



Public Accounts Committee Scrutiny Panel

Quarterly Hearing

Witness: Chief Executive Officer of the States

Monday, 9th December 2019

Panel:

Senator S.C. Ferguson (Chair)

Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary (Vice-Chair)

Deputy R.E. Huelin of St. Peter

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier

Ms. M. Scott

Mr. A. Lane

Mr T. Rogers

In attendance:

Ms. K. McConnell, Comptroller and Auditor General

Witnesses:

Mr. C. Parker, Chief Executive of the States

Mr. R. Bell, Treasurer of the States

Ms. C. Madden, Chief of Staff

Mr. T. Walker, Director General

Mr. M. Thomas, Director of Risk and Audit

[14:04]

Senator S.C. Ferguson (Chair):

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to this public hearing of the Public Accounts Committee. We are still looking at some of the legacy issues. I am sorry, yes, I should remind you to read the warning, as I think you have probably all seen it several times.

Scrutiny Officer:

For the sake of the transcript, could we please just go around the table so we know who everyone is? Do you mind if we do that first?

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

I am sorry, yes.

Comptroller and Auditor General:

Are we going down the table this way?

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes.

Comptroller and Auditor General:

I am Karen McConnell, Comptroller and Auditor General.

Mr. A. Lane:

Adrian Lane, independent member of the P.A.C. (Public Accounts Committee).

Ms. M. Scott:

I am Moz Scott, independent member of the P.A.C.

Mr. T. Rogers:

I am Tim Rogers, also an independent member of P.A.C.

Chief of Staff:

Catherine Madden, Chief of Staff.

Director General:

Tom Walker, Director General for Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance.

Chief Executive:

Charlie Parker, Chief Executive.

Treasurer of the States:

Richard Bell, Treasurer.

Scrutiny Officer:

Lindsey Power from the Scrutiny office.

Scrutiny Officer:

I am Caro Tomlinson, P.A.C. officer.

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

Deputy Inna Gardiner, St. Helier, member of P.A.C.

Deputy R.E. Huelin of St. Peter:

Rowland Huelin, Deputy of St. Peter.

Connétable J. Le Bailly of St. Mary (Vice-Chair):

John Le Bailly, Vice-Chairman.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

I am Sarah Ferguson, Chairman of the P.A.C. All right, in its decision-making report, the P.A.C. noted that there was not yet evidence that the Team Jersey programme would prevent silos from forming. What objective evidence do you now have in this regard?

Chief Executive:

I think there are 2 things which lead me to think that we are starting to address the problems in the way that we originally anticipated. So if you recall, we said that we would not see the results of this for a period of time, partly because we were going to take people through a programme of investment in a variety of the modules that were linked to Team Jersey. So we had initially the report, which came back to us with some of the failings, which we are now addressing. The first part of that was to secure the Team Jersey leads, which was the number of people that we would then embed in the organisation who would then become the champions, both in departments and teams, as part of that learning transfer that will come from ultimately the provider of the Team Jersey work. The first evidence I think that gives us some confidence this is working is that we were oversubscribed for the number of people who wanted to be Team Jersey leads. We have now about 150 of those who have been trained up and are part of that cohort of people who are going out and actively working across the organisation. The second part is the development of the various modules that we have coming onstream, of which there are 2 components. One is around individuals who are going through the initial support and training alongside the bite-size programme that gives them some specific areas where they can focus on. So as well as having the introduction to the Team Jersey principles and about what culture is required there are various modules, whether that is having difficult conversations about performance, whether that is managing teams, whether that is creating

opportunities for people to deal with and have the confidence to push back against poor activity, whether that is bullying and harassment or whatever. We have had, I think, over 500 people go through that in the year so far, which is another sign that we are beginning to get some traction on the throughput of people from across the organisation. The final bit, which we are running in parallel with that, is the development of teams, where each of the departments are going through their Strategic Leadership Team to go through the programme and looking at how they can improve and high-performing teams and the leadership skills that they need to have in order to be able to provide that overarching direction to the organisation as a whole. We are starting to work those through the individual departments at the moment. From a quantitative point of view, we have got some numbers that we can now show. From a qualitative point of view, we have a significant amount of feedback that is coming through from each of those individual session modules, be it for the Team Jersey leads or be it for the individuals who are going through it. That work is going to be brought forward in a report because I think we have agreed that we will bring back regular reports for both Scrutiny to look at as well as the Council of Ministers.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Now, if you have had complaints about bullying and harassment, which obviously is something that the Team Jersey culture is trying to get rid of, how many have you had and how many have been solved in a reasonable manner?

Chief Executive:

So I think we gave this information to the C.S.S.P. (Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel) meeting last week, and I think we have had 35 people come through on the hotline and we have had a number of other people, of which we are investigating. What we got for that Scrutiny Panel is an agreement that they will be provided with regular updates as to the progress of that, which goes to the States Employment Board, and that will be then provided to Scrutiny through that avenue. So that particular Scrutiny committee we are working with at the moment. If you want me to provide more detailed information, I can do so at the rise of this meeting. Can I just correct one point though, Madam Chairman? Team Jersey is not going to solve bullying and harassment in its own right. It is part of a programme of activity that we are dealing with about bullying and harassment, so by way of example, we have rolled out a much stronger training programme for managers. We have done a huge amount of information-giving to staff to ensure that they feel confident that they can use the processes, because the evidence in the past has been that that sense of if they raised the concerns it would never get investigated, it would never get dealt with and therefore why bother doing it was a real significant factor in the whole discrediting of the previous arrangements for how we dealt with bullying and harassment. So Team Jersey will be part of it, but we have also got a separate programme of activity which we are rolling out to managers and individuals to encourage them to

feel (a) that they should use the system that has been revamped in line with the HR Lounge recommendations; and (b) that managers will do what they need to do as part of that.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

All right, thank you very much. We were told that the management structure will be flatter, with fewer layers, and will be more modern. Can you tell us where this has been achieved and identify where?

Chief Executive:

If you recall the original statement that we made around the structures at the beginning of the consultation for the One Government, it was that we were going to reduce the tier 1 and 2 levels from 66 to 40. We have reduced it from 66 to 39 and then we have added 2 back in, so we are at 41.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes, but if you will excuse me, that is the number of people, yes, but it is the number of layers of management that I think people are concerned about.

Chief Executive:

If you recall, in the original principles around the Target Operating Models, we said 5 layers of management with an average of one to 8 span, albeit that we did expect that there would be some parts of the organisation, particularly in Health and also with front line street-based services - whether you are a parks team or whether you are a hospital team - you may have charge hands or superintendents that deal with some of those activities, which would mean that you would vary that because of the nature of the organisational structure that we had. Of course we have not finished the Target Operating Models yet, so we have not rolled it out across all organisations, but if you go to those that have been completed, which is Treasury, which is Strategic Policy, Performance and Planning, C.L.S. (Customer and Local Services) and part of the Office of the Chief Executive, we have adhered to that. In those other areas where it is work in progress, it is part of the design principles and once that has been completed we expect there to be those levels. Now, the one area where we will, I think, see some more levels to be determined is Health, because we have only got to tier 4, so when we deal with tiers 5 and 6, where there are a lot of levels, we expect to have a slightly different model for that, which should ensure that we can stick to the original plan, albeit there was always a bit of a health warning - excuse the pun - about Health.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

At the P.A.C. we welcome the development of the database to track implementation of recommendations. Is it now complete, being used, and more importantly, validated?

[14:15]

Chief Executive:

Do you want to come in just for this item?

Scrutiny Officer:

Before you answer the question, can you just say who you are for the camera?

Director of Risk and Audit:

Sure. I am Mike Thomas, Director of Risk and Audit. Sorry, just your question was: is it complete, is it validated?

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Yes, complete, validated and being used. Validated is the number one concern that we had last time we discussed this.

Director of Risk and Audit:

So in terms of completeness, we have had all the returns in through the user group. In terms of validation, that is still in progress and some of that is reflected in the document we sent through to you in terms of we are putting a really rigorous challenge in in making sure the evidence supports the completion assertion and that that evidence is there. We are still going through that process. That is sort of well on and we hope to have that completed by the end of this month.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Is this the report ... sorry, the presentation, the PowerPoint that came through, is it a report as opposed to a presentation?

Director of Risk and Audit:

Sorry, yes.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Can you give any early indications of any successes that you have had of consolidating this information?

Director of Risk and Audit:

What we are trying to do is in the presentation that was given to the committee, there is a list of the themes that you have been monitoring. Against them, we have tried to allocate each of those recommendations to those themes and we are yet to draw out the sort of key conclusions from that,

but I think that will show some significant movement from the original recommendations, which will show some positive outcomes.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

I think ... well, I do not think, I know we expressed concern about the pace of the implementation of these recommendations. Can you share with us the areas that you are focusing on and those that have not necessarily got the same priority?

Director of Risk and Audit:

Essentially what we have done is we have gone through those recommendations, and the older ones, we have focused on making sure they are closed off and then by department you can see within our presentation there are numbers of recommendations which we have then focused on where the sort of big numbers are and then looked at where the C. & A.G. (Comptroller and Auditor General) has closed off recommendations recently. We have made sure the evidence is there to support those changes and that validation.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

I think you are nearly halfway there.

Director of Risk and Audit:

Yes.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

How many of the closed have just been straight repetitions?

Director of Risk and Audit:

So at the moment it is probably two-thirds of those and we have got a significant challenge going back on some of the others, but as you can see from that presentation, there are some new officers in post who themselves have revalidated and they have come into the organisation within the last 4 to 8 weeks.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

The last question: the priorities for the next quarter?

Director of Risk and Audit:

The priorities for the next quarter, so we are looking to *get this finalised by the end of this month, then it will go to the E.M.T. (Executive Management Team), it will be agreed with all the D.G.s (Director Generals) and then from then on it is for internal audit to start to complete their work.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Finalise being validated?

Director of Risk and Audit:

Yes.

Chief Executive:

Do you want to just say though that there is the expectation, as we made the promise previously, we would be bringing that back to P.A.C. in the form of a report once we have done that in order that then you get transparency about the process, so it is not a tick-box exercise, and that is where the challenge needs to come back for you.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

So the report is here. We were expecting a December quarterly report. Is that what you are referring to ...

Chief Executive:

Yes, this is ...

The Deputy of St. Peter:

... because I asked the question whether this PowerPoint presentation was ...

Chief Executive:

There are 2 bits to it. One is the validation process. If you recall, we agreed that you would be satisfied that the validation process was not just a tick-box exercise. That needs to be brought back to you once we have completed this work at the end of December, in early January, so that there is an auditable line of enquiry from yourselves, which then gives you the comfort that we are doing what we need to do. That is slightly different though from the quarterly report, which will be an ongoing update, which if you follow the trend, will see the numbers coming down. The key is what are we doing with the learning.

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Absolutely. The question was when the validation will be complete; you will deliver a report based on that that will be auditable. My other question was what are the priorities for the next quarter, and I am assuming after validation in areas that you need to address.

Ms. M. Scott:

Could I ask a question, please, Chairman?

The Deputy of St. Peter:

Am I right on that?

Chief Executive:

Yes.

Ms. M. Scott:

A follow-up question. Just on this question, and it is great that, as you know, even that you are doing this work, it is quite a lead in what we had before, but I noticed that the tracker report that you gave us assigned specific recommendations to specific D.G.s, but as you said, Mr. Parker, there is also this question of cross-learning, so that seems to suggest that these recommendations need to look in a wider context. How will you be presenting that to us in terms of looking how these different recommendations are being carried through in different departments?

Director of Risk and Audit:

The original sharing process for that was through the E.M.T. meetings. As the Chief Exec has said, these reports will be agreed with the E.M.T., individual D.G.s, and then we will put out the themes for those that ensure that that learning is sort of consolidated through those E.M.T. meetings.

Ms. M. Scott:

So how will you tick them off?

Director of Risk and Audit:

Sorry?

Ms. M. Scott:

I mean, you are ticking them off at the level of some departments, but we do not see an actual check-box process going in other departments.

Chief Executive:

As I have just said, we are not having a tick box. We have got ... I think the presentation gives you the approach, which includes the role of internal audit to provide the verification that there has been a proper process. That has to come back to yourselves in order that you can see then the auditable trail. As part of that though there will be a variety of themes where, as the Chief of Staff has previously said, it links back to the C. & A.G.'s recommendation, which are quite clearly linking 2 or 3 pieces of work that perhaps have taken place in a number of separate audits. So let us just use

as an example the recent one about A.L.O. (arms-length organisation) remuneration, within that there is a very clear reference to governance. Behind that there are a series of other recommendations that have been part of a number of reports over the years where we have not actioned those, but if you follow them through, they all come together around 4 or 5 key themes, of which remuneration will be one. We have had a report on remuneration, but it is not the major one when you compare back it to governance, which when you compare it back to the role of boards, so that links to the States employment work, and then it links back again to the role in which the Government looks at things on a cross-cutting theme to deal with recurrent issues which are not just, for example, the responsibility of the shareholder, but also the responsibility of lots of service departments. It is that type of approach where we have not done the learning which we are now embedding in the organisation. So the Director of Risk and Audit will deal with the process bit, will pull out the learning, will provide the evidence. We then have to provide not just have we seen, done and understood it, but are we ensuring that future C. & A.G. reports are not coming back with the same old, same old, and that is where the problem has been in the past.

Ms. M. Scott:

Great, thank you.

Mr. A. Lane:

Can we turn to investment decisions?

Chief Executive:

Investment decisions?

Mr. A. Lane:

Another of our favourite things.

Chief Executive:

Yes.

Mr. A. Lane:

When you responded to the report on decision-making, you outlined the improved arrangements that you put in place for business casing and option appraisal, including training to staff there. Can you just provide us with what the latest update is, please?

Treasurer of the States:

So in terms of referring, if you like, to the Chair's question of objective evidence of that, first you will see it coming through in terms of outlying cases for, for example, office strategy within the hospital,

for the integrated technology solution. What we have also undertaken is training across in particular T. and E. (Trade and Enterprise) in terms of the 5 case model from H.M. (Her Majesty's) Treasury and we have established within the structure of T. and E. a team that specifically looks at business cases and investment appraisal. That is to provide a centre of excellence, but also to provide an element of training for finance business partners and others who are preparing business cases. You will see a variable level with the current Government Plan, that we are establishing hurdles that we expect to be delivered on a consistent basis for the Government Plan refresh in a year's time and that is being rolled out across fully, in addition to which there are areas within the P.F.M. (Public Finances Manual).

Mr. A. Lane:

What successes have you seen or any benefits identified in business cases as a result of that additional scrutiny?

Treasurer of the States:

So from my perspective, what you see is more challenge, rather than in the past, it was they who shouted loudest got the most money quickest, an element of that. So you see more challenge going into the process that we have in awarding funding, also going through in terms of those business cases that pass muster in order to go into a Government Plan, but also on the other side of that, you have people articulating and challenging themselves as to why funding is necessary or why they are delivering a project.

Chief Executive:

Can I just add there, one of the early successes was in the preparation of the Government Plan when the capital bids came forward, so while we still have a legacy of proposals that have been in the pipeline for some time and there were obviously also a number of projects that were a political priority which Ministers wanted to see taken forward, quite a few of the proposed capital bids had been and were going through and continued to go through the process that the Treasurer has just outlined. So by way of example, that has also seen an adjustment to the way in which the capital programme is being put together to include more resources going into the preparation of feasibility work before you bring individual projects through and that then means that you can do more of the business planning and business case work for stronger investment decisions. The best example, most recent example, which we did the joint presentation with C.S.S.P., was around the office modernisation proposal, which we are working through at the moment. I think that was a very good example of where we have now got much more rigour in the process that has been identified. But if you go back, there are a number of projects which are now the subject of that pre-rolling vote investment to help with that decision-making and business case preparation.

Mr. A. Lane:

So help us understand: what did not make the cut? Is there anything that has got kicked out as a result?

Treasurer of the States:

Well, the point being in principle that you have about £11 million of pre-feasibility funding in place that will determine whether those projects make the cut. In the past those projects may well have just gone into the Government Plan without approval or without going through the business case analysis and investment appraisal upfront.

Mr. A. Lane:

So the £11 million takes you through the ...

Treasurer of the States:

Yes, there is £11 million there.

Mr. A. Lane:

... feasibility stage for those projects in terms of all the support and consultants and such that you need?

Chief Executive:

Yes, and the other thing is it does not tie up your capital expenditure now in advance, so therefore the use and drawdown of public money is much more efficient and flexible in order to be able to learn some of the lessons that again have come out of previous reports. A good example is some of the hospital lessons that the C. & A.G. reported to, and we have taken that forward as part of the development of a different approach to preparing the financial arrangements that will ultimately be the subject of decisions by the States Assembly around how you prepare a business case for that. It is again another point about learning from the C. & A.G. reports, which in the past perhaps we were not as good at evidencing. I think this is a good example of where that process has started, but it is only work in progress.

Mr. A. Lane:

To that point, is there anything you would have done differently over the last 3 months or so in terms of business casing?

Treasurer of the States:

In the last 3 months?

Mr. A. Lane:

In the last few months, what has gone wrong? What examples have you missed?

Treasurer of the States:

What has gone wrong?

Mr. A. Lane:

If anything.

[14:30]

Treasurer of the States:

Not specifically in the last 3 months, but I would say a great deal that has come in front of the Investment Appraisal Board has had to be taken back to departments, who are making their bids for additional contingency funding for the period. That is often as straightforward as: "Are you making a good case on a strategic level for the funding?" so there is a lot of vetting that goes on before they reach the decision point.

Mr. A. Lane:

Let us turn to K.P.I.s (Key Performance Indicators) and more specifically the strategic K.P.I.s. I think, if I recall, we were expecting to see something perhaps May of this year in terms of the strategic plan K.P.I.s. You talked about steps that the Government was taking to use more outcome-based measures. What is the tangible progress that you have made so far?

Director General:

Sure, I am happy to deal with that. So the performance management framework has been continuing to evolve over the 12 months or so and so the work that was intended for May was completed and you saw some of the fruits of that in the Government Plan that was lodged in July around some of the objectives and outcome measures that were included in that. This is also a good example of something that could be a tick in the box that is assigned to one person to be accountable for it, but is being taken forward across the whole organisation. So in order to pick up your point from earlier, if there is something that says that I have an outstanding action which I am working on to get that done, and it is the way in which we are implementing it that ensures that the organisation moves forward. So the way that we are implementing it is having a complete organisational approach to performance measurements across all departments. So we have done the initial work around the outcomes-based measurement framework and I think that the first fruits of that are going to be published in January, and I think that there is a briefing arranged for P.A.C. in January so that we can take you through that.

Mr. A. Lane:

How are you engaging with the other departments in that exercise personally?

Director General:

It is a whole government approach, so I think we have discussed it at the E.M.T., gosh, probably 5 or 6 times over the last 12 months at least and we have evolved the system with the whole organisation. We have developed an approach that should deliver us both a national performance management framework, so how is Jersey doing, how is the whole Island doing, and also one that articulates how the public sector contributes to how the Island is doing across the organisation. The usual approach is we have Senior Management Team discussions, we have done workshops, we have done a lot of work with individual departments, going around all of the departments working out the measurement framework.

Mr. A. Lane:

When we see that in January, what should we expect to see? Will it be benchmarked against comparable jurisdictions or regions in the U.K. (United Kingdom)?

Director General:

What you will see in January is the upper layer of the performance framework, so what you will see is the outcomes layer, the top layer, and the top layer is benchmarkable because it is aligned with the O.E.C.D. (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) Better Life Index, which you can look at at both a regional, European and global level to see how Jersey is doing on those Better Life Index outcomes compared to everywhere else in the world.

Mr. A. Lane:

Have you got targets set against those measures?

Director General:

No. There are in one or 2 where various strategies, Government strategies, have set objectives to improve the outcomes, but generally it is a state of the nation assessment, so it tells you where Jersey is at, you can see it against the O.E.C.D. comparators, where you want to be, and you can see the trends, so it gives you the changes over time. What we have tried to do ...

Mr. A. Lane:

So you will have some historic comparators for Jersey as well?

Director General:

Absolutely.

Mr. A. Lane:

Therefore, it is not just starting gun, it is mid-race, effectively?

Director General:

Yes, yes.

Chief Executive:

Just linked to that though, you obviously will have seen the departmental business plans that have been prepared for or in accompaniment to the Government Plan. They were all published in draft form before ... I think it was in the autumn, was it not, that we did that, and they will be finalised now that the Government Plan has been deliberated on. Within that, there are more specific K.P.I.s that link back to departmental activity, which then allow you to look at the more granular detail as well as the outcomes that Tom has talked about and the framework. I think if I recall, one of the positive contributions from the C.I.P.F.A. (Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy) assessment of the Government Plan was the fact for the first time they could see the sort of link back to the funding policy and an outcomes framework, which they thought was a real positive for the way in which the Government Plan is being prepared. But you have obviously got to go, as Tom says, upwards but also down, so the business plans are the other part of the equation where K.P.I.s will ultimately be much more specific around certain types of activity, whether it is the number of children in care or the number of patients who are using A. and E. (Accident and Emergency) or whatever.

Director General:

Then the part that we will be working on during 2020 is really down at the service level, so the various service level outcomes and objectives that feed into the national outcomes. I think that is where there are not that many good benchmarks at the moment. Yes, I think at service level the benchmarking to date needs to be strengthened and we will probably be working on that quite intensively throughout 2020. When you see the top level national outcomes in January, then the outcome level is comparable. Then once we start to work on the service level stuff, you will see that it is much more of a mixed picture. Some service level outcomes are well benchmarked, particularly in Health and other areas where it is relatively straightforward to do that across the British Isles. In some other areas it is much more challenging and we do not have those service level benchmarks fully in place yet.

Director General:

No doubt we will return to it next year.

Chief Executive:

Just one other bit though that adds to that, we have had this conversation with the C. & A.G. and I am sure you will reflect on this. The other thing we do not do is we do not have a lot of external independent inspections or peer reviews of activity. There is a need, I think, for that to be introduced as more normal arrangements, where you benchmark through comparisons. We have had an Ofsted and we have just had the other Ofsted. We have had, for the first time in a decade, the police inspection which has come out. We have had, for the first time, a non-peer review, a proper review of social work practice in the Probation Service by Ofsted. These sorts of exercises are really important, because you have then a methodology which is independent. It then does allow you to do some benchmarking, albeit there will have to be some proxies about how you weight that, and that information should become much more normal, where you are subject to arrangements which ultimately the Care Quality Commission will potentially take on for some areas which are really important, whether that is about how we inspect our old people's homes, right the way through to other things. I think we are some way off getting there, but that journey has been embarked on and we believe that, working with the C. & A.G. recommendations, that is an area that we need to bolster and do more of going forward.

Mr. A. Lane:

Do you have an internal commitment as to what that is going to look like?

Chief Executive:

We have some views about areas that we want to see benchmarked. By way of example, I have this year made sure we have had an external planning review; we have had a review of our health and safety; we have had the reviews of Children's Services. I have asked for a review of adult social care services, which is now going to be undertaken. We have done it, as we have said, in the broader sense of the police, but there are other arm's-length bodies that need those reviews. So we are beginning to build that up as a portfolio, but we do not necessarily have at the moment absolute commitment from those non-government parts of Jersey to that, because not everybody wants to go through that scrutiny.

Ms. M. Scott:

Can I just ask, this sounds commendable in terms of the encouraging of more inspection and more challenge. How are you going to ensure that some of the data on which you are basing these benchmarks is robust? Because of course some departments may well have an interest in perhaps not presenting things in the right way.

Director General:

You have teed me up very nicely to talk about the Statistics Unit.

Ms. M. Scott:

I am sorry, I had better say that I am a member of the Statistics User Group.

Director General:

So the Statistics (Jersey) Law brings into being a body called the Statistics User Group that is our equivalent of the Statistics Regulatory Authority, so it is there to oversee both our official statistics, so those produced by Statistics Jersey, and also statistical theory produced by Government, produced by other bodies such as the Financial Services Commission and others. The Statistics User Group has very helpfully just issued its 2 codes of practice, a code of practice that Statistics Jersey now needs to follow in relation to its statistics, which are the source of most of the outcome level measures in Jersey, then another code of practice for all other public authorities that every other public authority in Jersey will need to follow also. So one of the things that we will be doing in 2020, as the Government of Jersey is embedding how we comply with the code of practice for statistics, that will be a matter of us appointing kind of professional heads of practice who are accountable for different statistical theories. Then the Statistics User Group, as we get into 2020 and through to 2021, will - I am sure - be exercising their independent powers to commission audits and reviews of various statistics that Government and others produce to make sure that they are robust and that they are as strong a dataset as they can be.

Ms. M. Scott:

If they have the funds.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

The draft department operational business plans relating to Growth, Housing and Environment do not appear to identify any clear deliverables in respect of property and capital delivery over the next 3 years. Can you tell us what is being proposed with regard to freehold office estate like, for instance, Philip Le Feuvre House, Huguenot House and Le Bas Centre? Have they been offered or consulted with with Andium Homes for possible housing sites?

Chief Executive:

There are 2 different issues here, which is there is a corporate property strategy now being finalised, which is the subject of a presentation to yourselves. Unfortunately, the private session that was timetabled for last week was overtaken by events that took place in the Assembly for the continuation of the Government Plan. That will give you much more of an overarching strategic overview, which you, as a committee, have been asking for to take a view of, which I think from within that will give you some of the outcomes and milestones that you are looking for. But there needs to be an

implementation plan for that that would be taken forward, which will be about corporate landlord responsibilities, an asset management plan and various other aspects that form part of that overarching strategy, which includes our estate management arrangements. Now, within that, those buildings that you have just referenced are forming part of the office modernisation business case that we touched on earlier. We have just published the framework for that to yourselves and C.S.S.P. for a joint session, where we took colleagues through the expectation that we will downsize significantly in our operational portfolio, which will include those properties that you have just identified.

[14:45]

There will be, over the next 3 years, a process where we will put some of the sites to the market for disposal. Some will go potentially to partners, such as Andium Homes, for housing and some will potentially be available to the private market for secondary uses, whatever they may be. Just picking up on the detail, we have got 2 planning frameworks now approved for Cyril Le Marquand House and for South Hill, one of which will be for housing/commercial, which would include potentially key worker accommodation, which may be delivered through Andium, and the other is for private for sale housing, because we want to be able to achieve some resources coming back into the Exchequer that can be used for payments towards other investment decisions that the Government may make. Philip Le Feuvre House is likely to be a site that we will come out of when we get a single office accommodation for public services, but we have not yet made a decision about the disposal of that, whether it is to the market or whether it is for housing, but in an earlier debate that if you remember took place around Ann Court, the Chief Minister was minded to dispose of that for affordable housing through Andium. We also gave a commitment that we would do that with the Le Bas site and that will definitely happen for housing.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

Will these sites be reviewed before they come vacant, rather than just sit there for perhaps years before anything happens to them?

Chief Executive:

So in the case of ...if we take Cyril Le Marquand House and South Hill, we obviously have to get a planning framework for that and we have done that now, so those are being transacted as a consequence. In the context of La Motte Street and the overall set of buildings we have got there, we have not yet prepared a planning brief, but we will be doing that by 2023, when we expect to vacate those buildings, and then we would be either putting them to the market or if we are going to develop them through a subsidiary or an arm's-length organisation such as Andium Homes, we can go and deal with that as soon as is practicable. So the expectation is increasingly buildings will not

sit vacant for years and there will be a plan for the disposal or otherwise of each of the individual sites. That is what the outline business case for the office modernisation makes very clear for the 20-odd sites that we are going to be coming out of over the next 3 years.

The Connétable of St. Mary:

In regard to Maritime House, that is a good example of a standalone department. Has that been discussed fully with them as to their preference?

Chief Executive:

Yes, so Maritime House will be in ... by 2023 we will vacate that facility. What we then do with it has yet to be determined. The reason why that is is there are 2 arms to Maritime House. You have got part of the customs function that is operating out of there and you have got part of G.H.E. (Growth, Housing and Environment). G.H.E. will come into the single development or building that we propose, but customs is going to be part of the redevelopment of the port proposals. We may well find that we relocate them into a more appropriate setting as part of that development, but that decision has not been made yet and is clearly dependent on the Ports of Jersey bringing forward their detailed proposals for any changes at the port harbourside, and that has not yet been completed. So that work is ongoing and therefore we cannot yet determine how and in what way that might impact on the customs function.

Ms. M. Scott:

It probably will be addressed at this meeting that you discussed, but I was saying has any plan been sorted out for these derelict buildings as well? We have mentioned the office modernisation, but we still have quite a few derelict buildings in the property portfolio. Are we going to see any decisions made about them?

Chief Executive:

Yes. I think your assertion at the front end is right. That will come forward as part of it, but I just need to be clear: we are bringing forward the strategy, because if you remember, we agreed we needed a strategy which set a framework before we went and indiscriminately dealt with some of the property issues, so what do we hold, what do we dispose of, what do we want to reinvest in, because it is part of our investment strategy. That is what the strategy will start to do. There then needs to be an implementation plan. I suspect that the granular detail about individual buildings will come through their implementation plan. That is still work in progress through 2020, and if you go back to the original question, that does form part of the G.H.E. operational business plan for 2020.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I am going to organisational culture and the corporate learning. I would like to check, in response to a recommendation to you, you have accepted that any slippage will be notified, we will be notified of any slippage or changes in the planned transformation. Apart from G.H.E., is it any other slippage that happened during ...

Chief Executive:

There are 2 sides to this. If you are talking about the Target Operating Models, there have been 2 areas where politically there have been interventions which have impacted. One is G.H.E., which you have just referenced. One was Justice and Home Affairs and P.24, where the States Assembly made a decision about the original Target Operating Model and changed it, so that has obviously pushed that out. We expect that to be finished by March of 2020. The other area where there is political input is on Children, Young People, Education and Skills, because of the 2 big pieces of work. One is around early years ...

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Development board.

Chief Executive:

... and one is around the review of school funding. That process is in train, but has been pushed back because we will see the impact of those in early 2020, but the first phase of consultation has been completed. We are assessing the outcome of those for C.Y.P.E.S. at the moment. We have obviously done the first phase of Justice and Home Affairs and we have done all the interviews and we are continuing to deal with that at tiers 3 and 4, and we expect 5 and 6 to be completed by March. Clearly G.H.E. is the subject of intense political discussion at the moment and we expect there to be some announcements about that in early January, which the Council of Ministers have said they want to consider at their meeting then. There was an initial conversation about that that was held at its meeting of last week. On the back of that, there are 2 other areas. One is in the Chief Operating Office. Two parts, modernisation and digital and people services, were subject to the Government Plan being approved, because there are significant investments taking place in those areas. So the Target Operating Model is being agreed on modernisation and digital and we are rolling that out, but of course we cannot recruit to everything until we have got the money. That has now been agreed. That is running behind, but that was always going to be part of the Government Plan and people services is in the same position, but all of that should be complete and done by March at the latest, if not before.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Just to be sure that apart from G.H.E., Children and Home Affairs, all other departments will complete tiers 2, 3 and 4 by December, as promised in the one-year report?

Chief Executive:

So we will not be able to do that in the C.O.O. (Chief Operating Office) in the 2 areas that we said, which we did make the point it was subject to funding being approved. That is being done, because legally we cannot recruit that, but the proposals will be approved. The other area is the C.Y.P.E.S. slotting interviews and ring-fence process will not complete by the end of December, but it has been started, so that will be done early in January. What will not be achieved at the moment is 4, 5 and 6. That is the key bit, so that is where the implication is of some of the changes politically. J.H.A. (Justice and Home Affairs) tiers 2 and 3 are complete; 4 they are going through at the moment, but that was always going to be slightly longer as a result of the decision by the Assembly, so they will run into early 2020. What we are trying to do by March 2020 is to complete right the way through to 6 - that is the lowest level, including 5 and 6 - in those departments. We will not complete that for Health until we have come up with a new model, which Health have asked us specifically to do, which the Minister has talked to the health Scrutiny Panel about, which is where is the best way of dealing with the 5s and 6s, where a large amount of that is around customers and they want to think differently about how that would link with C.L.S. about the customer offer.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I would like to see your point of view. We have some slippages, note 1 and note 2, and the process is going for almost 2 years. How does it impact ...

Chief Executive:

So the process, if I can interject ...

Deputy I. Gardiner:

It is less.

Chief Executive:

... it is far less.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

It is coming for 2 years.

Chief Executive:

No, it is far less. It did not even start until July 2018.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I mean, the whole process about discussion, Target Operating Model ...

Chief Executive:

So that is different.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

... how it will go, this uncertainty within the public sector will be 2 years.

Chief Executive:

Yes, so March 2018 was when it started. It will be the first consultation took place ... that is very different from the models. In your ... sorry.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

No, I am sorry, the point that I am trying to make is that the public sector coming almost in 3 months, in 4 months, for 2 years of uncertainty, and it has been told to us not once about low motivation, low morale, and once we hear a bit more and more slippage, it is for another month, for 2 months, for 3 months. I am just trying to assess how do you see this impact on the staff morale and motivation within these departments?

Chief Executive:

Morale will be variable. If you go to C.S.S.P., if you go to C.L.S., if you go to T. and E., those departments' morale is very different from 6 months ago, because we have completed the exercise fully all the way through, and that includes 5 and 6s. In other areas we are seeing some certainty come about, so parts of J.H.A., parts of the Health and Community Services where we have got the people now in post, that is seeing an improvement in morale. It is going to be patchy. Clearly in G.H.E. at the moment that is a problem, but we have just agreed and Ministers have agreed part of the next phase of interviews and getting people into posts, which we think will radically change the feeling of uncertainty into that department, but I cannot legislate for where politicians decide they want to wait and hold on matters. I think in your pack that we provided for you, we have given you an update which shows each department, where we going to see confidentially ...

Deputy I. Gardiner:

We need to be very confidential, so ...

Chief Executive:

But it shows you that there is quite a lot of progress going across quite a lot of the areas. Obviously I do not deal with non-mins, but even in non-mins in certain parts they are going through some reorganisation. That has just been completed, for example, in the area that the Greffier has responsibility for. So these are all work in progress. Would I have liked to have gone quicker?

Absolutely. Would I have liked there to have been certainty? Absolutely, but I equally cannot and should not not listen to the democratic process if there is a view that there needs to be a change in whatever organisation structure. That is what has happened in 3 big departments, which affects a lot of people.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

We are getting on for an hour. Have you time to just stay with us for a few more minutes?

Chief Executive:

Yes, sure. Certainly.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Super, thank you.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

So going to the next question, we highlighted the importance of sharing messages from P.A.C. and the C. & A.G. across the departments, a wider application. Can you please give examples of wider considerations and learnings from recommendations and messages that came from our side?

Chief Executive:

I think I gave some just earlier around, for example, the A.L.O.s. Do you want to come in on some of the specifics that we have been looking at, particularly around some of the themes that you have been spending this year, because I think that is probably going to be better?

[15:00]

Chief of Staff:

Yes. So if we take the example of financial management and internal control, all of the reports now come to not just E.M.T., they come to our C.S.B. (Corporate Strategy Board), which includes some of our non-mins as well, and a couple of our tier 2 people as well. We have a discussion about all of the recommendations right across. We have allocated a D.G., as you have already alluded to. However, that D.G. is just there for the accountability, so all the D.G.s have to have an input into what they think their actions are for those recommendations. The learning from not just the recommendations and the trackers but the reports, when they come through now, they have a process where they also go to the Council of Ministers, where I present the C. & A.G.'s recommendations and the responsible officer then discusses with C.O.M. (Council of Ministers) what they are going to do in terms of actions, which recommendations they are going to action, which recommendations they think they may challenge, because they think either it is not quite accurate

because the world has moved on. So that is how we have been doing it, so it has become embedded into the process of our senior management meetings on a quarterly basis. If a report does come mid-flow between the quarterly basis, that gets added to the agenda so that we discuss it, but notwithstanding that, on a quarterly basis we do have a standing item.

Director General:

Perhaps I can throw in a live example. I mean, the report that was done on arm's-length organisations looked at a certain number of those, but had wider learning points for the organisation. The broad principles of what we, as accountable officers, should do with arm's-length bodies that we are responsible for have now been incorporated into the P.F.M. Even though none of the bodies that were looked at were in my area, that prompted me to go away and put in place updated and better framework agreements with all of the arm's-length bodies that I am responsible for, the Care Commission, the Children's Commissioner and others, and that is all as a direct result of that earlier report.

Chief Executive:

Just to give you a couple more examples, we have touched on the A.L.O. and I think we do not need to rehearse that, but if you take, for example, the P.A.C., and ultimately this came from the C. & A.G. review of governance in Health and Community Services, which was a significant piece of work and found a lot of, I think, fault lines that are reflected. If you go back over the C. & A.G.'s last 7 years, in a number of ways we have fundamentally started to change the nature of how we deal with governance. We have tended to do things much more ad hoc. We have now got, as I think has been explained, some cross-government groups that now operate at the right level, which deals with the sharing and learning that comes from that. A simple but important change with the arrival of the new Public Finances Law and the introduction of the P.F.M. is the change in the accounting officer letters, which will be going out just before Christmas to become operational from 1st January. Within that there are a number of requirements now which go back to the points around some of the learning, particularly around governance, so there is another link back with that. If you take what has come out of the S.E.B. (States Employment Board) review and the work that we have been doing with yourselves again as a theme, part of that is being addressed in the Government Plan submission, which was very clearly targeting areas about resourcing, about talent, about long-term investment, but in addition to that, going back to my previous point, the governance of S.E.B. has now transformed in the last period, so looking at everything from the role that S.E.B. have to play in decision-making, what they are doing about ensuring that policies are updated, where S.E.B. are taking a more active involvement in the Target Operating Models, what it is that S.E.B. are providing in terms of auditable lines going back to the issuing of P.59s, all of that has come out of the reports, which have been quite challenging, not without moments where I think it would be fair to say there was a difference of view about where the problems started from and who was responsible from one

S.E.B. to another. The fact of the matter is that the committee is now getting on with that. That learning is not just coming out of the S.E.B. report, it is also linked to the other reports that have been going on. I think if you combine just those examples, we have got some common threads here, which are not specific to one or 2 C. & A.G. reports, but go back to what the tracker has been identified. Now, we will close a lot of those down, but there is work still to do, but a final one is the hospital. So the hospital report was probably one of the strongest and clearest about where governance did not quite work. We have changed that for the hospital project, but we are still work in progress, because it does and is not confined to just the hospital, it is confined to large-scale capital projects, it is confined to the way in which governance works. It is the relationship between political oversight and officer oversight, and all of those we are now switching and changing. That partly comes through the Treasurer's roles and responsibilities, which are different from mine as the principal accounting officer, but link back to the role of the principal accounting officer. I would like to think, Chairman, that when we started this year, we were not making those connections. We were dealing with things in a very sort of stop-start way. Part of the review that the Chief of Staff and the Director of Risk have been doing and the groups that sit below them now is to take that learning to deal exactly, Deputy, with the sorts of issues that you have raised. Now, we are very much in foothills, very much in the foothills, but it is progress and I believe that you will start to see that as part of everyday business going forward.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Super. We will be looking forward to climbing Ben Nevis.

Chief of Staff:

Could I just add, the C. & A.G. recommendations are part of my performance framework, so I have to report on them. It is not just about how many recommendations have we closed down, the new performance framework says: "So what? What difference has it made?" So from a corporate perspective, I would have to report on that.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Does it require you to sort of enunciate the outcomes?

Chief of Staff:

Yes.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Not the K.P.I.s, the outcomes for Joe Public?

Chief of Staff:

Yes.

Mr. T. Rogers:

I have a big voice and I believe this can pick up a good range. In the interests of time, I am going to combine 2 questions. We highlighted the importance of effective internal communications for keeping staff inside. How are you communicating with the staff and how do you measure the effectiveness of that?

Chief Executive:

Okay, so there are a range of methods that we adopt about communication. Some of that is through the intranet and the My States and various specific issues that may be particular to one department. One of the things that we are doing, which it is behind schedule, but is likely to be ready by the beginning of 2020, is a completely new and revamped intranet. Part of that is linked to the software programmes that we have now introduced for Office 365, which will allow a whole series of different mediums for staff to be able to work and talk together and communicate. We have got teams, a whole series of open forums where people can post their views and so on. Clearly, as part of the communications plan for 2019, which you will see the new one published for 2020 in January, there are a number of metrics that are then associated with that, so we now can measure how many things we put out, what impact that has had on campaigns. We do a whole series of tracking of where that information is now resonating internally. Supporting that there are a variety of events, so we have 2 senior manager forums. One is for the top 42 managers, which goes back to your first question, Chairman, and that takes place on a monthly basis. That is supplemented by the top 250 managers - well, it is about 200, it is not 250 - where every second month we have a series of thematic sessions with those managers, which is part cascade, part talking about key issues facing the organisation or facing the departments which have common links back to other departments. Those sessions are taking place, as I say, every couple of months. They are supplemented by departmental arrangements, so individual departments have then a whole series of departmental staff meetings, sessions, team meetings. They vary, because it depends. I mean, where you have got staff who work nights, it is very different to office accommodation, but those are in play and form part of each of the D.G.'s assessment about are they getting out, are they being seen, what are the measurements of that? When we do the next staff survey, we will get some measurements that will come back from that which will tell us a bit more about visibility of leaders, because that was an area that was singularly lacking in the staff survey we did in 2018. On the back of that, there are various team events that are taking place at a departmental level, leading back to the Team Jersey reference that was made earlier, and we have clearly got internal communication going on there about priorities. For example, it was about getting the Government Plan, preparing a lot of the transition arrangements that I have talked about over the last 12 months. Next year it is about how do we deliver all this stuff, how are we gearing up to changing the organisation's psyche and what are we

doing to take forward all the various workstreams that we have been talking about, but more importantly, the individual initiatives that are contained in the Government Plan.

Mr. T. Rogers:

That is an excellent answer. Could I just clarify, you have mentioned the communications plan 2020. Will I find that a lot of what you have said will be in that plan?

Chief Executive:

Yes, and more, to be honest.

Mr. T. Rogers:

Excellent. When do you anticipate that being available?

Chief Executive:

In January it is likely to come out, yes. We published 2019 and it was put on the intranet, so everyone has seen that. We have now got the metrics, so we have covered everything now, from news coverage to campaigns to all the work that we have been doing around internal ...

Mr. T. Rogers:

I look forward to seeing that document. It is going to be very valuable. The other thing that you mentioned is the next staff survey. When do you anticipate that happening? That is clearly a very important document.

Chief Executive:

So we expect that to be, I think, around May 2020 is the plan, and that will be, we think, the next indicator about morale, but not just morale, it is much more granular information that we require to see whether some of the change programme is starting to take effect, the whole thing about leadership, the experiences that people have about their desire to be in public service, accommodation, a big issue before I.T. (information technology), a big issue before, so it will have a range of areas that we will want to be looking at, but it will be pretty comprehensive.

Mr. T. Rogers:

Thank you very much. I am conscious of time. I have one other question, but I recognise that we are ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Sure, sure. Yes, please.

Chief Executive:

We are happy to do that.

Mr. T. Rogers:

You mentioned earlier the progress that has been made with the Jersey standard performance framework. You mentioned the fact that it was completed in May and that you looking forward to the first fruits of this in January. We, like you, have been very keen on outcome-based measurements, particularly in business cases and planning. To what extent did this feature at all, for example, in the Broad Street offices or those of the La Motte Street moves, outcome-based planning?

Chief Executive:

So Broad Street and some of the office moves, it is also about culture.

Mr. T. Rogers:

Absolutely.

Chief Executive:

It is also about investing in people, so some of the outcomes that come from that we think will be an improvement in productivity, for example, space utilisation, investment, efficiencies. You have seen that the expectation is it will cost us around £7 million a year less. These are a series of linked and important outcomes that link back to our performance framework, where we will get judged about spending public money; how do we contribute to Jersey plc's productivity, because public services is one of the lowest productive parts of the economy.

Mr. T. Rogers:

So to summarise your point, there are clearly efficiencies that you have looked at with these projects and there are hopefully service improvements, which are outcome-based, that the public would enjoy.

[15:15]

To what extent were those measures thought of going into the projects and to what extent do you have those measures, now having completed those projects, that you can say: "Yes, we have achieved those outcomes"?

Chief Executive:

I think it would be fair to say some of those projects started before we completed the work around the outcome framework and some projects will not be subject to exactly that sort of stress testing that will follow through from the outcomes framework, which was highlighted in the Government Plan. I think it is a mixed bag. If we take the office accommodation, that was started before we had agreed the framework, but it still has contributed to it, but it has perhaps been the old adage, the cart before the horse type thing. We had to deal with that for the reasons that I have explained to this committee before, and it was much more about culture, behaviours, about improvements in the way in which people were dealing with a whole series of silo-based issues. That was less about the happiness indicator, which is one of the ones that we need to bring forward. It was less about ... we knew that there would be an improvement in productivity, but it was less about being defined what that would be, but there will be and there is already, I think, some evidence of that.

Mr. T. Rogers:

So then given that this was completed in May, but your first fruits will be from January, we can expect to see more and more of these things adhere to these output measures?

Chief Executive:

Yes. January is about Jersey level outcomes, what is the Island achieving, and then as we go through 2020 and we start to put in the public sector contribution to that, then part of that will be, for want of a better term, kind of a public sector scorecard. It will have the usual things around finance and people and then that is where that will join with some of these larger programmes and projects to improve those, so it should all come together.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes, but are you not missing ... sorry, I thought we were talking about outcome-based results.

Chief Executive:

Yes.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Well, outcome-based results are there is Joe Public, what you are doing and how does it affect him or her.

Chief Executive:

Yes, and that is the 2 parts of the framework, so in January ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

No, that is the important part of the framework, come on.

Ms. M. Scott:

This is where I am confused, because we hear about the survey of the staff within the public sector and you said in your report on one.gov that the Jersey standard performance framework would help drive future service improvement, but I am thinking: "Should there not somewhere be some sort of dialogue going on with some of these users of services outside things like Social Security?" We could be talking about planning, we could be talking about other areas, so where is this dialogue going on that is forming these standards and will help you work out whether you are improving the services in all departments?

Mr. T. Rogers:

Kind of customer service level.

Director General:

So the customer service measures are starting to come together. I think that the work that is being done in C.L.S. and elsewhere is starting to bear fruit and you can see that some of those measures are included in the ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

What do you call the measures? Can you define the measures for us?

Ms. M. Scott:

Yes, and what is C.L.S., sorry?

Director General:

Customer and Local Services.

Ms. M. Scott:

Right, that is La Motte Street.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Right. Can you tell us what an outcome measure is then?

Director General:

Yes, and we can do this in a lot more detail in the briefing that we have arranged for you in January, but essentially the performance frameworks start with ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Just give us one.

Director General:

An outcome?

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

An outcome that is good for the public.

Director General:

So if you take a narrow example, you can have things like whether people feel that Jersey is a safe place to live, so people in Jersey have a very clear view on that, which they tell us, which is measured, which we have a time series on. Then you can look at what drives how safe people feel, and sometimes that is around crime, sometimes it is around things like fire safety and whether they feel at risk there. Then you can pull that down and say: "What is driving that?" and that is a mixture of their perception, things like the numbers of fires we have, how safe they feel in their own home and you can pull your way down it.

Ms. M. Scott:

That is related to the Future Jersey outcomes, is it not?

Director General:

Future Jersey is absolutely outcome-based measurements, yes.

Ms. M. Scott:

If you got a member of the public, say I know some people and it has taken 3 years to get a planning consent or something, how are we going to see a bit more in terms of dialogue and feedback?

Chief Executive:

So you are talking about user input into service design?

Ms. M. Scott:

Outside La Motte Street.

Chief Executive:

That is not the same as outcomes, so let us be clear.

Ms. M. Scott:

Well, it might help design the outcomes.

Chief Executive:

No, it is not the same. We had a headline level, a series of outcomes which will - and have been - identified in Future Jersey, as you rightly said, and we have taken that down at different levels of the Government's operation, whether it is at Government Plan level or whether it is at a departmental level. User input, which is absolutely critical and forms part of what you would expect on a number of fronts, a good example of that at the moment is the work that we are doing around the Jersey Care Model. So we have a huge amount of engagement with medical personnel, stakeholders and also people who use our facilities, be it at primary or secondary care level. We have been doing that for 6 months with surveys, meetings and we are now doing stakeholder engagement, which are different types of users across the Island which will help shape then the outcome for some of their views about the nature of what the Jersey Care Model will be. Now, that is very different to talking about, for example, the health indicators and outcomes that will come from the new Jersey Care Model or from a new hospital or from a change in the way in which primary care will be structured on the Island. We must not try and merge the 2, because they are very, very different. So users, yes, we need to involve users much more, so specifically on planning we have had quite a challenging review done of planning and there is within that a requirement for us to get much more engaged with users about the satisfaction levels, about the turnaround levels, about planning decision-making being more transparent and so on. That is not the same as saying how many planning applications are being done and how do the planning applications fit with the development of St. Helier that is in a much more long-term better way for creating the right form of public realm improvements to buildings and so on. That differential is important.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes, we understand that, Mr. Parker, but take Health, for instance. If you can be treated say more quickly for a stroke and the outcome is that you are much more recovered, you are not sort of half ... you know, you are absolutely okay to get back to driving, to normal life and so on and you are out of hospital more quickly and it has cost the hospital less, that is a good outcome.

Chief Executive:

For sure.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Right. Well, why are we not using outcomes like that?

Chief Executive:

Well, we will be.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

If I am applying to get some work done on my social housing home and it takes me 16 phone calls to get hold of somebody to tell them what is wrong and I can get straight through to ... as an alternative, I can get straight through to somebody who knows just what I need and can lay on a plumber for me or whatever it is very quickly, is that not a good outcome?

Chief Executive:

But that is a different set of issues, if you do not mind me saying so, Chairman. The first I would totally agree.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

They are both outcomes.

Chief Executive:

No, no, one is about ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

They are both outcomes, if you will excuse me, that affect the individual in the public. It depends what your definition of outcome is and I have a feeling that you have probably got 2 or 3 definitions as opposed to mine, so I think we need to rationalise them.

Chief Executive:

I would suggest that one of the challenges in this debate is what is the definition of an outcome, what is the definition of a K.P.I., what is the definition of user engagement, all of which contribute to a member of the public feeling that they get a better service. Now, they are different, whether we like it or not, so your point about Health I fully agree. If you have got more independent living, that you are more able quickly to be able to return to normal life and/or if that includes work or whatever, that has got to be a positive outcome that you will want from whatever medical solution that we would find for you. If you want a different way of getting through a backlog for your household maintenance, the issue is not necessarily about going round the back and getting an individual plumber, it should be about how and can we get a better supply of plumbers and services to get a better response rate to the outcome that you need as a resident and as a tenant of our stock and they are different.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

No, with respect, I think it is simpler than that. I think it is getting rid of failure demand. We have had this discussion before.

Chief Executive:

I do not disagree with failure demand, but I would suggest when we have our workshop with you or our session, we will be able to take it through in more granular detail, as I have said, for you to be able to see the different levels. I think the point about user failures in service provision, customer efficiency and also about outcomes for Islanders will be much better to be discussed in that more defined session. I think that would be better for you.

Ms. M. Scott:

Sounds great.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

All right, in which case, your question, has it been answered?

Mr. A. Lane:

I have just got one more. You mentioned the exchange of ... I think you call them accounting officer letters or accountability letters.

Chief Executive:

Yes.

Mr. A. Lane:

You talked briefly about preparing us for, if you like, a 2020 process. How is the preparedness for the return of those letters for 2019 going? Are your officers in a position where they are going to be able to confirm that they have done what you asked for this year?

Chief Executive:

So it is a statutory - correct me if I am wrong - obligation that by the end of this year, each of the D.G.s and the associated accounting officers, so the interim Chief of Police is a good example of one of those, have to provide me with a full report, of which they are all preparing that at the moment, which shows that they have discharged their responsibilities, as outlined in the accounting officer letter that was issued at the beginning of the year. I then take that forward as part of my one to ones, and in conjunction with the Treasurer, I talk through if we have any areas where we think that there are limitations or failings in discharging the legal responsibility and fiducial requirements that you would want for good public services. So sometimes that will vary from your legal position, i.e. what is good practice versus what is a de minimis position and that forms part of their performance for the year.

Mr. A. Lane:

You feel that that is well planned?

Chief Executive:

Yes. They are all due and they should all be in ... I think the date is 20th December, but I need to just check on that, whether that is the final date.

Ms. M. Scott:

With respect, just when you are discussing these accountability letters, you just mentioned the Treasurer. I mean, surely there are areas that the Treasurer is not too conversant with, so if you have got some accountability measure that says: "Make sure that the sewage plant is functioning properly" so how does that work?

Chief Executive:

So there are different issues here, so the principal accounting officer will deal with a whole series of performance issues outwith just the financial regulations piece. The Treasurer has different roles and responsibilities, as laid down by law, which require the Treasurer to be able to be satisfied outwith the P.A.O. (principal accounting officer) on finance and certain legal obligations around that. I have to confer. The Treasurer is independent of that process. That process needs the Treasurer to be able to feel comfortable and if there are any anomalies within that, then we have a route which is clearly laid down in law that we have to follow. So the Treasurer is also subject to performance reviews, so there are aspects of the Treasurer's performance which will be outwith his statutory roles and responsibilities as set out in law as the Treasurer and they are quite different.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Finally, when can we expect to see some form of analysis of the way the Public Finances Law, the States Employment Law and I think the machinery of government and so on are all working together and all the accountabilities and so on are working?

Treasurer of the States:

So the summary at this point is there are some inconsistencies, as we know, between the States of Jersey employee legislation and in particular the Public Finances Law. The Public Finances Law comes into full being on 1st January, but in the meantime Mr. Walker is undertaking the review of States of Jersey employees. We have got representatives from Treasury within there. Do you want to move on to that, Tom?

Director General:

Yes. The short answer is that the first output of that review is due back at C.O.M. in March.

[15:30]

So I guess it depends how the C.O.M. then want to take it forward, but March is the next date when you will see something of the Employment of States of Jersey Employees Law with you.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes, because tied to that is trying to identify which bits of the budget the Ministers have responsibility for. It took the Scrutiny Panels or the Scrutiny officers ... okay, it was about a week, I think, because they are pretty bright there.

Treasurer of the States:

We did provide some additional reporting in this year's Government Plan.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

But the thing was, there is no easy way of identifying what bits of the budget the Ministers are responsible for.

Treasurer of the States:

No, we are able to provide that analysis.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Yes, but Joe Public, the people who provide the money, find it very difficult.

Treasurer of the States:

We will take that feedback and build it into the next then, but for the first time we have breakdowns that went by Minister, because of course in many departments - and it has predated the latest round of Target Operating Model changes - you would have more than one Minister represented in any single head of expenditure. So that predated it. We provided an analysis in this Government Plan that took that, reconciled those total amounts and split them by Minister as well, but we have got further detail that underpins that. If anyone was struggling with it, we would be happy to provide it. That could go into planning for the next Government Plan. We could provide that down at a more granular level.

Chief Executive:

But each of the Ministers will know at the beginning of the year what their area of responsibility budget-wise is, all the accounting officers will know theirs. The new departmental realignment for budgets is complete with the transition report. The Government Plan will be allocated and the resourcing from that back to accounting officers, so from the beginning of 2020, there should be no

ambiguity at all and the Scrutiny function should be able to see that absolutely clear. If you think that we could do it differently, I would quite happily welcome that dialogue, if we think that is an improvement that we could make within the confines of either the refresh of the Government Plan next year and/or in terms of going forward, but I am pretty confident now you can be able to read across and up and down on budget lines. That should be much more transparent, as we said we would do in 2020.

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

We will see, but certainly it will be a great help and save everybody a lot of time. Right, I think that is about it.

Chief Executive:

I wonder if I could say one thing, Madam Chairman. This is the last meeting of the C. & A.G. at P.A.C. and it has been an interesting and somewhat and challenging period since I have come into office, but I would ...

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Educational.

Chief Executive:

... suggest that the ... I hope that the C. & A.G. is beginning to see some changes that we are trying to effect. I would like to say on behalf of officers and myself how much we have appreciated what has been an unenviable - obviously - role in some respects over the last 7 years, but nonetheless it has been a pleasure and I hope that you are starting to see the efforts of 7 years materialise slowly in a way that is positive. But we would like to place on record our thanks for all the work that you have done in helping us to get to a better and improved set of arrangements for public money and expenditure, so we wanted to say that. **[Applause]**

Senator S.C. Ferguson:

Right, thank you very much, Mr. Parker, ladies and gentlemen.

[15:34]