



Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny

Panel

Quarterly Public Hearing

Witness: The Minister for the Environment

Tuesday, 7th December 2021

Panel:

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade (Chair)

Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville (Vice-Chair)

Connétable S.A. Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier

Witnesses:

Deputy J.H. Young of St. Brelade, The Minister for the Environment

Mr. W. Peggie, Director for Natural Environment and Acting Group Director for Regulation

Mr. G. Morel, Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department

Mr. S. Petrie, Environmental Health Consultant

Mr. S. Webster, Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulation

Dr. T. du Feu, Head of Land Resource Management

Mr. K. Pilley, Head of Place and Spatial Planning

Mr. A. Breed, Chief Veterinary Officer and States Veterinary Officer, Animal Health and Welfare

Ms. K. Whitehead, Head of Regulatory Improvement

Dr. L. Magris, Head of Sustainability and Foresight

Mr. S. Skelton, Group Director, Strategy and Innovation

[11:31]

Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade (Chair):

Good morning, Minister, and welcome to the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel for a quarterly public hearing with you. I will introduce my team. I am Mike Jackson, Constable of St. Brelade, Chair of the panel.

Connétable J.E. Le Maistre of Grouville (Vice-Chair):

Constable John Le Maistre of Grouville, Vice-Chairman of the panel.

Connétable S.A. Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour:

Constable Sadie Le Sueur-Rennard of St. Saviour, panel member.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Your team, Minister?

The Minister for the Environment:

I am Deputy John Young. I am the Minister for the Environment.

Director for Natural Environment and Acting Group Director for Regulation:

Willie Peggie, Director for Natural Environment and Acting Group Director for Regulation.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Good morning, Constable, good morning members. Greg Morel, Marine Resources at Environment Department.

Environmental Health Consultant:

Good morning, Constable, good morning, panel. Stewart Petrie, Environmental Health Consultant.

Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulation:

Good morning. Steve Webster, Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulation

Head of Land Resource Management, Natural Environment:

Good morning, everybody. Dr. Tim Le Feu, Head of Land Resource Management.

Head of Place and Spatial Planning:

Good morning, Minister. Kevin Pilley, Head of Place and Spatial Planning.

Chief Veterinary Officer and States Veterinary Officer, Animal Health and Welfare:

Good morning, Constable and members. Alistair Breed, Chief Veterinary Officer and States Veterinary Officer, Animal Health and Welfare.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Well done the good team. I will start, Minister, in that case, with the fishing vessel licensing regime. We understand that a total of 125 permanent and 38 temporary licences have now been issued to the E.U. (European Union). How many E.U. vessels were in possession of a licence at the end of 2020 prior to Brexit?

The Minister for the Environment:

You mean number of vessels that had a Bay of Granville licence from France and from ourselves?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

That is what I am asking.

The Minister for the Environment:

I will ask Greg Morel to deal with that, please.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Constable. I do not have the exact figures of the Granville Bay list in front of me. I will source them for you, but it was approximately 340 French vessels from Normandy and Brittany were in possession of a Granville Bay access permit when the agreement came to an end in 2020.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

So there has been a net reduction in theory?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

That is correct, Constable, although we have to remember that the requirements for obtaining a Granville Bay access permit differ from the requirements under the T.C.A. (Trade and Co-operation Agreement) for obtaining a licence and so there is a difference there. The Granville Bay requirements were based very much on location between Dielette and Paimpol and a history of fishing in our waters whereas the T.C.A., as panel members are well aware, requires demonstration of fishing activity in our waters during the qualification period. But, yes, the numbers of licences or permits issued under the G.B.A. (Granville Bay Agreement) and the T.C.A. are less.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Can you outline the process and criteria from the public point of view that must be established in order to grant a fishing vessel licence? For instance, what evidence do you gather; how is the extent and nature of fishing activities determined and applied in a non-discriminatory manner; how is

evidence carefully evaluated in line with the criteria set out in Article Fish 10 of the T.C.A. before determining which E.U. vessels are issued licences; and how are our interests protected in applying these criteria?

The Minister for the Environment:

That is a very comprehensive list of questions, Chairman. I will make a start on the principles and then hand over to Greg Morel, if I may, for more detail of the questions. The first thing to say is that since the T.C.A. was signed what has happened is the marine resources team have had to concentrate I would say ... whether it is the majority of their time and effort or a very large proportion, either way that effort has had to go into searching out verifying evidence in order to make those decisions on the licence applications put forward by the E.U. through the new system. That has proven to be, frankly, a nightmare. That is the layman's words. I think it has used massive resources. The team have had to go through numerous data sources, they have had to buy data sources. We have had extensive communication trying to get that information. We tried to get it direct from the French fishermen and it has brought us to the point where we have been able now to make a decision that we are satisfied, and I am very clear that we have stuck clearly to the criteria in the T.C.A. There is a qualification to get a licence. There must be evidence of fishing for 10 days in any one year, a minimum of 10 days in those 3 years I think it is 2017, 2018 and 2019. If I get the years wrong, Greg will put me right. When we introduced the licences, our licences, we sought to implement the nature and extent provisions by attaching conditions about the metiers, the number of days at sea, the number of pots for both measures to control that effort. During the process of the E.U.'s reaction to our licensing decisions, we were asked to suspend the operation of those conditions pending the issue of licences. We have got to the point now, Chairman, where our effort, as far as I am concerned, is going to be - and it is an "is" - a clear focus of attention on putting in place the mechanism for ensuring that the nature and extent clause that is in the T.C.A. is implemented and that is the priority for the team now. I am anxious to get to the point now, and I feel we are at it, where we have made those licensing decisions where we have the evidence. There is a number of boats where we had not enough evidence but enough to give them temporary licences and those expire at the end of January, so we are clearly in a position if there is no more evidence produced by the end of January then there will not be any more fishing. The only boats that will be able to fish will be those that qualified under the 125 but the door, of course, will not be closed to any boat coming along later giving us that information. Now, obviously I have glossed over the detail there and please can I hand over to Greg Morel to pick up the details and the process of the information sources they had to go through in order to be able to make those licensing decisions. Thank you.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister on that. As the Minister has said, there has been quite a process in obtaining the information that allows vessels to demonstrate ... this is, I think, the significant difference between the previous regime and this regime is there was a requirement to demonstrate qualification under the rules. As the Minister has clearly said, there was a specific number of days of activity, demonstrable activity during a specific timeframe. Minister, you are correct in the years that you set out before. We were very clear early on with the E.U. that in an attempt to be as fair and as transparent as we possibly could we would consider any information that was available but the key for us was that issue of demonstration. So we established a methodology that put in place our ability to assess in really a hierarchy the type of information available. The clearest and simplest data that was available for us to make these determinations was the independent electronic monitoring systems that vessels have on board. So these are known as V.M.S. (vessel monitoring systems) which are a requirement for larger vessels to have under law and that was a relatively easy way of determining fishing efforts in our waters. We are also able to use another system, as the Minister has referred to, which is A.I.S. (automatic identification system), which is different to V.M.S. but still an available and independent source of electronic geolocation data. This is the key here, we have to be able to geolocate those boats to be in our waters. That dataset was harder to come by but we were able to do so. But we are aware that smaller vessels do not have that information on and this has been something that has been particularly problematic for us in that our location, as panel members will know, is pretty close to France and, therefore, we do have smaller vessels fishing in our waters quite extensively that possibly the U.K. (United Kingdom) or other Crown Dependencies may not have to the same degree. So we worked through other sources of data such as chart positioning data. Despite these vessels being small, they often have quite sophisticated electronics on board that allows them to geolocate their position where they are, because quite a few of them are static gear boats so they throw quite a lot of equipment in the sea and they really want to go back and pick it up the next day because that is where they make their money. We considered chart plotter information that we were able to verify. Also members will know that lots of fishermen or all fishermen keep extensive records for themselves in what we used to call the Decca books for those who are old to remember the Decca system before it moved to G.P.S. (global positioning system) but they seem to have maintained their name, Decca books. Also logbook declarations we have been able to use, other survey data that has been done in an official capacity, so where fishermen have been involved in official survey work with organisations. So what we try to do is use a combination of data sources that allow those vessels to demonstrate that they have fished in our waters. It is a hierarchy of information that has been used but we have been able to piece together a demonstration of qualification by using a variety of sources but the key has to be that it locates those vessels within Jersey waters and we have the landing data to back that up as well that those vessels were fishing at that time. As the Minister has already said, it has been quite a puzzle to piece all this together but we have been able to do that, although it has taken some time. We have received data from the EU really quite recently, up until October, and hence the time it has taken to

determine some of those licences. But I suppose just to be clear, Chairman, in terms of you referred to, I think, an equitable system in terms of the T.C.A. I suppose the T.C.A. is effectively blind to that and what it really says is if you demonstrate qualification that is the criterion that you have to use. It does not refer to any kind of balance. It is simply around if you demonstrate that you have fished in those waters then you can qualify for a licence.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

We have heard anecdotally that screenshots from iPhones have been accepted as proof of fishing activity. Is this the case and, if so, how might it be audited? Really the question is: does this seem fair or equitable given that Jersey fishing fleets are required to provide data logs or risk having their licences suspended?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Minister, do you want to come in? Apologies.

[11:45]

The Minister for the Environment:

No, I think I will let you answer the question. I was going to come back on the principle of the matter but you carry on.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Chairman. We have accepted a whole variety of sources of data but we have been able to corroborate that with other sources and also even with a photograph or a screenshot or a picture of certain information there is still evidence within that that you can verify that it is legitimate. If it has, for example, been taken at an appropriate time with a date stamp that that information will have on it as well. Where we have not received that information, where we have not been able to cross-reference it or been able to verify it, we have not accepted it and we have sent it back and said: "You must provide additional evidence or indeed different evidence." So we have gone through a very, very thorough process, but it is true we have accepted data from many, many different sources in order to determine whether vessels qualify under the T.C.A.

The Minister for the Environment:

Chairman, the point I wanted to just add is that the work on the evidence that Greg has just described has been extensive, massively resource-intensive and in fact we have been required by the E.U., through the agreements with the U.K., to produce and have all this evidence scrutinised through the processes that have been set up under the T.C.A. So it is not just a process of a one-way flow. The evidence has been gone over again and again and again and so even I think in the last week the

batch where we have refused licences, those discussions are still going on. What we are talking about is entitlement to a licence. I think that is very, very different to what I think we expect as the pattern of regular fishing because I think that is a different position and that is why we need to get on with the nature and extent provision. The team have been working on that and we are very ready in an advanced position to go forward with proposals to the E.U. if we can facilitate that arrangement so that we can move away from this argument over licence numbers into the details of what those fishermen are allowed to do, what métiers they can do, how long they can do it for and the ways we need to have in place to conserve our fishery. That is now the task.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. The Constable of St. Saviour.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

I have a couple of questions because you keep referring to the E.U. of which we are not theoretically a part. Is Guernsey under the same regime with the E.U. as we are, and you would know this through Alderney fishermen and bits and pieces? Also my second question is: are you keeping the Jersey fishermen abreast of what you are having to do to jump through these hoops for the E.U. of which we are not a member?

The Minister for the Environment:

To deal with the first question, yes, I meet the Jersey Fishermen's Association whenever it is possible. I cannot remember the last meeting. I think it was the Friday before last and I updated and in fact I gave them information ahead of what we have been able to put into the public domain. So I will carry on doing that and I regularly talk to the chairman and talk to other members of the association and I know the marine resources team do as well. Our relationships, I believe, at an operational level are good but I do understand the fishermen's public position again of where we are with this agreement. At the moment we have got a scheme with licences but without the means yet to be able to regulate the activity, which is the key point in the agreement. From my point of view, there is not any point in having a licensing system unless we can do that, so that is why I have made it quite plain we now want to move on from the issue of licences. I do believe that that aspiration is also shared by the European Union team now. We are not a member of the E.U., we never have been, but we did agree, as a States Assembly, to participate in the T.C.A. that was signed between the United Kingdom and the European Union, which sets out the framework of the access post-Brexit by E.U. vessels in British waters. We decided to participate in that, as did our neighbours Guernsey. Now, Guernsey have got, I think, a different situation to manage because they do not have E.U. access within their 6-mile zone. They have an exclusive 6-mile zone; we do not. We have access of E.U. boats into our 3 to 12-mile. We only have an exclusive 3-mile and that means that we get a lot of smaller boats fishing around in our shallow waters around the reefs and so on,

which our neighbours do not have. They have different waters and larger boats. I think there has been working together with Guernsey and ourselves in how we deal with things but, of course, the position is that some of that has varied in detail. I think that has, if you like, led to some comment. Personally I am disappointed that that happened, that somehow Jersey was dragging its feet. We have not been dragging our feet whatsoever and we have come to the point where we have exhaustively gone through every piece of data we can possibly find in order to make sure we can make a fair decision on whether to give a licence or not. So we have refused a number of licences and those on the temporary licence list, if there is no evidence produced, will not be able to fish beyond the end of January.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Could I just have what they call a supplementary? You said about we only have the 3 miles, so we are into smaller boats, but that is not strictly true, is it, because they had large vessels dragging nets and doing all sorts even in the 3-mile? So it is not just small boats that we have had. We have had large boats coming through.

The Minister for the Environment:

Just one thing and I will ask Greg to pick out the detail. One would have to look at a map, a chart of the area to see where the 3-mile boundary goes but my understanding is that nought to 3 is Jersey's exclusive. Could I pass over to Greg Morel, please?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Constable. Yes, you are absolutely right, we do get a range of vessels fishing in our waters from the smaller vessels the Minister has referred to but also we have a number of what we would consider larger vessels that are entitled to fish in our waters. I think the point between Guernsey and Jersey is well made because, as the Minister referred to, there was a different regime that we were subject to. Prior to the T.C.A. coming in Guernsey was part of what was known as the London Convention which did, as the Minister rightly said, set out access to U.K. and Guernsey waters in their 6 to 12 rather than the regime that Jersey had in place prior to the T.C.A., which was the Granville Bay Agreement, which was access for E.U. vessels from the 3 to 12, so there is a difference there. We had a different starting point in terms of the decisions we had to make, but in terms of the process that our colleagues in Guernsey have gone through to determine the demonstration of fishing effort in their waters, it is very similar to us. It is not exactly the same but the T.C.A. requires them to do the same thing, so the processes are similar but they are slightly different because of the different starting points.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

But we do have the larger vessels fishing in our 3 miles? It is not just small, we have larger vessels dragging nets and fishing in our waters?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Our nought to 3, as the Minister has said, is exclusive to Jersey vessels but we have controls in there on the size of vessel and the size of activity you can do. Outside in our 3 to 12, yes, we do have some larger vessels that are able to access our waters because of their qualification under the T.C.A.

The Connétable of St. Saviour:

Okay, thank you very much.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Minister, do you empathise with the frustration felt by local fishing fleets and exporters who are prevented from accessing European markets and have had major difficulties in landing catch into France and yet licensed E.U. vessels are able to fish in Jersey's waters and land back into France without constraint?

The Minister for the Environment:

I think not only do I share it, Chairman, it makes me angry. I feel very frustrated that under the new arrangements that have been made under the T.C.A. we have to proceed with all communications through this long chain, roundabout communication involving the U.K. and the E.U. on everything we do. Obviously I have been helped in the work that we have had to do by our External Relations colleagues and I have made it plain through our ministerial channels to ensure that all of the events that we know ... and I believe there has been a mixture of unofficial, perhaps, behaviours in French ports and maybe some official elements of it. It is very, very hard to know where the sources of these disruptions are but the fleet has had very significant disruption from being able to land. So we have ended up at the point where that is not ... we have had periods when it has been possible. That is immensely frustrating and I have drawn those issues to the attention of our External Relations colleagues but unfortunately the dialogue with the E.U. now through the E.U. commissioners has concentrated exclusively on this licensing issue. This is something I find immensely frustrating because we need to get off that subject on to regulation of the fishing through the nature and extent clause. It is axiomatic, as far as I am concerned, that if there are breaches happening which are preventing us having free access to those markets in my view that is a breach of the agreement and action should be taken on it. Now, I do not have the access that I would have had under the Bay of Granville Agreement where we could directly liaise with French officials in Normandy and Brittany. That arrangement has been disrupted for everybody and I do not think it has been positive.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Are you aware, Minister, how many local vessels have moved elsewhere, have been sold or are currently up for sale as a result of these ongoing difficulties, as a result of not seeing a future for themselves in the local fishing industry?

The Minister for the Environment:

Yes, I have had many discussions with fishermen. I understand the last number I think I was given by the chairman and he believed that the fleet that either had been sold or was up for sale was about 25 per cent of our fleet, our fleet being around 70 vessels who regularly fish. I have done my best through Economic Development to try to get financial support to carry them through this very disruptive period. In terms of the exporters, I think that is much more difficult. I really can understand the concerns that the exporters have because they have got major costs in their lines of delivery and their customers, which have been disrupted in an unpredictable way and that has obviously affected them badly. What I have asked the Economic Development team to do is to ... I think there does need to be a fishing strategy in terms of marketing and looking at alternative business models, which Government, I believe, has a duty to support the industry with to try and find ways in which it can adapt to the new post-Brexit situation. I think we have not got anybody on the call from Economic Development so I think those questions will be best aimed at those Ministers if you were to bring them before the panel, Chairman.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you, Minister. Given it may be a last resort but at what stage would you consider revocation of all E.U. fishing vessel licences should these blockades from the French and refusals to land catch from Jersey vessels at the ports continue? We seem to have no teeth.

[12:00]

The Minister for the Environment:

Chairman, I am sure that what we have got allows the Minister powers to revoke licences under our law. I do not believe we are at that point yet although sadly if things do not improve, if we cannot progress the nature and extent clause, I think that we will come pretty close to those decisions having to be made. Before making them, though, I would need to have not only legal advice about our law but legal advice about our obligation under the Trade and Co-operation Agreement. Almost certainly I would have to consult with colleague Ministers at the Council of Ministers because of the involvement of the Minister for External Relations and any knock-on consequences as far as the Island generally, in fact all aspects of trade. So I would have to consult with that and, of course, I would ask myself the practical question, and it is a question I pose: if one were to do that, what position does that leave us with? Is it being suggested that if we were to do that then magically no

E.U. vessels are going to fish in our waters and there will be no consequences? I do not think I could make that assumption. I just could not make that assumption.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Moving on to positivity, shall we say, and you mentioned earlier economic support, how might an on-Island processing plant benefit Jersey? Is this under consideration and, if so, what are the practicalities of this?

The Minister for the Environment:

I do not know, is the answer, Chairman. I think it sounds a very good idea. What is involved is the practicality and the economic feasibility. I do not know if Greg wants to come in or anybody else on the call who can ... have we got John Vautier on the call? I do not think we have, have we?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. I am happy to add a little bit on to that, if it is helpful. I think as the Minister has set out, Mr. Chairman, the situation has changed with respect to accessing traditional markets; particularly on the Continent it has got significantly more difficult. I think I should say that it is still happening, it is still possible to do it and to access those markets, but we cannot ignore the fact that it is much harder, there is more admin and there are additional costs to doing it. I think the industry together with colleagues from Economic Development are looking at things as you have alluded to, whether additional processing on-Island is something that can assist the industry to add value, whether there are other aspects of economic development. I am thinking along the lines of new markets, slightly different products, possibly the concept of developing the branding of Jersey products. We all know that we have a very high standard and a good standard of product in the Island, can we add value through that; the concept of sustainability labelling on these things to prove to consumers that they come from a well regulated sustainable fishery, all those sort of things. The idea of on-Island infrastructure is in the mix at the moment. I know the industry are considering what that might look like and how that might develop. It is something that is ongoing at this moment in time but it is in there as something that needs to be considered and thought through properly.

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier:

Minister, you worked well with the Minister for External Relations to address challenges with the French side. You have mentioned twice the Minister for Economic Development. Would you consider that in light of onegov we need to create a forum that will consolidate all issues to address and to support the fishing industry going forward and not having disconnection between the 3 departments?

The Minister for the Environment:

Absolutely. At the moment it is fragmented and it would be certainly easier if all the functions were under one Minister, whichever one it is. It has always been an issue on fish: is this an environmental issue, is it an economic one? I think it is both but for me managing our marine resource, which is a wonderful rich environment, is principally an environmental issue, so that is my personal view. I would add to the Deputy - a very good question - this is not the only area in my responsibility where under our current One Government structure we have got fragmentation. Certainly it has been my position, and I voice this openly, that these functions should be grouped under one Minister so that some of the co-ordination problems are overcome.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Minister, it has been recently reported in the media that the Breton and Norman fishermen want to talk directly with Jersey, like they used to with the Bay of Granville treaty rather than this process of going through London, Brussels and Paris as exists at the moment. Our Scrutiny report SR5 of this year also made recommendation to this effect. Do you accept our recommendation acknowledging that dialogue between shareholders is very important and will be supported and encouraged, as the Deputy has just alluded to? Could you advise how you are working with colleagues in External Relations at this moment in time to achieve this?

The Minister for the Environment:

I can say positively I absolutely accept that. I absolutely accept that that is a goal we need to try and work towards achieving. Frankly at the moment I do not believe we are anywhere near that or even starting it. We have had a number of direct contacts with the French during this whole situation. First of all there was the Normandy summit, which I thought was outstandingly good. The relationship between the French team that came over, politicians and executives, with our teams was extremely positive. They had a very, very good rapport. We have had that. I had reports from our fishing patrol boats, and Mr. Morel may wish to elaborate, where we have been able to have open dialogue between French fishermen at sea. We have put on board our fishing patrols French speakers and that has really helped as well. We have set up open lines with French speakers in Jersey so that any snags that fishers in France had they could talk to us direct, but of course it is a fact that all of those efforts have been, I believe, frustrated by the French Government. We have been told that that is not something that the French Government allows or encourages, and so it has been an uphill struggle. I have made it plain to the Minister for External Relations that I need to get to the situation of at least, if not a direct dialogue, a much closer dialogue with our neighbours in terms of the nature and extent provisions. What I am not at all keen on is this 3-way communication involving the U.K. and these long-term communications. We need to be able to get to the heart of the matter of managing our waters. I believe the issues of nature and extent in Channel Islands waters are very different to what they are in the U.K. because I am advised that all of our waters are

what they call non-quota waters. They are not subject to the fish species quotas that the U.K. waters generally are and that involves a different issue in terms of management.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Cutting to the chase, how do you intend to explore, shall we say, the less formal routes of communication directly with the French fishing fleets?

The Minister for the Environment:

I think we can have informal communication but at the end of day we have got an agreement that provides formality. What I need, and I made to External Relations, is a structure that we can work within to have those direct communications on the things that really matter to us both. I will do that. I am going to put my hands up, I have not been able to get to the point where I have that and I will carry on pressing for it and asking our Minister for External Relations to please facilitate that for us.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Moving on to the issue of sustainable fisheries management and conservation, can you advise what action you are taking to exercise powers for the benefit of sustainable fisheries management and marine conservation?

The Minister for the Environment:

Well, I do not think at the moment I would want to, with your permission, Chair, air in public all the full details of the way in which the team have prepared their proposals for managing the nature and extent of fishing in our waters to make sure they are sustainable, but I can tell you we are very close to being ready with those details. Normally I think in negotiations, if we can get them because my previous answer was about negotiations, one would not air those details in public before you meet the other party to the negotiation. You would not normally do that, but I wonder if Greg Morel would just elaborate a little bit on some of the principles to assure the panel that we very much have this in our sights now.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Absolutely, Minister, thank you. I think there is possibly 2 bits of this question that we can separate out. One is around this question of nature and extent, which as the Minister has referred to, is something that we disappointingly have not really been able to nail down at this moment in time because of the protracted nature of the conversations in respect of a number of licences. It is something that we have done considerable thinking about but, as I say, it is still subject to negotiation between ourselves and the E.U. Of course what it has to do is put in place, as the T.C.A. requires, a limit, a cap on what is taken out of our waters. That is what the T.C.A. says. It sets that bar to make sure that going forward the fishing effort reflects the nature and extent of what happened

before. That can be done in many different ways and there is lots of different ways that you can achieve that through effort restrictions, technical restrictions, but they are still subject to further negotiation between, unfortunately, ourselves, the U.K., the E.U. and France which, as the Minister has referred to, makes things quite complicated. What I would say just on perhaps more operational matters, thanks to the support of the panel and indeed the Minister in respect of securing funding under the Carbon Emergency Fund and also a research budget for us to work, we have pressed on very hard this year. Well, some luckier members of the team, who have managed to get out in the boats this year, have pressed on very hard with our work out at sea, looking at our stock conservation measures, looking at all of the work that we do on the ground to ensure that we are able to move forward to the Minister's recommendations around either licence condition or changes to regulations that then go forward to the States, after obviously coming through Scrutiny, to put in place those management measures that help us and help the sustainability of the stock going forward. All that work is still going on, although I would have to be honest, it has obviously been slowed by the discussions we have had with the E.U. I suppose there is 2 bits to your question, Mr. Chairman, the nature and extent one, which we are hoping to resolve soon, but we are proceeding with our day-to-day assessment and recommendation in terms of managing those local stocks that we have in our waters.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

This may be one for you, Minister. Would you agree in fact that your abilities to exercise powers to the benefit of sustainable fisheries management have been constrained by these difficult diplomatic exchanges?

The Minister for the Environment:

Yes, absolutely. I think, frankly, that is perfectly obvious and that is a very unsatisfactory situation because the prime purpose of the agreement was to give us the powers to do that. What I do ask is what is the point of having those powers if we cannot have a way of putting them into effect to manage the sustainable stocks. It is as simple as that. As far as I am concerned, we have to now, as an Island, move to priority now to put this licensing argument out of the way and let us get on with the work. We can present the work that we have got ready to go. We think there are very strong gains for both our fishermen and also for French fishermen as well. We think this is something that nobody should be fearful of. The proposals are designed to ensure that we can share the waters and do so in harmony but within the principles of sustainability. That is the goal and I want to be able to get to that and remove some of this bureaucracy.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

We need to get that message across. Going on to a bit more detail, can you clarify the position on vessel size limits? We understand Jersey agreed to ban 12-metre-plus boats to protect stocks. Are

there plans also to make this a condition on the issuing of licences for E.U. vessels in Jersey waters and to phase out existing vessels above this size?

The Minister for the Environment:

My recollection, and it seems a long, long time ago that we were in a position to make such judgments, before Brexit came along we were managing our own fleet and concentrating on our own fleet and we did put conditions on the licences of, I think, 2 over-12-metre Jersey boats, conditions which meant that those licences expired in time.

[12:15]

I cannot remember the exact words of them. Both of those decisions were in fact subject to challenge by both the fishing concerns and their lawyers, but my recollection is that since Brexit came along and completely moved the goalposts on all of us, I believe that we have had to effectively either withdraw those conditions or not enforce them. If I can just check with Greg what we did, but effectively we have been stymied on that one. It was not done to be unreasonable. It was done for conservation of stock reasons.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. You are absolutely right. If I remember rightly, it was just prior to all the T.C.A. things but we brought in a licence condition that prevented a fishing vessel above 12 metres being licensed in Jersey waters. We were aware obviously we had some vessels larger than that size in the fleet at the time and they were given a 10-year sunset clause or grandfather clause, however you wish to word it, in order for them to carry on their business. But as the Minister rightly said, we were advised once the T.C.A. came in that that was not something that we would be able to legally enforce on E.U. vessels and the Minister made the decision that, therefore, it was not appropriate that that licence condition remained in place for Jersey boats. The idea of the T.C.A. was that it was balanced and would be applied to all, so that condition was removed from the Jersey licence conditions so it is not in place at the moment.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Is it something that you might consider revisiting once things have settled down a bit?

The Minister for the Environment:

I think this is where we get into the detail that we want to have these negotiations on. In the past when restrictions were brought in, in the past under the Bay of Granville Agreement fishermen sat around the table together between our jurisdictions and they basically discussed the conservation measures. The conservation measures that were introduced generally had the agreement of

fishermen because they were there for that purpose, to ensure that species are not overfished. So that is an example where the processes allowed that sort of discussion but, as Mr. Morel said, there are lots of different ways that the fishing effort can be managed in its technical details. Unfortunately to go further in this conversation we would almost be laying out our thoughts on what we think those measures might be, but can I promise you, Chairman, that as soon as we get into a dialogue with the E.U. on this then the Scrutiny Panel will be kept fully up to speed with what we are working on.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Coming back locally, you accepted, Minister, recommendation 3 of our report and commented that the marine resources team have been putting the pillars of a strategy together and a framework for consultation which could be established by the end of the year. How is work progressing on this and can we expect to see a framework produced for consultation before the end of this month?

The Minister for the Environment:

Is that consultation with the E.U. or the French? Who is that referring to?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

It is "putting the pillars of a strategy together and framework for consultation", so it is not all about the E.U.

The Minister for the Environment:

Greg, please. Greg is looking very positive. I am struggling to recall it, Chairman.

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. I think I can maybe just add a little bit there. So you are absolutely, Mr. Chairman, we were keen to put in place, in a post-Brexit world, a sort of strategy that would look to the short term to a certain extent but really to a longer-term place, so that work has started. We hope it will encompass - and the Minister referred to it already - some of the economic aspects of the marine industry, not just the fishing industry but the wider marine resources portfolio as well. That work has started with Economic Development. We are also looking to put in place a longer-term strategy for managing marine resources, which would consider our bread-and-butter piece of work, which is about the day-to-day management of those fishing stocks and also the marine environment. We think also, and the panel will be well aware, the third strand of that is around the spatial management of our marine resources. This, of course, links in with the bridging Island Plan discussions, which are ongoing, some of the commentary that has been raised about protected areas as well. So it all links together in, we think, a sort of 3-stranded approach. Unfortunately it is not as advanced as we hoped it would be by now. It is unlikely that we will go out to wider consultation on that ... the hope that we would do it by the end of the year but it is something that

we intend to bring to the panel as soon as we possibly can. As I say, we have been slightly side-tracked by some of the discussions with the European Union but that is the plan and the very premise of where we are trying to get to in terms of that strategy.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. We will keep asking. Do you consider there to be sufficient enforcement of E.U. vessels operating in Jersey waters at this time given that it is sensitive, there is diplomacy involved but life carries on? Do you anticipate any further requirement for additional manpower in order to sufficiently enforce the vessel licensing regime moving forward?

The Minister for the Environment:

I think I can share this with you, Chair. We know where we finished up in licences. We have got 125 French vessels, sorry E.U. vessels. I think we have got about an equal number of Jersey boats; only about 70 boats fish regularly, I think. What that means is that we are looking ahead with a management requirement of managing effectively the licensing conditions and details of double the vessels, double the number of vessels that we historically have done because obviously the licensing and all that was done by the French authorities under the Bay of Granville Agreement. Effectively that workload logically shifts to the marine resources team and we have been asking ourselves the question of how are we going to resource that. I have asked the team to look at that. Fortunately the States have been prepared to fund us in the conservation work and the marine science that Mr. Morel outlined and we have also been able to increase staff, but I think we are looking ahead. I am absolutely confident that if we can progress through and get into the real task of managing the marine resource and try and make a success of the T.C.A. there will be a resource implication. That will be probably a mixture of money and people and may need infrastructure and assets. Of course in the longer run I believe that we have got funding in our long Government Plan for a new marine resources vessel. I think that is now down ... I cannot remember whether it is 20215 or 2026 it is scheduled for. So I think the honest answer is, yes, there will be. Is the present activity sufficient? I will ask Mr. Morel. I believe there is activity going on at the moment and nobody is just ignoring things but I think in the future there we will need to increase our effort in that area, yes. Mr. Morel, can you deal with the present?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. I think you have described it absolutely spot on. From an enforcement perspective at this moment in time, I think we need to be honest, obviously the pandemic and the situation with respect to the licensing did make things a little bit difficult for a while at sea but the marine resources team are back now working out at sea. Thankfully not working today because it would be a bit grotty out there really would it not? As the Minister has mentioned, we generally get a pretty good reception when we are out there. Obviously we are dealing with local boats that are

licensed so you would expect that but the enforcement at sea continues as we have always done before. As time goes forward you are able to have slightly more complete electronic monitoring of vessels with V.M.S. and A.I.S., so there are other tools we have together with intelligence-led work that we do. I think the level of enforcement at the moment at sea is appropriate for what we are trying to deal with. We are very lucky. The panel will know that the Norman Le Brocq underwent some refit work fairly recently so we have a very capable asset out there together with another vessel that we are able to use. So I think at sea enforcement is being dealt with appropriately. Obviously we have to react to how things change and that might change in the future, but I think the Minister has alluded to the real area where the workload has changed, which is around, unfortunately, the administration and some of the work that is associated with licensing those vehicles and being responsible for them in a different way to that which we were under the Granville Bay Agreement.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Minister, I gather that some 46 Jersey vessels have applied to fish in French waters. Could you let the panel know what the status of those applications is and is it being supported by London?

The Minister for the Environment:

Thank you. I did not receive the list of the 46 boats from the chairman of the Jersey Fishermen's Association. I think I got them last week, towards the end of last week. I have to say it did come as a surprise because up to then I was aware that the marine resources team had made submissions through the channels, as it were, for licences for I think it was 8 Jersey boats that we believed qualified under the terms of the T.C.A. because the qualification provisions are reciprocal. They qualify and those went forward. I believe that at the present time we have only received one. I do understand that there was some hold-up in at least 3 of those, possibly 4, applications did not get communicated by the U.K. to the E.U. but that now has been rectified. Also a number of other applications were submitted, so bringing our number to 8. I cannot give you the dates. If you need those we will have to write to you with those details. Now, I have had a conversation with the chairman of the J.F.A. (Jersey Fishermen's Association) about the 46 and I have had early discussions with the team. I have explained that Jersey's credibility is really important here and if we are to put forward those 46 we will need verifying evidence from fishermen that they do meet the T.C.A. qualification. If they produce that information, which the team consider is the right quality of information, they will be supported, but I have to say I have voiced my doubts to the chairman of the J.F.A. - these are my personal doubts - and I have asked him can he be really sure that he believes that all those 46 vessels meet the qualifications because that has come as a surprise to everybody that I have spoken to already that there would be as many as that number. Anyway, the team are on that work now and are following that up and I think the current proposal is they would probably communicate with each fisherman individually to try and see what information can be produced.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

From that I deduce that normal logbook entries or screenshots thereof would work for Jersey fishermen as well as they would for the French?

The Minister for the Environment:

Can I ask Mr. Morel to comment on the evidence issue?

Head of Marine Resources, Environment Department:

Thank you, Minister. The Minister has described exactly the situation we are in. We have received a further request from the E.U. in respect of the 7 licences. One has been granted and in respect of the 7 they are seeking further clarification, which is slightly disappointing but not altogether surprising, given the way that the E.U. work, that they are requesting additional data. We will put together, as the Minister has said, a package of evidence for each of those vessels who can demonstrate that they have fished in French waters. The 8 vessels that have been submitted already were ones that told us that they had fished in French waters and, therefore, that was the ones that had been previously submitted. Of course we will package up all of the evidence that fishermen can provide and will submit it for consideration through the E.U. when it is provided to us. That work, as the Minister said, is something that is ongoing, Mr. Chairman.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I gather that is a cut-off date of 12th December. Does that mean that those applications that are received before qualify?

[12:30]

The Minister for the Environment:

Can I explain this because I think there has been a misunderstanding about this? The reason why I think that date is getting some currency is because I have explained that throughout this whole time there has been numerous technical meetings between the E.U. commissioner - sorry, I cannot pronounce it, it begins with a V, and I mean no discourtesy to the gentleman who is the lead person in the E.U. dealing with this - and External Relations and our officers and also including the U.K. Our marine resources team, Mr. Morel, is able to attend those meetings to observe and is able to get a report of what happened. Of course, through those meetings a position was taken by the E.U. commissioner expressing the view that he wanted the licensing issue all resolved by 10th December. That was his aspiration and, of course, it was an aspiration that both myself and the Minister for External Relations absolutely shared. We want this ended, this licensing issue. It would be perhaps speculation as to what is the relevance of that date but I have read recently reports being published

by French Government sources to the tune that there is going to be an E.U. meeting after that date on the subject where this business is going to be aired. It is disappointing that the last report I heard was the French national government were saying they were going to maintain and carry on and try and get licences for all of the vessels irrespective of the qualifications situation. I, frankly, hope that we do not get into that position. If evidence is produced after that date we will give licences. That is it, there is no closed door.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. We hope that arrangement is reciprocated. Right, thank you for talking about fishing. I am going to move on to more general matters, Minister. Article 56(a) of the draft legislation confers powers on the Chief Officer to designate relatively broad geographical areas as conservation areas. The panel is concerned that information provided so far does not adequately detail responsibilities of the Chief Officer in this regard nor give an indication of accountability when exercising these powers. Could you expand on this and give an indication of how the roles of Minister and the Chief Officer will be co-ordinated in a designation of conservation areas?

The Minister for the Environment:

A big question, Chair. Just, I think, for perhaps the members of the public listening, the power to designate conservation areas is one that we included within the Planning and Building Law, Amendment No. 8, which is at the moment been approved in principle by the Assembly but subject to a review by your panel, Chair, which obviously you are in the process of doing, Chair. I think I did write to you yesterday and I think probably it is useful to inform the public of that, that I consider as Minister that I think the panel probably needs a greater length of time to be able to complete the review in this and a number of other areas. I have suggested to you that I will be moving the debate date on to allow us. But moving to the substantive question, the issue of conservation areas, the principle of the policy, has been in the Island Plan for at least the last 3 Island Plans and it does seem to be relatively uncontentious in the draft plan so far, fingers crossed, as it were. The role of the Chief Officer in the planning system, previously the Minister had a very large number of responsibilities in the law and powers. When the late Deputy Rob Duhamel brought the revised appeal system to the States - and I think it was somewhere around probably between 2012 and 2014 - the Minister then ended up with the powers of determining appeals, which previously had been dealt with through the court. I think all of the powers of the Minister, which were empowered in the Planning Law for all sorts of things, were deleted because on the principle that the Minister cannot adjudicate in an appeal situation on decisions that he or she has made in the first instance; you cannot mark your own homework, as it were. Those functions were given to the Chief Officer. I think that worked well enough. It was not ideal because, personally, when I was in the States not as a Minister I voted against those changes because I think it depowered the Minister too much and that is still my view, but one has to recognise the overriding importance of the appeals system. But

going back, before we had the new Government structure there was a Chief Officer at Planning and the Planning Chief Officer exercised those powers and obviously did so in consultation with the Minister or politicians at the time. With the new Government structure of course that has all become very blurred and so we no longer have a chief officer of the planning system. What we have adopted in terms of practice has been that those powers where it says the chief officer are exercised by the Director of Regulation. The Director of Regulation is, if you like, one down from the Director General under the One Government structure. The Director General is the boss. They have a number of divisions of which 2, one is the Director of Regulation and the other one is Director of the Environment and underneath the Director of Regulation there are a series of functions, one of which is land and development, which is where the planning function sits. There are a number of layers in that structure. It is not a satisfactory position and is one that I am seeking to get resolved with the aid of legal advice. I think at the moment it is safe enough with the Director of Regulation but I think when it comes to conservation areas I think there should be a ministerial function. I have asked for advice on a further amendment to put those powers to the Minister. You have not received that draft amendment, if the legal advice allows me to do it, which is another reason why I have extended the date, Chair, to allow more time for your review. I am sorry in noting that in public but I think the public probably needs to know that I am delaying that down to allow more time to answer this and other questions because there are other matters in there that do require answers as well. We have got work in progress to answer them, Chair, and I am very confident by the time we get to the new date we will be able to answer them properly for you.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you, Minister. Moving to trees, which is a subject always close to my heart, can you clarify whether under the proposed tree protection orders the planning application will be required to undertake any work to trees that would include routine tree management practices, that some stakeholders feel that this may inadvertently discourage landowners from allowing trees to be planted in the first place due to the additional bureaucracy?

The Minister for the Environment:

No, we do not want any plethora of planning applications on all these sort of routine matters. The team is leading the work to be able to come up with the details of that work and that is in progress now, which I will invite Kelly Whitehead to come in on shortly, if I may, Chair, who will explain what work is going on there. But what we are going to do is to put forward that information to you and exactly how we see that working in practice. I certainly do not see it with everybody having to make an application for every single piece of minor work. I think it is more likely that we are going to be looking through some kind of notification system. But if I may, Chair, may I bring Kelly Whitehead into that ...

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, just before we go to you, Kelly, if I can just round up the rest of the questions in this area which you can, I am sure, encompass. I suppose the question is: would you consider creating exemptions to exclude traditional management techniques involved in lopping around field margins and for the branchage as well as the lopping and pruning of fruit and vine trees of course? Will distinctions be drawn between specimen trees and an urban setting, shall we say like the Royal Square and woodland and hedgerow trees in a rural setting? Over to you, Kelly.

The Minister for the Environment:

Yes, exemptions and all those things. Kelly will elaborate the detail.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thanks.

Head of Regulatory Improvement:

Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Chair. We are doing quite a lot of work in this area and we took on board the panel's comments the last time we spoke about the level of lacking of detail in this area. We have been doing quite a lot of work behind the scenes. We currently have a draft tree strategy, as you are aware, which has gone through a public consultation and also a stakeholder engagement, several workshops. That draft tree strategy was part of the biodiversity crisis under the Climate Emergency Fund and the carbon neutral roadmap about protecting our sort of green infrastructure and so natural capital. There are a lot of excellent recommendations coming out of the Jersey's first tree strategy. We do want to run that past our stakeholders to gain sort of consensus on the principles that have been agreed and we will be doing that in January 2022. We are hoping then to publish the final tree strategy towards February. Again, as the Minister indicated, it would be good to have that released before we make further proposals on the orders. In relation to the orders, which is the control over works to trees, that is where the detail sits. Similarly, to our other orders such as the general development order, most of our orders allow for an element of permitted development, which is, essentially, exemptions, as you suggest. All of our orders propose a range of permitted development, things you can do without applying for permission. The Minister automatically grants by order. Those things have been determined by not only the sort of input we have had from the public on the tree strategy but we also have consultants from the U.K. who are doing a legislative comparative analysis across all of different legislations around trees. We have sort of looking at the systems in England and Scotland, some European countries, Germany, Poland, France, also other small island jurisdictions, Guernsey, Alderney and the Isle of Man. We are looking at best practice in terms of regulatory regimes for trees and that critical analysis piece will also be sent to the panel for consideration as part of your review. We are hoping to have that in the next couple of weeks. That will also help inform the drafting of the orders. We are looking at a

list of exemptions, if you will, so permitted development rights that would be aligned with our own legal constructs. We are also looking at, potentially, there are options around a competent person scheme or a notification scheme. M.S.I. (multiscale segment integration) are sort of schemes that exist in other jurisdictions that might be more appropriate than applications. We will still have applications for the very significant and the very outlying requirements. We would still need a mechanism by which someone could apply if they fell outside the exemptions or they fell outside the notification schemes. But the idea with that, that would be in the very minor elements.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Minister, just picking up on Deputy Maçon's proposed amendment to Article 6 of P.76 which seeks to increase the options for membership of the determining panel in the event of a conflict of interest arising between the Minister, the Assistant Minister and the Chair of the Planning Committee, would you be supporting this amendment and, if not, why not?

The Minister for the Environment:

When I first saw the amendment I thought it sounded a very good solution to the problem that the panel previously identified during the States debate about the position of potential conflict that a Chairman of the Planning Committee, as originally proposed, would be in, so I thought that was a solution. But then the more I started to think about it and realised there is a number of potential questions to answer: on what basis would the Minister choose a panel; is the decision made in a public session or a private session; what about the papers going to that committee? You open up a whole lot of process questions that I think technically could be seen to be quite arcane but in reality in regulatory matters they do matter. I have taken advice on this and I have answered a question. I do not know if you have seen it yet, Chair. Deputy Maçon has put this into a question in the States and I have said that I am currently taking advice on that and that advice will be made available to the Scrutiny Panel. Obviously this particular proposal to have a determining panel on a call-in application because that is what it is about, is within that Planning and Building (Amendment) Law, which, as I say, I have delayed now until April before a States debate. There is no ducking this, this is a process for the very most significant applications, which are likely to be very controversial. I think one needs to just be a little bit cautious before going one way or the other on this. That is why I am taking advice on it, Chair.

[12:45]

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Moving to conservation areas, what assurances can you provide that the designation of conservation areas will not inadvertently create a loss of land currently used for agricultural purposes and/or food production?

The Minister for the Environment:

Chair, I have not come across that challenge before, I apologise. Conservation areas are generally about areas of built environments. I think I will probably need to take that question away and perhaps ask Mr. Pilley because Mr. Pilley is leading on the Island Plan review and obviously I did not hear that particular session when that came up at the planning inquiry. Could I ask him to see if he can pick that up?

Head of Place and Spatial Planning:

Yes, Minister, happy to take that. As you say, Minister, the designation of conservation areas would generally reflect areas of special historic interest and character and would not necessarily embrace agricultural land in terms of, as the Minister suggested, it tends to be related to areas of the built environment. Having said that, it would include areas between buildings. It is not just about the specific buildings themselves, it is about the spaces and public realm between buildings that can help confer that particularly character on an area. Even if it did involve any open space or agricultural land, I would not necessarily see that causing any issues around the continued use of that agricultural land or any issues associated with it remaining in productive agricultural use. I hope that deals with that, Chair.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you, yes. Is there any detailed guidance about what is and is not permitted within conservation areas in terms of planning? Is this available to the general public?

The Minister for the Environment:

Chair, again, I think we are in quite a close parallel situation to the tree situation here. Again, the panel have raised a lot of very important questions and I took the view we need to give you very much more detailed answers, which is why, again, I have delayed asking for the debate now. We will wait for it, it gives you more time to review it but work is in progress to answer that. One of the key principles that I have indicated to the team, you asked about who has the power to designate a conservation area. I think it is really important that there is a process whereby, if you like, properly informed proposals come forward to the process, if you like, recommendations on what is a conservation area and part and parcel of that will be what the criteria will be. Of course it is true, and I think there is no avoiding this, that within conservation areas in other places, in other jurisdictions, there is an impact by that on what we would call the permitted development rules, i.e. in non-conservation areas there are lots of things one can do without consent. In a number of enforcement conservation areas I have come across in other jurisdictions, those permitted development rules are a lot tighter. I think what we need to do is, this is the work in progress, to try

and get you more information together on what is proposed. I do not know whether Kelly or Kevin wants to come in, could I just ...

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Can I just come to the Constable of Grouville, please, who has a question?

The Minister for the Environment:

Sorry, I beg your pardon, Chair.

The Connétable of Grouville:

That is okay. I think Mr. Pilley said that the conservation areas would tend to be around the built-up area but surely it is going to include the countryside, which probably will be being farmed.

Head of Place and Spatial Planning:

As the Minister said, Constable, we are working to develop the criteria that will be used to identify and define conservation areas. But I think, as the Minister said, successive Island plans have sought to identify those areas that might be the subject of conservation area designation. You can probably think of parts of the Island that might fall into that category, so where they have a distinct architectural or historic character, places like St. Aubin, Gorey, some of the parish centres, thinking about Grouville Church and the area around the church. It will be related to historic buildings and their settings but it may embrace some areas of agricultural land or public open space that helps give that area its character. I hope that gives you a sort of flavour of the type of places that might be under consideration, Constable.

The Connétable of Grouville:

Yes. The designation is different to sort of an S.S.I.s (natural sites of special interest) then.

Head of Place and Spatial Planning:

It embraces an area, as opposed to a specific building or a place. As I say, if you think about the character of somewhere like harbours, small harbours like St. Aubin or Gorey, even some on the north coast, some of the parish centres, we might look at some of the Victorian areas in St. Helier, so Havre des Pas or Cheapside where there is a distinct architectural identity to those places ...

The Connétable of Grouville:

Sorry to interrupt but this is more about buildings than ...

Head of Place and Spatial Planning:

That is right, Chair.

The Minister for the Environment:

If I could come in, Chair, I think the concept is that I think it is likely that the conservation areas are going to tightly drawn. They will have to have boundaries set for them. The kind of odd notion of a conservation area is that where you have got a place, where you have got an assemblage of lots of different structures and buildings and artefacts, the sum of the whole is more important than the individual parts, if you like. For example, if you have got a village centre and, say, you have got a lovely church and you have got a churchyard around it with lovely granite walls and things like that, you define that area very tightly, I think, that is what I am expecting. Of course the realistic thing, if one listens to Mr. Pilley's list there, it is going to take quite some time, I think, I would probably say years, to be frank, to go through and define and do the sort of work that one has got to do and, as I have said, they have got to be properly evidenced. Some of that work, I think, is probably already in progress. We have got a number of studies of different parts of the built environment in town and others which give us that information but it probably needs to be updated.

The Connétable of Grouville:

I think perhaps I am getting the wrong end of the stick. I thought it was more to do with conservation in the countryside rather than the built-up area.

The Minister for the Environment:

I appreciate it, I am pleased I have been able to clear that up. It is confusing. In the countryside the orders that would be used are what they call sites of S.S.I. orders. That power exists in the law anyway but, again, it is subject to proper procedures in law. You cannot just go out and designate an S.S.I. whenever you like. As I see it, we have got to define those procedures for the conservation area powers, which I think Kelly is leading on. Yes, did you want to hear from Kelly or would you postpone until we can ...

The Connétable of Grouville:

No, I will postpone. As I say, perhaps I have got the wrong end of the stick because all I know is, from experience, that when land is subject to an S.S.I. it is more difficult to manage and there is a cost involved. It may not get managed as well as perhaps it should and it certainly will be less useful in commercial terms but I will leave it there.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Minister, I am going to move to the draft Official Controls Regulations. For the record, can you just summarise the purpose of these draft regulations and why they are now necessary?

The Minister for the Environment:

I wish I could and I am going to defer to better minds than mine, if you mind, Chair. I think we have got Steve Webster and Stewart Petrie, who have been leading on this. My introductory remark, this is part of the bureaucracy we need in a post-Brexit world. I am sure that my colleagues can explain exactly what these regs are intended to do. I do not know which, Steve or Stewart wants to go first; who is going first?

Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulations:

Shall I, Minister?

The Minister for the Environment:

Yes, go on, Steve.

Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulations:

Thank you, Chair. If I kick off and Stewart can chip in as and when. The Official Controls Regulations, essentially, applied to Jersey pre-Brexit and they have applied post-Brexit with additional regulations. They applied pre-Brexit but we never noticed them because we do not have imports generally from outside the E.U. and pre-Brexit they would have only applied to imports from outside the E.U. and rest of the world. We do not have borders with the rest of the world and our borders are generally with the E.U. and with the U.K. and we do not have long distance international flights coming into Jersey. We never really noticed them before but had we had that trade beforehand we would have had to apply the Official Controls Regulations. Post-Brexit we put in place the E.U. legislation Official Controls (Jersey) Regulations, which, essentially, followed on from the original regulations. They provided for the treatment of goods entering Jersey from the E.U. as if they were from the U.K., so, essentially, we continued as we were. What we are doing now is we are putting in a new set of regulations, repealing the old regulations. The new set of regulations implement the Official Controls Regulations, allowing us to treat goods entering Jersey from the rest of the world different to how we treat goods entering from the U.K., but they also provide for the Minister to determine how controls are applied to goods entering Jersey from the E.U. For that a degree of flexibility and this really reflects what has happened in the U.K. The intention of Official Controls Regulations overall are to provide protection to our sanitary and phytosanitary borders, so animal, human and plant health. They allow for checks to be made at the border on imports coming into the Island. When I say at the border, that is in a very broad term. In the U.K. the border is now at any designated site clusters a place for inspection. On Jersey, again, the flexibility we are trying to build into this would allow for inspections away from the border because we have very limited infrastructure at the port. They are, effectively, therefore, protection of animal, human and plant health. There is nothing new in them and they provide the framework that we need in order to control animal, human and plant health at the borders. Hopefully, that summarised things.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Can you advise the panel on the status of negotiations with the U.K. with regards to ensuring Jersey's trade links with France are not disproportionately affected by the U.K. E.U. trade arrangements on animal and plant goods?

[13:00]

Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulations:

Yes, certainly. Jersey is in control of its own borders, that is the first thing to say. The U.K. is in control of its own borders and the E.U. is in control of its own borders. We do not negotiate each other's borders. What we are trying to negotiate with the U.K. is that they accept that our border controls are sufficient that they will not attempt to introduce additional controls between Jersey and the U.K. from north-bound goods. For trade into France we are subject to the E.U.'s border controls which we cannot negotiate. We simply have to comply with their regulations and we also need their country listing for certain goods in order to get them in, to demonstrate that we have applied the controls within country that they would demand. The negotiation with the U.K. relates really to whether or not they accept that our controls are sufficient for incoming goods from France; that they do not need to apply additional controls for north-bound goods from Jersey. Those negotiations are being done in parallel and conjunction with Guernsey, so we are hand in hand with Guernsey on this. They are going, I would say, quite well in that we have not capitulated in any way or form. That said, we are pushing, as it were, for an end point and a landing position now in those negotiations and we are quite positive. The starting point would be that we would have to create a full border control post, large scale infrastructure on the Island. We have moved away from that. We are now talking about inspections and point of destination for live animals, for example. We are talking about small scale additions to existing infrastructure on the Island so that we can simply, as it were, dip into incoming freight and make inspections of that. Generally I would say those negotiations are going well. They are ongoing and we would hope they will land very, very shortly. The U.K. appreciates, I think, more and more over the last 12 months certainly, they have appreciated how difficult this situation is, for themselves as well as for us. Their own controls have been delayed and delayed and delayed. They are now delayed until at least July next year. I think they have begun to see where we are coming from.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Can you give some reassurance that support will be made available to small traders importing goods from the E.U. who may be faced with additional costs and bureaucracy as a result of these regulations?

The Minister for the Environment:

I do not think I can, Chair. The task that sits, I think, under my brief is regulatory. Mr. Peggie probably has a wider role - I see he is on the call here; he has just his camera on - is in contact with other parts of Government. The comment I would make at the moment is that I do not think any of us expected these. I certainly did not expect this level of post-Brexit complication. What I am reassured is that the work that Steve and Stewart are doing is beginning to get what I might call a practical more common sense impact upon the Island than perhaps we had feared earlier, which is good and long may it continue. But there is no question, there will be extra costs and inconvenience. Chair, perhaps Mr. Peggie could tell us what he knows. I cannot give you that assurance that there is money there.

Director for Natural Environment and Acting Group Director for Regulation:

I was coming on to reiterate what you have just said, John. We have very much been focusing on the practicalities of the discussions between us, D.E.F.R.A. (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) and A.P.H.A. (Animal and Plant Health Agency) to establish what we need going forward. Rather than spending multimillion pounds on what could be quite a large and sizeable facility at the port, or indeed away from the port, we, through the auspices of the work that has been facilitated by Steve and Tautenay and Stewart and our wider team, have created good relationships with senior players in D.E.F.R.A., A.P.H.A., got them to understand the picture in terms of scale of business of materials emanating from Europe through to Jersey. They have visited the sites, we have visited their sites to establish that an alternative is not, as was initially envisaged, entirely unfeasible. We were very much in discussions at the beginning of this where there was a significant inflexibility from the U.K. and just because they, like we, were very much at the beginning of a discovery process, we have worked with them and to establish this alternative position. I think the works of Steve, Stewart, Alistair as well, who is on the call and also Scott Meadows have been instrumental in trying to get there. As to supports, I would agree that it is likely that there will be supports will be required; that is not the game we are in but we are in discussions with our Economic Development colleagues, just general ongoing discussions. But as our colleagues on the call have said, because of the delay in implementation in the U.K. it is difficult to establish exactly what ... therefore, what implementation we are going to require here, it is difficult to know quite what that level of support would be required and so that is an ongoing conversation.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Can I suggest initially that work on some guidelines might be most appropriate for those people involved? Getting down to detail, what effects are these regulations likely to have on importers of small amounts of foodstuffs from the E.U., for example, the Normandy French markets? Have compensatory measures been considered for that sort of situation?

Consultant Working on the Official Controls Regulations:

Minister, can I again chip in here? The O.C.R. (Official Controls Regulations), as it is established within the E.U. and within the U.K., is good for big businesses. It is not good for small businesses. It is designed for large scale, large volume imports of single commodities. It does not work particularly well for smaller scale, small imports of mixed commodities. As has been found out by, for example, fish exporters from the U.K. going into France, our own exporters from Jersey going into France and in the other direction as well, will be found for importers to the U.K. We do not have big businesses, we do not have the infrastructure necessary. What we are trying to do is twofold here: firstly, we want the infrastructure to be suitable for smaller scale businesses and, secondly, part of the negotiation with the U.K. is that, ultimately, we want a bureaucratic system which does not penalise small scale importers. That is quite a hard negotiation with the U.K. but it is a possible negotiation. Part of the reason it is made very possible is because the U.K. has - I was going to say dreadful position - this position with Northern Ireland where it is trying to square a circle, which is un-squareable. That Northern Ireland position opens up opportunities for us because we are trying to do something quite similar. We do not want to impede trade through bureaucracy on costs to businesses. If we applied the Official Controls Regulations exactly as they were to be applied, they are proposed to be applied in the U.K., we could well decimate our import from France and it would be very difficult to run the Norman market. All of our importers at the moment are relatively small scale of mixed consignments, et cetera. It is a case of balancing these out. I think we can get somewhere with reducing those import costs and those bureaucratic costs but it is not through support to industry, it is through negotiation with the U.K., so that we establish something which is appropriate for Jersey and which takes into account the fact that Jersey has, as it were, an unseen border with the U.K. for a northbound route in that we have a limited number of freight providers, only a single substantial ferry route and we have a fair distance in terms of there is a large body of water there. We can control the northbound route almost by default and I think can justify, as it were, a softer bureaucratic approach from the south-bound route that should be acceptable to the U.K.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. What effect will these regulations have on organisations that are maybe similar to those to which you have previously referred but on organisations that bring in consignments of rescue dogs and cats from France and the E.U. to rehome in Jersey? How will they be supported in continuing with their charitable work? There is quite a lot of that that goes on. Is that a veterinary issue or is it a ...

The Minister for the Environment:

Is Alistair on the call? Thank you, Alistair. Thank you. I wonder if you could ...

Chief Veterinary Officer and States Veterinary Officer, Animal Health and Welfare:

Yes, thank you, Minister and Mr. Chair. Yes, I think there are 2 things it is worth possibly distinguishing between. The movement of pet animals by their owners as pets is not a commercial activity and that continues under the pet scheme, although there are issues with the passports. Commercial dogs come under commercial controls and they will be required to have a health certification. They are required to have health certification already, so that is not a change for them. What is a change is they will have to go through some form of official control point when they come in. But we are still working through the details of this with the United Kingdom authorities because they have not yet decided exactly what they want to do about this. We are not minded to have any more severe controls on this than our colleagues would have in the U.K.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. We await that with interest. Finally, on this one, do we have a timescale for implementing these regulations and how can businesses and stakeholders expect to be able to adapt, shall we say, to these changes and their role within the E.U.? I know you have deferred the debate, Minister, until January.

The Minister for the Environment:

Yes, I have yet to get an update from my officers, I apologise for that. I am looking there at Mr. Peggie, I do not think I have yet signed off the latest version. I think the last I heard there was still some change taking place on it.

Director of Natural Environment and Acting Group Director for Regulation:

I think we are looking to get that lodged today, Minister. I think there is an M.D. (ministerial decision) coming through for signing. We are hoping it comes back today from the Greffe, as I understand it, so that the implementation will be throughout the course of 2022. I do not know whether Steve has got anything through the discussions and Stewart perhaps ...

Environmental Health Consultant:

Can I just talk to how we are dealing with businesses? Being a small island we know which businesses regularly import. We are already talking to them, discussing what may have to happen, how it is happening and our officers are going out there and meeting with them. Obviously when we have some sort of conclusion as to what will happen we will have more formal discussions with them and provide the necessary information. But the officers are there to facilitate those imports. Our intention is to continue to make it as easy as possible for those businesses to continue and so far so good. They understand it is not necessarily completely in our gift and they understand that negotiations are ongoing.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Minister, I am going to move now to the Citizens' Assembly and the carbon neutral roadmap and the preferred strategy report. We made a number of recommendations within our Scrutiny report of the Citizens' Assembly process on climate change, which you accepted would be considered during the Government's evaluation report to be published before the end of this year. Can you update us regarding the progress of the evaluation process being undertaken by the Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance team?

The Minister for the Environment:

Sorry, Chair, I think I have missed the boat on this one. I have been concentrating on progressing the route map. Obviously if I just got your question right, if I just read it and make sure I understand it, you are talking about the evaluation of the process that took place for the Citizens' Assembly.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Yes, there was going to be a Government evaluation report to be published before the end of December.

The Minister for the Environment:

I think Steve Skelton has come to my rescue I can see there, who handled that particular part of the project. If I could ask him to respond.

Group Director, Strategy and Innovation:

Thank you very much, Minister. I think the Chair is asking about a piece of work that is being led by the Strategic Policy Department, which the panel will be aware has undertaken not just the Citizens' Assembly on climate change issue but obviously also the Citizens' Jury on assisted dying, as well as having previously done work such as the involvement of the Citizens' Panel in relation to the childcare inquiry. What the evaluation report that we are working on and seeks to do is just to reflect on some of the experience in running those exercises and to draw any conclusions primarily for professional policy making practice, rather than trying to come to any decisions or observations about the efficacy of those exercises on the democratic process. This is very much about how we manage those exercises, how we manage them in the future, how we could think about work planning then and things like that. Obviously the actual question about how effective they were depends entirely on how decision-makers, in this case elected Members in the States Assembly, believe those processes affected their own decisions in the end point, as well as how well they succeeded in proving their understanding of issues in the wider public. Those issues will only be answerable when we have had downstream decisions on climate change and on assisted dying. But the piece of work we are doing at the moment is underway and is due to conclude reasonably soon. It is an internal working document rather than a sort of a Government paper, but that work is

progressing. I think we have undertaken to show that confidentially with the panel to enable you to draw on some of that in your own ongoing review of the Climate Change Assembly.

[13:15]

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thank you. Strategic Policy 1 outlines that Jersey will follow an emissions reduction pathway in line with the Paris agreement, ultimately to deliver net zero by 2050. If agreed, how will carbon neutral and net-zero pathways align to the strategy we are just discussing and what stages?

The Minister for the Environment:

Thank you, Chair, it is a really key question. We just had a session with the Council of Ministers on this very key point. I think Louise and Steve would be able to do that real justice, rather than my lay understanding of it. Could I call either of them, please?

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Please do.

Head of Sustainability and Foresight:

Thank you, Minister. I can come in on the carbon neutral Paris overlap. It is a key point that aligning with the Paris objectives in no way stops us from becoming carbon neutral if we wish. The concept of carbon neutrality was something that the States Assembly signed up to as an aim in 2019. The fifth strategic policy of the preferred strategy talks about the fact that carbon neutral can be achieved as part of the net zero to 2050 objective. There are 2 things going on here, there is the 2050 Paris journey, which is what internationally is being judged by all nations who are signing up to Paris and there is a possibility for Jersey to be carbon neutral by 2030. When the carbon neutral strategy was first agreed back in 2019 the definition of carbon neutral was that it would be an aggressive emissions reduction strategy, so real and genuine progress to reduce emissions. Then at 2030 it was always clear that there would be some emissions on Island that could not yet be got rid of because it was such an aggressive and early target. In order to be neutral by 2030 those would be offset; that of course still remains a very strong possibility. What Paris does is it gives us an emissions reduction trajectory. It does not just say do it as aggressively as you can; it says hit 68 per cent by 2030, which is really quite strong, given that we are at 36 per cent now, so it is a really aggressive emissions reduction target. If we wish future governments, as we understand the carbon offset market more, could choose to buy offsets at that point in time to be carbon neutral at 2030 or indeed any other time. What we say in the preferred strategy is that we think there is more work to do to understand the offsets market. The work that we did with the Citizens' Assembly, Scrutiny and the in-committee debate all questioned carbon offsets as perhaps, is that the best use of money to

facilitate our carbon reduction journey? We have recognised that in the preferred strategy and it will be in the roadmap as well, to say: "When we understand more about offsets and Jersey's ambition at 2030 we could be carbon neutral at that time." What we most certainly want to do in line with every other advanced jurisdiction is follow the Paris reduction targets, which are guided by science and would take us to a 68 per cent reduction in emissions by 2030 and 78 per cent by 2035, net zero at 2050.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

What feedback, if any, have you had or have you shared with participants of the Citizens' Assembly in respect of the response to its recommendations? Has any follow-up with the assembly taken place and what has their reaction been in respect of the Government's response to its recommendations?

Head of Sustainability and Foresight:

Sorry, Minister, I have jumped in, would you prefer to go or shall I?

The Minister for the Environment:

No. My recollection is that I did approve a document because there was a very long document where the team assembled all the recommendations that came out of the assembly and kind of structured them a bit around a number of themes. We put a comment on there, the numbers that were accepted and I think there was a relatively few number which were not accepted I think at that point. My recollection, that document was published but I think, please, Louise, can you pick that up?

Head of Sustainability and Foresight?

Thank you, Minister, that is exactly right. In the preferred strategy, as Constable Jackson rightly says, we have outlined every one of the Citizens' Assembly recommendations and categorised them to how they are being taken forward. I think the question that the Chair was asking was, what have the citizens said about this back to us at the moment? The answer is because the Citizens' Assembly participants were independent and managed by the consortium that were carrying out the independent process, their identity does not remain with our department. We do not have nor did we intend to have a mailing list, for example, of all the citizens that participated in the assembly, they were a task-unfinished group. While they exist and are out there and I know that many of them talk among themselves still and speak to the Chair convenor, we do not have an official line to them because that was not the purpose of the way that group was structured. At the moment there is not a direct line of communication between their thoughts on what they have seen so far and the response of Government. I think there is a further step to go, which is for the citizens to see how we have taken those categories of response to their recommendations and how they turn out in the

carbon neutral roadmap in the policies that will be coming. That roadmap will go out for consultation and the Citizens' Assembly participants will, of course, at that point have the opportunity to be part of that consultation and I am sure will have a view on what they see. The answer to the question is, what have the citizens said so far? That is not shared with us at the moment, although I know they do have views and I know that they are talking; they have not spoken directly to the Minister yet but they will have the opportunity to do that through the consultation process.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Minister, Jersey has a mammoth task ahead to speed up decarbonisation to achieve net zero. How do you intend to appropriately involve the public, stakeholders and local organisations and businesses on this journey for a timely and impactful change?

The Minister for the Environment:

The first thing is that the effort has gone into the roadmap. The roadmap, I think, really gets down to what I would call the meat of the issue. What are the actions? This is something which everybody absolutely rightfully has been asking ever since we started with this journey from the aspiration and I think the roadmap provides how it can be done. Of course in preparing that roadmap it has been crucial that we subjected all of the actions that could be taken to a proper process, a proper evaluation. First of all, obviously one had to establish what their costs were individually and they all have got different costs. Then of course, what is their impact? What is their impact in terms of carbon reduction and what is their timing? It is almost what I call almost like a cost benefit analysis that has been gone through to try and produce a shortlist of those things, to try and draw up priorities. We are at the point, I believe, very close to publishing that roadmap, publishing it for consultation. There is a downstream process of extensive engagement, which I will ask Louise or Steve to take us through shortly the various steps in there. But we are at the moment seeking the Council of Ministers' support that we publish this for consultation. But of course the plan that we have drawn up, the roadmap recognises, as you say, it is a long journey. What we set out in the roadmap is some specific actions for the first 4 years of the Government Plan because the States has already decided to allocate £23 million in the Government Plan for the Climate Emergency Fund. What the roadmap will show is how it is proposed to best spend that in the first few years. But it is quite plain that that is the start and there is obviously the option for future governments and future government plans to vary those things, either by putting more money into the Climate Emergency Fund or by introducing, if it needs to, fiscal measures or what have you to do things. But at the same time a programme of spending because we are reminded of the fact, not reminded, we absolutely know that we are charged with the roadmap to not worsen, at the very least, income inequality. We need to have systems and that work is all being done in the roadmap. It is a consultation process prior to the decisions of the States, which I think it is our States responsibility before this term of office closes

to make those decisions but that will be the work for the next 3 months. Louise will talk us through the detail of how it is going to be done. Thank you, Chair, for letting me do that.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I suspect easier said than done. Please, go ahead, Louise.

Head of Sustainability and Foresight:

Thank you, Minister. Thank you, Chair. That is absolutely right, the consultation process for the roadmap will begin in a couple of weeks, in fact less than that, 10 days now. That will be the opportunity for the whole community to have a view and, of course, States Members and Scrutiny themselves a view on the package of policies, the thing that everyone has been waiting for, to help Islanders transition. I think your question, Chair, asked about how we are going to help individuals and that is absolutely the right point. It is individual action that will help us to reach these Paris targets. As you say, they are ambitious and difficult and it will be down to individual behaviours. How do individuals travel? How do they heat their homes and places of work? That is what a lot of this comes down to. Obviously the policy that is under development and that you will see really soon will be talking about what are the policy interventions to help individuals move and help businesses make those movements? I am afraid I cannot tell you what I would love to tell you, which is what some of those policies are. But you will recognise in them the direct ways in which the policies hope to intervene, to use the money that is currently available and will be needed for the future, to help people to decarbonise their lifestyles. There are policies in there that will apply to individuals and how they live and travel. There are policies in there that will also look to help businesses as well. You can see that as a community the package that will come forward will be about enabling people to decarbonise their individual behaviours to take us on that Paris journey. But you are absolutely right, it is not unambitious but it is a challenge that everybody faces, everybody who is trying to meet the Paris targets has that same level of ambition to try and reach if we are to prevent catastrophic climate changes, as the scientists tell us.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Minister, this morning I heard Senator Gorst urging Government to curb its borrowing ambitions. Will this have an effect on your strategy?

The Minister for the Environment:

It will not have an effect on the next Government Plan periods because any changes to the Government Plan, other than of course Senator Gorst's specific amendment this time, ... obviously that is its own issue. Of course the States do review the Government Plan every year and so there is the opportunity for a new States and new Members to change that plan. I think it is absolutely clear that £23 million over the next 4 years is a good start but it falls well short of what the cost would

be. I think the sort of cost that I think I am hearing spoken of is that it is very, very difficult to assess a cost going to 2050 because you are talking about something which is 30 years away and there is all sorts of technological changes and numbers that will happen between then. But one can assess, I think, what a potential cost could be in order to achieve the goal by 2030. Unless I am wrong I think the estimate being put on that is around £212 million. Obviously there are choices in there: how is that funded? You know, Chair, I am not going to be standing in the next States but from the side-lines I will be watching because there are choices. Borrowing is one possibility and of course we do seem to be borrowing for rather a lot of things at the moment.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Indeed.

The Minister for the Environment:

I will reserve my comments on that for the States debate. But I have to admit £212 million sounds a little bit less impactful than the sort of figures we are doing for other things, so that is one possibility. But, equally, I think one should also recognise the need for fiscal carrot and stick measures. What I would expect the States to do is rather than just impose sort of grand, big general increases in tax, no, I think measures which are targeted on helping us achieve those goals is one of the things there. But, equally, we have to support people who need the support to help make the changes because large sectors of our community do not have the economic circumstances to enable them to do that. I think what Government need to do is to facilitate that. A long answer in there, Chair, but, no, there will no change to the next 4 years yet. What the roadmap does, I think it is a great framework because when you see it and I would love to have had a talk to you about it in more detail now but obviously we have got to wait for a number of formalities. But what it will show, I think it sets out the journey right through Government term after Government term after Government term right through to 2050 and there will be those options that Members of the day then can change and use and adapt. Throughout the assumption I make is that Jersey will be managing and monitoring its progress and will be able to see how well we are going.

[13:30]

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

I think the important thing is that it does not impact households, businesses, workers in an unfair or disproportionate way. Minister, I am going to at this point thank you and your team for your honest and candid responses to the questions. We look forward to talking to you again. I close the meeting and thank you.

The Minister for the Environment:

Thank you very much. You gave us a good grilling this morning, Chair. Thank you and thank you all the other members.

The Connétable of St. Brelade:

Thanks.

[13:31]