

**WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR TREASURY AND RESOURCES
BY THE DEPUTY OF ST. MARY
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON TUESDAY 12th OCTOBER 2010**

Question

Following the response to written question 5612 on 13th September 2010, can the Minister explain how considered and thoughtful in-depth reviews, which aim to restructure departments without detriment to front-line services, can be undertaken in less than 2½ months (ESC) and 3½ months (Home Affairs, Court and Case Costs and Terms and Conditions)?

Can the Minister tell members the exact dates on which Tribal were engaged as professional advisers to start work on the 4 reviews mentioned above?

Given that the written answer of 13th September only gives details of 4 out of the 6 major reviews promised for the CSR, can the Minister give precise details of the reviews into Social Security and Health and Social Services and advise how these reviews are progressing?

Who are the 7 “independent” reviewers’ and what reviews are they working on and what is their role?

What is the timeline to which these reviews have been working – with regard to draft reports, discussions, redrafting, and final submission?

What was the selection process for the ‘professional advisers’ and ‘independent reviewers’?

Answer

I accept that the timescales for the major reviews were tight but all the reports, together with the Steering Group reports which members will receive on 11 October 2010, have proved very useful.

Tribal were engaged as follows:

- Home Affairs/Court and Case Costs – 1 June 2010
- Education, Sport and Culture – 7 July
- Terms and Conditions – 12 July (my previous answer stated that this review commenced in June – the selection process did but the formal engagement was 12 July)

As the Minister for Social Security has committed to undertaking a review of Income Support, I agreed that this would be the CSR major review. Income Support and supplementation are the key components of that department’s budget and, as supplementation is being considered together with FSR, any CSR savings would need to come from Income Support, together with the other benefits and services funded from taxes. Undertaking two reviews into Income Support did not seem appropriate and would be wasteful on both internal and external resources.

It was not appropriate to commission a major review for Health and Social Services until the new Chief Executive was in post, which was in June. The Steering Group for that department has produced a report highlighting the current issues and the way forward, which was circulated to States members yesterday. This highlights the need for a major review to develop a new strategic model for Health and Social Services which will now be progressed.

The seven independent reviewers, as I have previously advised are:

- Philip Taylor – Court & Case Costs

- John Mills and Paul Marett – Health & Social Services
- Tom Binet and Chris Ambler – Home Affairs
- Tony O’Neill – Terms and Conditions
- Stephen Regal – Education Sport and Culture

One of the reviewers chaired each of the Steering Groups of the major reviews.

As stated in the last answer in September:

“The advisers’ reports have been, or are being, finalised and presented to the relevant Steering Group. Those groups are now drafting their own reports with their findings to be discussed at political boards set up on 21st September. These outcomes will be discussed in relation to the CSR Part 2 process looking at savings in 2012 and 2013.”

The major review reports as well as the Steering Group reports are now completed and the latter have been circulated to members.

The consultants undertaking the major reviews were selected following the appropriate procurement guidelines with at least three companies requested to submit tenders. I advertised for members of the public to put their names forward to help on the major reviews and, after individual interviews, I selected the seven named above.