

STATES OF JERSEY

Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel Quarterly Public Hearing with the Chief Minister

MONDAY, 7th MARCH 2016

Panel:

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence (Chairman)

Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour

Connétable C.H. Taylor of St. John

Witnesses:

The Chief Minister

Chief Executive Officer

Director, Corporate Policy

Transcript Index

- Impact Assessments 2
- Liberation Day 3
- MTFP 5
- Confidential Information 6
- Freedom of Information 8
- Charities Law 11
- Dormant Bank Accounts Law 12
- Future Hospital 15
- European Union Referendum 20
- Population Policy 23
- Corporate Delivery Plan 28
- E-gov 29
- Public Sector Reform 30

[10:32]

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré of St. Lawrence (Chairman):

Right, welcome to the Quarterly Hearing for the Chief Minister. For the benefit of the recording we will go round the table. Deputy John Le Fondré, Chairman.

Deputy K.C. Lewis of St. Saviour:

Deputy Kevin Lewis, panel member.

Connétable C.H. Taylor of St. John:

Constable Chris Taylor, panel member.

Chief Executive Officer of the States:

John Richardson, Chief Executive.

The Chief Minister:

Ian Gorst, Chief Minister.

Director, Corporate Policy:

Paul Bradbury, Chief Minister's Office.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Obviously, for the purposes of the hearing, as people who are sitting in the public seats know, there is no interaction, please keep mobile phones off and all that sort of stuff. Chief Minister, obviously there will be times probably when we feel you have given us sufficient information in your response so please try and keep your answers concise, and if we feel we have got enough information we may move on to the next question. Impact assessments is where we are going to start. So States Members were told on 8th October 2015 by yourself that a framework of impact studies would be presented before the debate on the Budget 2016, which has obviously now passed. Why has it taken a further 4 months for this framework to materialise?

The Chief Minister:

I think I have apologised in the States for the length of time it has taken and I stand by that apology this morning. You are aware now that the Council of Ministers considered such a framework in February and are working to deliver the impact assessments prior to the launching of the M.T.F.P.2 (Medium Term Financial Plan) edition.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. When will the framework itself be presented to States Members? That is not the impact itself but the actual framework.

The Chief Minister:

Well, you and Scrutiny have had it. Their work is starting so I see no reason why it cannot be presented during the course of this week.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. We obviously will be making some enquiries in due course on that but, yes, and perhaps if this was circulated you could say that Scrutiny will be commenting in due course.

The Chief Minister:

In fact, I could say that, if you do not mind, you have asked me to do it arising from this meeting and ...

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Yes. The other point that comes out of that is, when do you anticipate the impact studies to have been completed and presented to all States Members?

The Chief Minister:

That is a good question. You will know from the framework that some of the work is being undertaken this month and next and then further work will need to be continued during May. It is going to be included in the edition. I have no indication yet that it is going to be ready prior to the edition but I can certainly check with Treasury and, if it is, then we will try and provide it before that if possible.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Yes, because obviously for all Members it would be useful to know the impact of the decisions that are going to be made. I think, as you are probably aware, there has been a query that has recently come up around Liberation Day which we wanted to just discuss. Now, as I understand it, obviously there was a circular that was issued on 19th February 2016 which went to all staff and it is in relation to Liberation Day 2015, which fell on a Saturday. Now, the law makes no statutory provision for a day off in lieu to be provided if it falls on a Saturday, so why are States employees who did not work on a Saturday being given an extra day off?

The Chief Minister:

If we just go back in time, there was no initial intention to do so and that was the position of the States Employment Board. A number of unions raised a dispute along that, stating that we were obliged, as the States Employment Board, to observe collective agreements and some also used the phrase of “custom and practice” of course. Custom and practice can change, and that is the view of the States Employment Board, but when it comes to collective agreements it is more difficult and we received advice that we needed to abide by those collective agreements and so we felt that that was the only course open to us. We know that for some States Members it is not satisfactory and it is certainly not the course of action that the States Employment Board first considered. The questions that we asked advisers while we were taking this decision was we wanted to ensure that we were not again at odds with what we thought was happening and what it transpired collective agreements indicated that we should do. We could, of course, have said we would not abide by those collective agreements and then we would have been in official dispute and that would have had to go through the official dispute processes but again the advice was that our decision to maintain the position of not providing the time off in lieu would likely to be challenged and potentially our view would not have held because of the collective agreements. Of course, the whole of the workforce modernisation is around renegotiating those agreements and we are advised and have requested that officers ensure that changes are made such that we do not find ourselves in this position again.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. Can you confirm the financial implications of implementing this?

The Chief Minister:

All departments were clearly told that it would be provided from within their budgets and there would be no extra funding provided. I do not have the figure of the financial implications because the decision was not based upon those financial implications, it was based upon the collective agreements and the advice we received about, if we were not to provide the day off in lieu, whether it would be challengeable positively and therefore it would have to be provided anyway.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Is it fair to assume on the basis of previous comments from the Council of Ministers when the issues of, and I will say public holidays has been raised previously like Boxing Day and/or Liberation Day, it is in the order of £1.5 million?

The Chief Minister:

That is my understanding, yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

So you have indicated it is your intention to change this. When do you hope or anticipate that such change will be achieved?

The Chief Minister:

Well, we anticipate it will be achieved during the process of the reform to the terms and conditions. We are already moving some new employees on to new terms and conditions as at the start of January. So there is a slow tail that is happening but as part of the workforce modernisation process you know that everybody will be moved ultimately over the course of the next few years on to new terms and conditions, and these Liberation Days falling on a bank holiday only occurs every 4 years, or something ... 7 years. I do not have the dates in front of me so it should correlate.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. This panel understands obviously that the private sector do not generally get a day off in lieu. Do you accept at a time when the States are trying to save money this sends the wrong message?

The Chief Minister:

You will note from the date that we made our decision, which was January this year, there is quite a long time between 9th May 2015 and January 2016 and that is because I think the States Employment Board shared the view that it was clear that those in the private sector would not necessarily be getting a day off in lieu and we felt that that was an appropriate position at that time for States employees. It was only after the official dispute was raised by the unions and our advisers went back and considered what the potential outcome of such a dispute might be because of collective agreements and, as I said, customary practice, that we came to the decision that we did.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

For me, I have got a final question and then I will pass it out, but had no one looked at the collective agreements previously?

The Chief Minister:

I cannot recall whether they had or they had not, but we can certainly go and check that.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

In other words, if it was potentially going to be something contentious because presumably there was a decision made that it would not be a day off in lieu, that seems to be the implication of the circulars originally, would not someone have taken advice at the time?

The Chief Minister:

Well, I cannot recall whether that was the case or not but it was the instigation of the dispute that led to the review and the further advice.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

So perhaps you can just outline the circumstances for us?

The Chief Minister:

Yes.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Chief Minister, during the last Medium Term Financial Plan process this panel issued questionnaires for other scrutiny panels to receive written answers from the relevant departments on issues relevant to the M.T.F.P. Despite direct communications between the panels and respective departments, the Chief Minister's Department insisted on collective responses, contacting each department individually, which caused delay. Can you confirm that, should this panel follow the same process for the M.T.F.P. edition, the Chief Minister's Department will not get involved?

The Chief Minister:

Well, I cannot confirm that. I would have thought that hopefully a central co-ordination of responses to panels was going to improve the timeliness. If you are telling me that it added to the length of time then that is certainly something we need to review and, if necessary, not have what we thought was going to be a helpful co-ordinating role. If it is an unhelpful co-ordinating role then there seems to be little value in us doing it.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

I think sometimes it is always easier to go directly to the individual departments.

The Connétable of St. John:

This brings us on to access to confidential information and documents. As you are aware, Scrutiny has had great difficulty in obtaining documentation to assist it in performing its proper function. There now appears to be additional difficulties in receiving third-party reports. Could you advise us what action you propose to take on this to allow scrutiny panels access to documents held by States-owned bodies?

[10:45]

The Chief Minister:

Well, I know we have ... well, I am not sure we have discussed it formally as the panel before but we might have done, that we found ourselves in an interesting position where I think the panel looking at the work of S.o.J.D.C. (States of Jersey Development Company) has wanted sight of commercial documents that third parties to the States have signed and agreed. My understanding is that the process that we use, or that S.o.J.D.C. have used, is largely a mirror of that that you might find being used by parliaments elsewhere, and your panel instructed independent experts and they did have sight of the original documentation. I am aware of the difficulties that perhaps you encountered but now you are asking for sight of those documents by the panel as well and I understand that that is being considered by P.P.C. (Privileges and Procedures Committee) and we shall await their ruling. I know that there is a secondary issue with a report that is being delivered to Treasury and Resources and I understand that the Assistant Minister is endeavouring to ensure that they receive that report which then ...

The Connétable of St. John:

Can I just point out that while our experts had access to these documents they were not allowed to refer to them in their report and they were not allowed to use them in their calculations and instead their calculations were on market averages and not for the actual case of S.o.J.D.C. So, in other words, our experts in producing their reports had their hands tied behind their back and were not able to give a true and accurate report of what is happening. This is why we, as a panel, require that information, in order to give a true and accurate, as opposed to just a market average because the 2 could be very different. Can you please, as Chief Minister, take the necessary action to ensure we get this information?

The Chief Minister:

That, I think, comes to the issue where we do not necessarily agree and I do not think the Minister for Treasury and Resources agrees as well. If an independent expert and adviser has had access to the original source documents they may not refer to those documents because of commercial sensitivity. But I would expect, and it has been, I think, my experience and experience elsewhere, that if there was any material divergence from the calculations that they had been able to put into the public domain, then they would have made findings along those lines without referring to the individual documents because ...

The Connétable of St. John:

This is why they said in their report it was vital that we see the information. As incorporation spreads throughout the States, and there is intention for further incorporations, what action will you be taking to ensure that future incorporations do provide necessary documentation to Scrutiny?

The Chief Minister:

As I said, I think we are waiting for the P.P.C. findings in relation to this particular item. I am not aware of any other panel that has encountered a similar problem but if, P.P.C. raise an issue that we need to consider more broadly then, of course, that is what we will do.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

So you accept that, looking ahead, as incorporation spreads through the States, this issue of confidentiality of documentation could worsen?

The Chief Minister:

Well, I do not see how it can worsen when this is, so far, the only case that we have had where there has been the problem that the Constable has just outlined and yet we have had incorporations in existence for a number of years prior to this and we have had a number of Scrutiny reviews dealing with some of those third -party bodies as well, and most probably notably Jersey Telecom.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Right. I think obviously we should just note that we are looking to receive information on a confidential basis and it will be treated confidentially, and that is part of the problem at the moment. I will just raise a question while everybody else is reflecting: do you think it is acceptable for a report commissioned by a States department to be held up on the basis of confidential issues?

The Chief Minister:

It should be available to that department, yes, it should, which is why I made the point about the Assistant Minister liaising to ensure that they are in receipt of that report. That is important and I treat that category of report differently from the comments that I have made in response to the Constable.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. So you will be endeavouring to get that situation resolved as a starting point. I want to cover a couple of areas around Freedom of Information. The States passed a proposition, I think by the Deputy of Grouville and Deputy Labey, November 2014: "To extend the F.O.I. (Freedom of Information) legislation to companies owned or controlled by the States and the Chief Minister has requested a report-back to the States within 6 months", which would have been by June 2015. Now, in answer to a very recent question in the States you advised that you now: "Hoped to report in the third quarter of 2016, as officers have been focusing on the implementation of the law."

Hopefully, you will agree this represents a somewhat significant delay of over 15 months from what was approved by the Assembly. Why was this work not given a higher priority in order to meet the timescales approved by the Assembly?

The Chief Minister:

I think we were clear from the start that trying to bring in all these issues earlier than was envisaged was going to be difficult and I think that everyone would agree, looking back at the introduction of the Freedom of Information Law, such a large piece of legislation, there was potential for difficulties in its enacting, as we have seen elsewhere, when they have enacted Freedom of Information Law. I think that we will look back and think it has been largely successful and operating in a successful way, and so I think the focus on bringing that law into effect and its operation, in hindsight, although it has meant that bringing in extra or further entities has been delayed slightly from that which the States might have liked, the implementation of that law was the right priority at that time and now we are moving on and going to give priority to doing the work to report back about those extra entities. So I appreciate it has taken a lot longer than the States might have liked but I think that the working of the law is showing that those priorities were the correct ones.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

So I think you said third quarter 2016; I will take that as by 30th September. Are you going to be reporting back on the implementation of those entities or are you going to be lodging some legislation that achieves this?

The Chief Minister:

Well, the target that we are working towards an extension of is 2017. So if you work back from first quarter of 2017.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

So 1st January 2017?

The Chief Minister:

Yes. I am not absolutely aware of the details of the administrative work but if I simply look at the question before me it would seem to me that the legislation needs to be lodged and approved by the end of this year. So it is going to need to be a report and working on the law drafting probably roughly at the same time.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. So the legislation lodged and hopefully adopted about sometime towards to the end of this year and implementing, in effect, what, from 1st January 2017?

The Chief Minister:

It says the first quarter but it is for the first quarter, so that would have to be 1st January 2017, yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Right, okay. So your department is going to be bringing legislation in place to have Freedom of Information applied to States-owned bodies on 1st January 2017?

The Chief Minister:

That is the intention. I have got to warn the panel that I think it is fair to say that representations have been made by some of those entities around what the potential downsides might be, but that ultimately will be for the States to consider.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

But ultimately the States have made a decision that they want Freedom of Information extended to these people, these bodies, and they are owned by the States, are they not?

The Chief Minister:

That is why I think it was for a report, and that is why I say that the States will ultimately have to consider.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

These are bodies that are owned by the States, are they not?

The Chief Minister:

The States will have to consider those representations, will they not?

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Can you just confirm that they are bodies that are owned by the States?

The Chief Minister:

Indeed, they are.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Thank you.

The Chief Minister:

But that does not mean to say the States still will not have to consider those representations.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. Possibly in light of the recent controversy over the travel expenses incurred by civil servants, would you give a commitment to routinely publishing details of all expenditure by the States online, as I believe is required in the U.K. (United Kingdom) and certainly as is practice in the U.K.?

The Chief Minister:

Well, as you know, ministerial expenses are published online and, of course equally, one of the advantages of Freedom of Information is that we are undertaking a programme to try and publish as much online so that those who are interested do not need to go through the formal process of requesting information. During the first year of its operation, of course, we have not made that much progress on that. I have not considered the practicality of publishing all the details perhaps as fully as they do in the United Kingdom, there would be a cost associated with that, but I have, theoretically, no problem with publishing detailed expenditure information because I think it is good for transparency and it is good for accountability, but I have currently not considered how that might work.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Because it is certainly the case, I can think of a couple of the councils, I have not gone through very many of them, where they literally download all items over £500, I think it is, on a monthly basis. So that would be something that theoretically you would be supportive of?

The Chief Minister:

It is something that theoretically I could consider and would support, providing it was not too costly in money or people.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. Would you be prepared to recommend to one of your officers that they go away and have a look at it?

The Chief Minister:

We always go away and have a look at the issues that Scrutiny have raised across the table; it would be remiss of us to do anything other than that.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

So perhaps you could do that and then perhaps report back to us in, say, a month's time to let us know whether it is feasible or not?

The Chief Minister:

I expect it might take ... yes, we can do.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Thank you.

The Connétable of St. John:

The Charities Law and Dormant Bank Accounts Law; are you able to confirm on what date the new Charities Commissioner is likely to take up the post?

The Chief Minister:

No, I am not.

The Connétable of St. John:

When do you expect to bring forward the detailed regulations underpinning the Charities Law, which we understand is in the second and final phasing of implementing the law?

The Chief Minister:

It is in the second phase. I am not sure it is the final phase because we will need to see how the Commissioner operates and there may need to be a further phase after that. One of the reasons that the implementation of the law and the Commissioner has taken longer than we might have liked was finding a suitable source of funding for it. We had a plan; it has not quite happened in the way that we thought it might, and so we are currently in a process of looking at underspends to cover the timeframe between wanting to implement it, because we think it is an extremely beneficially piece of legislation, and will support local charities, and the implementation of the Dormant Bank Account legislation, which we know is in process.

[11:00]

The draft law is going to be lodged by the end of this month, but it will take a number of years before we might see any flow of funds in order to provide for that funding. So we have got a bridging situation and we are trying to work out a way of funding that.

The Connétable of St. John:

So effectively the Charities Commissioner and the expenses of his office, or her office, are due to be funded by monies raised through the Dormant Bank Account Law?

The Chief Minister:

In due course.

The Connétable of St. John:

In due course. So what estimates do you have of how much revenue will be raised in total through the Dormant Bank Account Law?

The Chief Minister:

I do not have those figures with me but we can provide them to you. It is all based on assumptions and, dependent on what assumption you put in there, you can get wildly differing amounts.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Do you have a ballpark figure?

The Chief Minister:

I do not have it with me, no.

The Connétable of St. John:

What sort of proportion of this is likely to be spent on the Commissioner and the office?

The Chief Minister:

I have not got the costings of the Commissioner and the office with me today but, if memory serves, it is between £60,000 and £70,000 per annum, I think is what is being proposed. So it is a minimalistic office of Commissioner and I think one or a half admin support.

The Connétable of St. John:

It is an awful lot of money that could be going to charity though, is it not?

The Chief Minister:

Of course you can always take that view with any charitable organisation or any charitable gift, that you want it simply to be going to the charity itself but, in the world in which we live, it is important that we have got appropriate legislation in place supporting those charities, giving confidence to donors and those who are receiving the help of the charity. So I do not think that it is a large amount of money considering the amount of money that we put into the charitable sector through the lottery and what third-party philanthropists give to Jersey charities. In fact it looks from a

distance that it is another area that is missing and we need it to support both the local charitable sector, and I think they are going to see great benefits from it, and, of course, those charitable structures that others might want to use Jersey for as well.

The Connétable of St. John:

The draft law provides for the possible use of reclaimed funds for the purposes connected with health, education and/or the environment. Can you confirm there are no plans to use this money to fund normal States expenditure?

The Chief Minister:

Well, there are no plans to use the money to fund current State expenditure, which I think is what you meant by: "Normal."

The Connétable of St. John:

Or future States expenditure?

The Chief Minister:

No. Future services which are currently funded by the States, then the answer is no.

The Connétable of St. John:

Good. Thank you.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

I have got just a minor query. You talked about this gap needing to be bridged. Biological warfare against the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel is not appreciated **[Laughter]**. You have talked about bridging the gap between the introduction of the costs of the Commissioner side and then the flow of money coming in when the dormant bank accounts come through. Basically, you are saying that there is going to need to be £60,000 and £70,000 a year that will need to be funded, correct?

The Chief Minister:

I think that is around £50,000; yes, anyway, so it is about that. I do not have the details with me.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

You have said that number. Do you have any indication at this stage how many years we are talking about, effectively, for the gap to be bridged?

The Chief Minister:

Well, I think we started working on the assumption that it was probably going to be 3; I think the reality is it is more likely to be 4.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. Do you want to elaborate on the reasons for the delay?

The Chief Minister:

It is just the flow of funds. So in the dormant bank accounts there is a transitional period of 5 years. Now, it is expected from the work that has been undertaken that some banks will choose, because of the work that they have already undertaken around their dormant bank accounts, to move money across earlier than they might absolutely need to after the 5-year period because they have already got processes in place, but again we will wait and see.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

And others will be less so. Is there not a risk here that you will have a sweep-up of dormant accounts and you will have a pot of money but then, after that, it is going to be relatively small amounts coming through? Well, we do not know it is small amounts but certainly small numbers of accounts coming through. So how many accounts do you anticipate receiving once you have cleared out the existing ones? Do you have any indications of an ongoing flow?

The Chief Minister:

No, I do not have those details with me today but certainly they can be provided to you.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Does all the money go out, in terms of the capital, on to charitable causes or is it invested and it is the return from that that gets put to charitable causes?

The Chief Minister:

No, it is the money.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Okay. So it is a sweep up and pay out. Right.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Chief Minister, hospital sites. With the removal of People's Park at the eleventh hour and the previous site decisions that seem to have been overturned, does the Council of Ministers have the ability to deliver such a large project?

The Chief Minister:

Absolutely they do, yes.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Would you care to elaborate on that? What confidence ...

The Chief Minister:

One thing we are absolutely committed to is making sure that we deliver a new hospital, and the first stage of that is getting agreement around what that site is going to be. States Members said to us when we were speaking to them nearly a fortnight ago now, is it not, around the States Chamber, that they wanted to be more involved in the process going forward. So the Minister for Health, and I have not had time just to confirm with him, but during the course of this week is going to be inviting Members to a workshop to go over all the work that has been done, to answer questions. A number of States Members have suggested that they would like a little bit of revisiting work done on one or 2 of those sites, and that is what Ministers will do, and engage States Members in a different way so that we can get to a point ... We know that there is no ideal site; I think all Members accept that, there are going to be trade-offs, but we have really got to, acknowledging that fact, move forward and decide on a site.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

What confidence does this series of events give to the public that the current Council of Ministers can successfully oversee a large project such as this? How are you going to rebuild confidence for the public?

The Chief Minister:

Well, Kevin, you were not in favour of keeping the People's Park on the shortlisted site. I am not sure that the Chairman was and I am not sure that the Constable was, so it is slightly odd that you would use such terms in questioning me when what we have done is listen to what members of the panel felt about the shortlisted site. We have listened to what I think over 5,000 members of the public felt about the shortlisted sites, we have listened to what States Members have said about shortlisted sites and we have accepted what has been said and that is why we are carrying on a slightly amended process, as I have just outlined. So members of the public and States Members should have more confidence that we are listening, that we want to take people with us because the important thing, as the survey of the existing sites said, is we need a new hospital.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

It would have been nice to have had the debate but you are quite right, I was not in favour of People's Park.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

I will ask a question then on the basis of what you just said there, Chief Minister. Where was ... I will call it the sense check on People's Park? In other words, when it was first mentioned, did no one turned around say: "Fine in theory, it is not going to work in practice because you can just see how the political opposition is going to impact on this suggestion." So, you know, where was the common sense factor which might have suggested very early on, not half an hour before the debate, that this really was not a good idea?

The Chief Minister:

Is it wrong for a government to bring forward a site that, once you have done a piece of work, showed that you could get a lower cost hospital, showed that you had great medical adjacencies, which is a technical term that basically says, from a medical perspective: reducing waiting times, getting people into hospital, getting them treated, getting them out again, meaning that they are not having to sit around on trollies like we see elsewhere around Europe. Is it wrong that the government says to itself: "We know it is going to be difficult. We know that there are going to be people who are against this site and will not think that the trade-off with other open space is acceptable." Is it wrong for us to ask the public whether that is a trade-off they would like to make? It would be wrong for us to have said: "That is the one we are having and we are going to push and fight it through." But it cannot be wrong that a government in any community says: "Look, we know that this is difficult. We know that there is no ideal site but, if you look at that site, you get some of those things but we know that for some people that trade-off will be too great." That is what we did and that was, I think, right thing to do.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

The suggestion I would put forward, and it is the same with certain States Members that I have spoken to and also members of the public, is that it is all very well having a theoretical position but common sense would have said that the outcome of where we are now was predictable and should have been predictable 2 days after it was initially raised. In other words, it may have been brilliant in theory but the outcome was predictable and what has happened is you have lost a lot of months of time on this area. Was someone not saying in the Council of Ministers: "Lovely idea; is not going to work"?

The Chief Minister:

Look, we had lots of robust discussions about whether it should be included on the list or not, but it has got to be right for governments to come forward, even if something is going to be unpopular, and ask the public what they think about it, because it is going to be a hospital for us for the next 50 or 60 years. We knew it was going to be difficult. The easiest thing would have been to say,

taking your logic: “Well, no, we are going to say that those trade-offs are not appropriate and we are going to make that decision for you.” That would have been the easy thing to do, but engaging with the public, difficult as it has been, unpopular as it has been, and asking the public for input into those difficult trade-offs, has got to be the right approach.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondre:

Well, you certainly had an element of public input, as you say, from 5,000 people. I think we will move on from that one.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

What do you think of the recent comments, Chief Minister, attributed to Kevin Keen that Health and Education should be split away from the States like Ports and Tourism?

The Chief Minister:

I was not at the lunch so I cannot relay first-hand the context in which Mr. Keen made those comments but, if you take the principle that we should look at all the services that we are providing, and we are doing this, and asking ourselves whether the delivery model that we have currently got is an appropriate one or it can be enhanced, then that is what we are doing. If you take the Health Service there is an argument that says that, because we are a small place, and other small places do this as well, you end up with the delivery of health services and what elsewhere you would think of as the Department of Health, so thinking about quality, running in a combined approach. We are fortunate because we have Social Services in that same melee as well, and asking yourselves: “Is that an appropriate model for delivery of health service and for the creation of the best policy and for holding to account of those delivery arms as well?”

[11:15]

That is something that we are considering and that we are looking at. So it might not be exactly the model that Mr. Keen suggests but, certainly, we are looking at how those parts of health service interact and how we are going to deliver them into the future.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

So can you confirm that you have no plans to incorporate Health or Education, but possibly not ruling it out?

The Chief Minister:

No, I am not talking about incorporation, I am talking about a different model, which is potentially at the basis of where Mr. Keen's comments originated from, but I am not sure how incorporation would enhance the delivery of services in those 2 particular areas.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Could you expand on the kind of model that you are thinking of?

The Chief Minister:

Well, I think I just did, did I not?

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Well, either it is sort of private or public, or are you talking about a hybrid, or ...

The Chief Minister:

No, it is not. If you just look elsewhere in the world ... of course, they have private and public health services but the way that they manage policy, and they have the Department of Health thinking about policy, and the way that they have delivery mechanisms. So you have got your hospitals and your G.P.s (general practitioners) and everything that happens in primary care, and the way you procure those services is very different from the model that we have here. So it is looking at that model, not looking at private and public.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Over the last 2 years both the Minister for Health and the Hospital Director have made comments about the possibility of the hospital being used for health tourism. Given these comments, has the possibility of health tourism been factored into the size of the new hospital?

The Chief Minister:

This is where you can talk about expanding the private provision at the hospital. We currently know that there is a piece of legislation which means that Health can only deliver private care on a cost recovery basis. That does not seem sensible in a world where private healthcare is largely paid for by insurance and those insurance premiums are not just based on activity in Jersey but elsewhere as well. So it could be that we are in a position where Jersey individuals who are benefiting from health insurance policies are paying higher premiums for higher costs of service that they might be experiencing elsewhere. So I think there is an ability to expand that, and that is certainly part of the work that they have been looking at, but to think of Jersey as a high-level destination for health tourism, like you might see some hospitals in London ... There was some work undertaken by Ernst and Young, I think it was, thinking about the funding models for health in the future, and we know that we are not the only place looking at funding models of health in the

future, they are around Europe as well, because they are all facing a similar, if not worse, financial strain on their health service, that it was most unlikely that Jersey would be one of those types of destinations.

The Connétable of St. John:

So could we just be clear on that: there are no provisions in the new hospital for health tourism?

The Chief Minister:

It depends what you mean by “health tourism” does it not? If you are talking about ...

The Connétable of St. John:

Basically, people coming to the Island as opposed to those living on the Island having a private health fund, so in other words, coming to the Island.

The Chief Minister:

As I said, there might be in some small way, and that is where Ernst and Young did some work, but to think of us a destination, as London is seen as a destination around the world for health tourism, that review suggested that that would not be the case, for all sorts of reasons.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I suppose just to delve slightly, you talked about the different models of effective delivery services under different regimes, but I presume that does also require different structures to be put in place. Is that fair comment?

The Chief Minister:

Yes, I think it is. Yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

At this stage, do you have an indication of what those structures might look like or what might be involved?

The Chief Minister:

We do not. We started to look at it and the Health Department was starting to look at it, but I think it is right that there is no firm decision on what that will be.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Chief Minister, the European Union referendum, what do you foresee as the main impact on Jersey should there be a vote to exit the European Union?

The Chief Minister:

With respect, that is what the debate is all about, is it not, and we day in and day out hear our colleagues in London and across Europe arguing about what the impacts will or will not be.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Obviously, specifically referring to Jersey in this context.

The Chief Minister:

The impact in the United Kingdom will have a knock-on effect to potential impacts for us. We know that the very fact that there is an E.U. (European Union) referendum has already slightly impacted us in our Standard and Poors rating, it has already impacted the United Kingdom's sovereign rating with a similar negative outlook, simply because there is a referendum taking place. It will, of course, depend upon any agreement that is ultimately negotiated with the E.U. should the U.K. decide to leave after their referendum on 23rd June this year. You will have seen the documentation that the U.K. Government has published about what the impacts might be on the U.K., what the possible models moving forward might be. Our position is, and remains, and we have been quite clear about it, that we want to maintain the same access that we enjoy under Protocol 3. We know that the U.K. Government understands that and we know also that, in any renegotiation of their relationship with the E.U., they will be absolutely mindful and cognisant of that during those renegotiations. So we are clear in that regard about what we want. We know that we already have third-country access to the E.U. in various fields, there should be no reason that that is not maintained, even if the U.K. decides to leave, because that is agreed on a third-country basis. What we, of course, do not know is what the trading agreement will be for the U.K. with member states.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

What discussions have you had so far with the U.K. regarding the possibility of the U.K. leaving the E.U., and what is Jersey's position?

The Chief Minister:

Well, those facts that I have just outlined to you. You will know from the document that the British Government has published, they might have lumped us in with Gibraltar, which is not constitutionally accurate, but they are aware of the effects that it will have upon us. Of course, our position is the mirror opposite of Gibraltar: they are in for services and not for goods and we are in for goods and not for services.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Well, they are full members of the European Union.

The Chief Minister:

That is right. The British Government knows, Back-Bench Members of the British Conservative Party know, Labour Party, Liberal Democrat Party, Members of the House of Lords; we have had conversations with them, they know that we want to maintain the existing relationship. We have met with the Europe Minister on a number of occasions; he knows that we want to maintain the existing relationship that we have under Protocol 3 and we want to maintain the existing relationship with the United Kingdom as well. So they are fully sighted on that. Cabinet Office knows that we want to maintain the existing relationships, my officials have very good links in to not only the F.C.O. (Foreign and Commonwealth Office) but also Cabinet Office, as you would expect, which has taken a lead on these matters, and into Treasury and into the Ministry of Justice. So they are fully sighted on what our position is and what we would want our position to continue to be should the U.K. vote to leave.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Do you have a unified approach with the other Crown dependencies, obviously Guernsey, Isle of Man?

The Chief Minister:

We do have a unified approach with Guernsey; the Isle of Man of course have a slightly different relationship with the United Kingdom because of some of their V.A.T. (Value Added Tax) arrangements, but we are aligned also with the Isle of Man. If we look back to the process that happened during the 1970s, we are fortunate in Jersey in that my international adviser, who still works in my department, was also working for the Jersey Government during that process of session. If you go to the papers from all that time what we are seeing is a little bit of a reverse. It will be a very similar process: things will change throughout those 2 years of negotiation, which will have the U.K. Government setting the trigger for the 2 years of exit, and all that that will mean, and you would have another parallel piece of work as well thinking about what the future will be and negotiating trade deals elsewhere with the world, because they are currently led through the E.U. So we will need to continue to be informed. We are in discussions with the British Government about what the best platform is for continuing to keep us informed through that process should they decide to leave, because there will be a platform for devolved administrations. It seems to us that it would be best at this point to be part of that platform so we are updated on a timely basis, rather than trying to create a second platform where just C.D.s (Crown Dependencies) are being updated. I just think it is better if we start off from the basis that we are aligned and we are all being informed together. But it will be a fluid negotiation and it will be a fluid situation, as it was when the U.K. Government went in and we were successful in agreeing the Protocol 3.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

But at that time it was just 7 countries to negotiate with as opposed to, what, 26, 27?

The Chief Minister:

27, yes, as will be. It is much more complex and the E.U.'s relationship with micro states is also changing as well.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I have got just one query, I suppose: just to clarify: it will be the U.K. though that will be negotiating on our behalf with the E.U.?

The Chief Minister:

Because the U.K. is a member of the European Union. It will not surprise you to know, and I think we have said it in the public domain, that we are setting up a ministerial subgroup looking at our contingency plans, but our plan at the moment is, as happened on the way in for the U.K., that the U.K. would negotiate on our behalf. Again, if you look at the process on the way in, it changed during that process, so the U.K. was going to be negotiating and the C.D.s were told, no, they would not negotiate on their own, it was a: "Take it or leave it" and then no, it was a: "What do the Crown Dependencies want?" and the U.K. would go and then negotiate on the Crown Dependencies' behalf. Which is why I say it was fluid on the way in, so one would expect that similar potential for that change on any negotiation to exit.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Just to wrap up in that area then, and just to confirm: you have referred to the third-country status, so things like A.I.F.M.D. (The Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive), for example, basically remain unchanged, or should do?

The Chief Minister:

It should remain unchanged. So things like A.I.F.M.D., data protection, aircraft security; all of these things which are important to us but largely often under the radar, we have succeeded in maintaining third-country access and third country equivalence, which is why sometimes we find legislation frustrating, but we have to be able to show that we can meet equivalent standards with the E.U. Which is interesting because it goes in some ways to the heart of what the U.K. is debating about sovereignty and decisions of sovereign parliaments. We know, because we are small, that it is never that straightforward.

[11:30]

We have to often show that we can comply up to a very detailed technical level, far beyond what you would expect for a small place, to show that we are a responsible trading partner and we can have access to those markets. Anybody wanting to have access to the E.U. market is going to have to be able to the same.

The Connétable of St. John:

Population and migration: the Population Policy expired at the end of last year. Why have you not introduced a new one?

The Chief Minister:

I apologise that the Assistant Minister is not able to be with us today because he is unwell, but you will know that he has delegated responsibility in these areas so he is up to speed with facts and figures there, but you will know from previous conversations that in actual fact the main tenets of the policy in practice rolled over to the decisions that they are making on a weekly and monthly basis when it comes to issuing licences both for employer and employees and for undertakings. In the meantime we are starting off on the long-term planning approach.

The Connétable of St. John:

Forgive me, I did not understand much of that response. I asked a simple question: when will the new policy be introduced?

The Chief Minister:

No, I think you asked me why a new one had not been introduced at the expiry of the old one, which is a different question.

The Connétable of St. John:

Sorry.

The Chief Minister:

I answered it, as I said, to the best of my abilities. For all intents and purposes, practically the way the law is being operated and decisions are being made by the Housing and Work Advisory Group, which is what gives practical effect to the law and to a population policy, the same main tenets of that policy are being adhered to.

The Connétable of St. John:

So when will the new one be introduced?

The Chief Minister:

Well, as we have spoken previously, we are in the process of engaging on a long-term plan and we expect, once that comes to the States, part of that plan will be a refreshed and new Population Policy.

The Connétable of St. John:

Figures I have seen on the last policy the immigration far exceeded the guideline of 325 persons a year, so what factors are being considered into the new policy?

The Chief Minister:

Well, we are taking it from a much broader perspective because you will know we are developing a vision and a planning framework for the next 20 years and engaging with Members and the public and interested parties as well. We have started that engagement; I was at a meeting last week with a number of organisations asking for their involvement in developing that vision and looking at how we want Jersey to be over the next 20 years and as part of that, we will be discussing population. So all the things that you would expect to be in a 20-year vision and plan will have an effect upon population.

The Connétable of St. John:

We note from your recent answer to Deputy Higgins's question in the States, the Principles of the Interim Population Policy as embedded in the Strategic Plan and the M.T.F.P. remain appropriate. Does it not trouble you that you are the first Council of Ministers, and indeed you are the first Chief Minister, not to have a Population Policy?

The Chief Minister:

I think if you had just listened to what I said, you have read the answer out, your question is not quite correct, is it, just because it had a date on it. The way that the law is being administered currently and the decisions that are being made are in line with that policy.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Can I just clarify: am I right in saying that the Interim Population Policy basically expired at the end of last year; the document that was approved by the States?

The Chief Minister:

There were dates put on it, yes, and those dates have been and gone ...

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes, they have expired.

The Chief Minister:

I used a different word in the answer that the Constable just read out, but the basic tenets of that policy are still being adhered to.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

But if there is not a ... and I am trying to think if it was a proposition or a law now, but basically if there is not something technically in place, if somebody wishes to challenge a licence application or something along those lines, what defence do you have?

The Chief Minister:

No, because the policy and the advice remains in place, does it not, that has not changed, so they would challenge any decision under the policy documents which are in place.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Your officer to your left is frowning. Do you wish to add anything?

Director, Corporate Policy:

Not particularly frowning at all.

The Chief Minister:

I do not think he is frowning in disagreement.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That is okay, then. If it is a frowned agreement, that is fine. Do you want to do your next question?

The Connétable of St. John:

Yes, I will just ask the other question: what was the target of the interim policy in numbers and what were the actual numbers?

The Chief Minister:

I think you know the answer to that: you have asked it of the Assistant Minister before and it is in the public domain: there was not a target, there was a planning assumption that departments were working to of 325 and the actuals, I have got them in front of me here, in 2013 and 2014, was 1,200 and the Statistics Department then said: "Well, okay, that is roughly 600 per annum."

The Connétable of St. John:

The targets with your policy were not being met?

The Chief Minister:

As I said to you, it was not a target, it was a planning assumption.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

The planning assumptions were lower than reality; is that a fair way of putting it, Minister?

The Chief Minister:

Thank you, Chairman.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

That is okay. I wanted to see if I could help you out there at all.

The Connétable of St. John:

Thank you.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

I suppose the question, while Kevin and Chris are just cogitating at the moment, if they are: you referred to the long-term plan is going to be where the Population Policy is going to come back to the Assembly, effectively, and I may have misunderstood, but obviously I would have taken the long-term plan to be a set of relatively high-level principles from which it then goes down at differing levels. So are you suggesting in the long-term plan there will be some detail around the population also, or are you going to set a principle and then there is going to be another piece of legislation that will come through which will have this in detail?

The Chief Minister:

No, because the long-term plan, you are right, is going to be principles, but it is going to have to have key performance indicators in order to deliver on those principles around all of the 3 major elements of the economy. The environment, so how we are going to improve air quality, how we are going to improve water quality, and there are going to have to be measurements, because if there are not ... one of the ways we have gone wrong in the past is not having proper measurements to say: "Okay, well, that policy" or "that strategy is working because it is delivering this particular outcome." We have developed a strategy or a policy and some have got good targets in them some have not. What we are saying is the long-term planning framework is going to help us drill down and deliver those targets for delivery, and I fully expect that some are going to be overlapping. But I see that population might move to a target, we do not know. But there has to be a way of managing population to deliver on all sorts of other targets as well.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

I am still cogitating over the expiry of the principles. I will remember that next time I get caught for having car window insurance: “But I am still adhering to the principles.” Corporate Delivery Plan ...

The Chief Minister:

With respect, Deputy, in that case you would not be, would you, because you would be without insurance, which is a very different thing to having policy documents in place in administering a policy under the same principles that existed the day before. You would be driving then, quite clearly, one day with insurance and one day without it, and it is a very different scenario.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Yes, but you would not like to bring something to the States extending the previous interim policy?

The Chief Minister:

It is not something we have given any consideration to, is it, but ...

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Moving on. Corporate Delivery Plan: in the Medium Term Financial Plan you state: “The Corporate Delivery Plan will provide the accountability mechanism by which the Council will monitor delivery of its Strategic Plan and report to the community on progress made.” What progress has been made?

The Chief Minister:

I thought you were going to ask me where it is, because that is a good question; it is not in my pack. Paul is the official overseeing this so perhaps if he wants to just update us on where it is.

Director, Corporate Policy:

Yes. The purpose of the Corporate Delivery Plan was to recognise that the Council and the States had adopted or approved the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan is a 4-year plan and it is really important that the government operates and monitors performance not just on a 4-year cycle but on an annual cycle. So we have in draft, and very near to completion, a Corporate Delivery Plan for 2016, which was circulated to the Council of Ministers 8 or 9 days ago, and we are just collating final comments with a view to finalising and publishing and presenting it before the Assembly. As I say, the objective is to break down a 4-year plan into an annual plan and for that to be monitored by the Corporate Management Board and the Council of Ministers so they can prioritise in the press and make sure we deliver on what we said we were going to deliver on.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Do you have a timeline?

Director, Corporate Policy:

I have said to senior officers end of March absolute latest, but obviously that is contingent on Council being content with the final version, but that is my aim.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Will the C.D.P. (Corporate Delivery Plan) be online once approved?

Director, Corporate Policy:

Yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

There is no States debate on it so I presume it is a report?

Director, Corporate Policy:

On the basis that it substantially reflects what was outlined in the Strategic Plan, it is a report, yes.

The Connétable of St. John:

Public sector reform and the e-gov. This panel recently had a briefing on e-gov and the forthcoming objectives, and will continue to monitor e-gov to see how it is progressing. What changes do you expect the public can look forward to seeing in 2016?

The Chief Minister:

That is a good question. Already 2016 will have seen us go live with the car parking app, and I see that media outlets as well are reporting spaces available in car parks in town and there is an app that does the same thing, so they will be able to see that on their own mobile device. I should say these apps are what as a technical term are referred to as "beta", so you get up to a certain percentage of accuracy and then you launch it and you get feedback to help you improve it to get it to be even more useful for the public. We have got the bus routes, where the buses are round the Island app that has gone live in beta as well. We have got the Open Data website, which has gone live. These are all things which have gone live this year. There will be other areas like that which will go live during 2016; we can send you the details of what those are: things like sports bookings, further increases to the way you can do Tell Us Once, so we have had those things going live at Social Security, but they will be rolling out that you can do that at other parks as well. But there is also another side to e-gov which is the big areas.

[11:45]

We will have had the design authority ... what is the word I am looking for ... organisation appointed in 2016. We will be making progress on digital ID during 2016. I would hope that we have a decision about what or who we are going to use for the digital ID; I would have hoped that we will during 2016. It may take slightly longer but we have just been discussing over the last 10 days or so about how we could potentially speed this up into 2016, have a decision about what new tax system we are going to need to use in 2016, and then we will have other progress which the public may not see, but there will be work-in-progress around a new H.R. (human resource) system and thinking about how health technology can change as well.

The Connétable of St. John:

You touched on it, but could you give us some background as to the reasons why a U.K. company were given the contract to implement some of this e-gov work?

The Chief Minister:

As you know from the answer I gave in the States last week, this is an area that we need to balance: bringing in expertise and people with experience elsewhere as part of that process to balance supporting local tech firms and individuals in that area as well. That is why on this particular piece of work a preferred supplier was used, and over ... obviously not the next 30 days because we are probably halfway through that period now, they are through Digital Jersey working with local suppliers to see how they can work with and use local suppliers to help in the delivery of that piece of work. So we have got quite a lot of money, I think over the period of the M.T.F.P. it is something like £20 million that we are going to be spending in I.T. (information technology) and technology-driven processes. Some of that is going to be off-Island, and it always was. What we are working on now is ensuring that, even if you have got an off-Island spend, how it is that you get that knowledge transfer to ensure that local technology firms, once the U.K. person has gone, are able to run that system, build upon it, support it and all those areas. It was always going to be a balance, but there is an opportunity. The money that we spend on e-gov and on technology in government to support the local tech industry is in a way that nobody else has, and that is what we are absolutely committed to. I have had meetings with the C.E.O. (Chief Executive Officer) of Digital Jersey, and we are working through how we can refine that model to make sure that it continues to work in that way.

The Connétable of St. John:

My concern is how can we promoting Jersey as a digital centre for excellence when we ourselves use outside consultants and contractors?

The Chief Minister:

It is through that balance and that relationship between off-Island and on-Island that we are going to promote Jersey's digital sector, and that is why it is so important that we do that and we have that balance. Every single ... I think this is right, the word is not "applicant" but the people who applied to undertake the work of the design authority, of the consortiums that were shortlisted, each one of them had an off-Island part of their bid. We know that is going to happen, the challenge for us is getting the balance right.

The Connétable of St. John:

Voluntary redundancies and compulsory redundancies: how much money has been saved on the last round of voluntary redundancies?

The Chief Minister:

Which was the first round of voluntary redundancies, yes. The annual saving will have been just over £4 million.

The Connétable of St. John:

Have you got a timetable as to when compulsory redundancies will be commenced?

The Chief Minister:

No, we do not.

The Connétable of St. John:

How many meetings have been held with the unions regarding compulsory redundancies?

The Chief Minister:

It works such that each department talks, consults with the unions, they have to comply with employment legislation and go through processes if there are members of their staff that might be at risk in that regard. So departments where they are undertaking work where that might be the case, have met with unions, but I do not have all the details with me.

The Connétable of St. John:

How many times have you personally met with the unions?

The Chief Minister:

Me personally?

The Connétable of St. John:

Yes.

The Chief Minister:

In regard to?

The Connétable of St. John:

Well, as Chairman of the S.E.B. (States Employment Board) and so on, as Chief Minister and meeting unions.

The Chief Minister:

S.E.B. deals with policy and sets parameters for all sorts of areas as the employer and the employing body, and officials on behalf of the S.E.B. meet with unions very frequently. The S.E.B. meet much more infrequently, I cannot recall the last meeting, but it was some time towards the end of last year, October of last year.

The Connétable of St. John:

Did you personally meet unions in October last year or representatives of the S.E.B.?

The Chief Minister:

The S.E.B. personally did and I was there.

The Connétable of St. John:

You were there personally in October. Okay, thank you.

The Chief Minister:

We will confirm the date for you.

The Connétable of St. John:

Thank you.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

Long-term plan: is the Council of Ministers planning on presenting a long-term plan to the States Assembly?

The Chief Minister:

Yes.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

When? Do you have a timeline for that?

The Chief Minister:

I do not have the detailed timeline. When we discuss the long-term plan with you ... I cannot recall when that was now, whether it was this year or last year, I think we left that general discussion feeling that it was appropriate that we gave more time to consult with the public, and I have not seen a revised timeline arising from that giving more time for consultation.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

What I will just ask on long-term plan, because you referred to K.P.I.s (key performance indicators) basically in the long-term plan, which obviously will be part of the debate before the States Assembly. So effectively will States Members be signing up to those performance indicators and therefore those targets when the long-term plan is approved?

The Chief Minister:

We have not given that detailed consideration but I would expect that they would be.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

So the long-term plan then becomes a somewhat more important document and some of it is aspirational?

The Chief Minister:

It is a very important document, yes.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Yes. Which would then beg the question as to making sure there is sufficient time for it to be considered.

The Chief Minister:

Yes. We accepted that point absolutely.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

So it is presumably going to be after the M.T.F.P., perhaps into the first part of next year, rather than this year?

The Chief Minister:

Yes, absolutely.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

Okay. I have got no more questions. Are you happy? I think 5 minutes before scheduled we are complete.

Deputy K.C. Lewis:

We can add 5 minutes on to your next meeting.

The Chief Minister:

You are very kind. I was going to be late and I warned them I was running late. Thank you very much indeed.

Deputy J.A.N. Le Fondré:

We finished, broadly speaking, on schedule. Thank you very much, and we look forward to receiving the information that you have given us.

[11:54]