a business and footfall than we were about heritage and history. The answer is of course we have got to be about both. We are there to display the important collections that organisations in the Island have built up through the years and obviously to do it in a way that is attractive enough to get people to come in and pay to look at it, so they can still be displayed in the future.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

This discussion goes on in history about people's history versus monarchical history, for example. Do you feel you project the people's history as opposed to sort of history of "great" people?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It is like the cosmic question. I am not quite sure what you would define as the people's history. I mean to give you one example, the recent collections of Artefacts of the 1970s at the Archive. There was a letter of mild rebuke in the *J.E.P. (Jersey Evening Post)* that sort of said: "Why are you gathering all this stuff up; just so you can trot it out at some future date?" Well, that is exactly the point. It is not so much next year, it is in 30 years' time when this stuff has long since vanished and is part of some landfill in some corner of the Island, that people can trot it out and say: "This is what people wore, played with, listened to, used in their daily work in the 1970s. Is it not idiosyncratic?" And people will say: "Where was the mobile phone?" "They did not have one." "Where was the computer?" "They did not have one." "How did they make copies?" "They used carbon paper." Within a remit that can be as wide as you want, I think we do our best, if that is an answer to your question.

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Can I have a go at that as well? They really are just questions, maybe it is the historian in me but in respect of this question about elitism of use, I would again go back to the evidence. I mean the 2009 Statistics Unit survey again is very helpful evidence on local use. There is every support in the idea that penetration across various socioeconomic interests in Jersey is quite high. Heritage is very well supported in Jersey generally. I do not think there is any evidence that generally the Heritage Service in Jersey is elitist in terms of use. It will be interesting to monitor the impact, and I am sure there will be one of new charges in areas, which have previously been free to see if that is affected by that. But certainly in 2009 and Duncan Gibaut would talk you through the moderation of the representativity of that survey. But the evidence is, it is not elitist in use at all. No evidence of that whatsoever. In terms of the story that is being told, I know it is a slightly more sort of difficult to answer question, but I think if you went to the 'Story of Jersey' in the Jersey Museum I think you would find as much about Riots at the Robin Hood as you would about the development of the constitution and monarchical interests in Jersey, but I guess that is always partly a question of perspective.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

How do you spark interest in the member of the public we have got here? In the States recently was the

1769, and there is an issue sort of been said to me that we do not celebrate the real people from history. You cannot talk to a school about the Norman Le Brocqs very much or the Chris Wakins(?), who is still around today. Do you think there is a fear, almost a taboo with heritage, that we do not do enough in that way? I mean I brought up the idea should 1769 be made into a public holiday, and it was just laughed at, where really it was probably fair to say there were only half a dozen people in the States who even knew what was being referred to. Is there that sort of taboo that heritage does not want to get involved?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Heritage is a very long ... we start at La Cotte, hundreds of thousands of years ago. I think the sort of issues you are describing are very relevant to recent political history, maybe it is true that that is in a certain category where there are different sorts of sensitivity, but you have got to remember that 99 per cent of what we do is ancient history going back, the Neolithic and the rest of it. But I think those issues do apply, and I think it is only possible to do general human history, which is free from that kind of political interest.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Another answer to your question though is in the time that I have been involved with Jersey Heritage, there has never been a suggestion of any sort of taboo regarding any particular historical period that I can recall. Nobody has said: "No, no, we cannot talk about that." Generally the reaction is: "Can we do it and can we do it well?"

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Interesting area, but we have got to refocus ourselves, I am afraid, and Deputy Pitman will now go back to 6 and the Cultural Strategy.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

In your view how should the implementation of Cultural Strategy be addressed, and are there any

specific areas that should be focused on in the immediate future?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

The Cultural Strategy was eventually an aspirational document. And I say “eventually” because the second shoe, namely the funding for it, never dropped. So it could only ever be a directional and aspirational document. There is nothing wrong with that, and there is nothing wrong with the framework in which it was put together. It was just perhaps unfortunate that the funding implications were not perhaps fully thought through at the time the document was laid before the States. But I do not think we see anything in there that fundamentally changes our view on what our role is or makes us feel that we are inhibited. We believe at Jersey Heritage that our contribution to the cultural strategy in the next 2 to 3 years will be getting ourselves to the right size and shape, delivering under the service level agreement, intelligently spending the capital, the money, that we have, and/or raising as much of it as we can to produce more and better attractions. If we can do all those things, and that is going to take 2 or 3 years, we hope that will be regarded as a positive contribution to the cultural strategy, working alongside the other heritage organisations. But I do not think there is any particular desire on our part to see the cultural strategy fundamentally altered. It might have come without the bullets to fire but it does not mean to say it was not a bad weapon.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Are you speaking with one voice on this one?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Yes, it is about realising potential, is it not, in 2 areas where the potential is as yet unrealised. One is this business of by working more closely together can we do more? The second is, can we realise the full value of the potential of Island heritage, which we have only scratched the surface of? We are enormously lucky in Jersey, as you know, to have a wealth of historic sites and places and indeed stories of the sort you have been referring to. We have only really just begun to explore how we can weld that together into a story of Jersey which tells all those narrative streams that we might want to realise as a

benefit for locals in terms of place and identity, learning and participation in building communities, and realise the potential for the Island as a tourism destination which we still very strongly believe in. So I think, yes, we are only really just beginning to get there.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do you think in terms of joint action, again, I have to reduce it to a fairly basic level, do you think there could be a common membership card, for example, as the Minister was alluding to in his evidence?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

All I can say is that Jersey Heritage is completely open to the idea. I am not going to speak for the others or publicly canvas any views they may have, but Jersey Heritage is completely open to the idea. It is also worth saying that if it does not happen, it is not the end of the world. The sensible thing that somebody then does is say: “Well, okay, if we cannot do that, let us go find something else we can do” and that is what is important; not dwelling on the things that we cannot do but it is finding the things that we can do.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Building on Trevor’s question, you have constantly mentioned retrenchment and you have given the impression that you are going to read it well; you are going to really try and make it work even though there is a down side. When do you think you will reach the point where you will lose your critical mass and you might move into inexorable decline? I hate to be gloomy but this has been talked about quite a lot because if you keep stripping things out there must come a point when you say: “We have done too much.”

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

It is a very fair question and as Jon partly alluded to earlier in the way that we have tried to do our restructuring, we tried to do it in a way that gives us the flexibility to sort of shift direction. For example, we do plan to charge more people than previously have been charged for access. Now, we do

not know what effect that is going to have. There is no way you can reasonably model it so we need to have certain flexibility in how we have our numbers structured so that we can take account of that. So therefore the answer is we have done our best to make it reasonably proof against inexorable decline but if for some reason tourists cease to come at all or to any significant extent, which is going to badly hurt other people with larger commercial interests and money at stake than the States have in Jersey Heritage, it is going to hurt an awful lot of people; it is going to be difficult. But what was clear to us before we were able to get the engagement of the present Minister was that we, as a board of trustees, were doing little other than manage a process of genteel decline. We are now optimistic that things have been restructured and we have been supported in such a way that we will be able to manage a normal level and as we are able to progressively invest be able to grow. I will say this very clearly, it has been significantly due to the engagement of the Minister.

[14:45]

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Well I think he will appreciate those kind words because he is obviously having a more difficult time in other areas. Jonathan, do you have anything to add to that?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Well I think the question hits the nail right on the head; there is a critical mass, I absolutely agree.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

How near do you think we are to it?

Director, Jersey Heritage Trust:

I do not think we are dangerously near to it but I think that we need to be serious about it in assuring that we continue to aggregate these interests and opportunities together. I do think that there are risks in going down a different direction. I think that the critical mass of these services and activities is

absolutely spot-on as an idea.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Jeremy?

Deputy J.M. Maçon:

Nothing further to ask.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Any final comments you would wish to make? Do you feel we have the wrong end of the stick on anything or we have not appreciated your points?

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

No, I thought all your questions were entirely pertinent and we are just grateful for the chance to come along and tell you our side of the story, so thank you for the invitation.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Well, thank you both for coming and although we are not here to hand out the praise we do appreciate your commitment and your hard work in what obviously has been a very, very difficult time, so thank you very much indeed.

Chairman, Jersey Heritage Trust:

Thank you.

[14:46]