

---

# STATES OF JERSEY



## SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT PLAN: 2021-2024 – ENVIRONMENT, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE SCRUTINY PANEL (S.R.12/2020): JOINT MINISTERIAL RESPONSE

---

Presented to the States on 10th February 2021  
by the Minister for the Environment

---

STATES GREFFE

**SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT PLAN: 2021 – 2024 –  
ENVIRONMENT, HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE PANEL (S.R.12/2020)  
- JOINT MINISTERIAL RESPONSE**

<b>Ministerial Response to:</b>	S.R.12/2020
<b>Ministerial Response required by:</b>	13th January 2021
<b>Review title:</b>	Joint response to Review of the Government Plan: 2021 – 2024 (EHI Panel)
<b>Scrutiny Panel:</b>	Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel

**FINDINGS**

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	The removal of the economy function from the IHE Departmental Budget is the main contributing factor in the 20k reduction in Heads of Expenditure from the previous Government Plan, although there are various other small changes to the budget which make up the 20k figure	The reduction in Head of Expenditure for the department compared to 2020 is almost £20 million. Of this, £18.3 million related to the transfer of the Economy function. The figure of £20k in the finding is erroneous.
2	The projected income in the IHE Departmental Budget is reduced largely as a result of the “growth” item in 2020 for waste charges (£6.9m) being classified as expenditure growth in the GP 20-23, but reclassified in base budgets in 2021 as a reduction in income. The Panel is advised that the net impact of this reclassification is nil.	This is correct.
3	The funding proposal for the Housing Policy Development Board – Long-Term Plan has been cut by half and whilst the Chief Minister has provided assurances that the level of funding should be sufficient, it remains to be seen as what key outcomes this will deliver. The Board is also yet to publish its report setting out recommendations for a long-term housing policy.	Reprofiling of the ‘Housing PDB Long-term Plan’ housing bid from last year’s Government Plan (GP 2020-23) resulted in total net saving of £1.725 million. Revised ‘Housing PDB Long-term Plan bid is comprised as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Coordination: To introduce a coordination function within government for housing. A core task will be to ensure government departments and housing suppliers work together effectively in delivering a consistent supply of housing,</li> </ul>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		<p>with an emphasis on providing more affordable homes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Policy development: Reflective of ongoing need for new housing legislation and policy advice;</li> <li>• Shelter Trust Grant: Increasing the grant of Shelter Trust so it can meet staff resource requirements and operational costs. Bid is consistent with the recommendations of the independent Homelessness Strategy; and</li> <li>• Vacant Homes: A project will explore opportunities to bring vacant homes back into active use.</li> </ul> <p>These bids reflect current housing policy priorities and are assessed as sufficient to deliver the activities set out. The report of the Housing Policy Development Board has been submitted to the Chief Minister and is expected to be published in the early 2021.</p>
4	<p>The funding proposal for the Tenants' Rights programme has been cut by half and whilst the Chief Minister has provided assurances that the level of funding should be sufficient, it remains to be seen if this will be the case. The Board is also yet to publish its report setting out recommendations for a long-term housing policy.</p>	<p>Reprofiling of 'Tenants' Rights housing bid from last year's Government Plan (GP 2020-23) resulted in total net saving of £380,000 in the current Government Plan. Revised Tenant's Rights bid is comprised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rent Stabilisation: Covers policy evaluation and development as well as estimated funding required for staff and administrative costs. Any resulting legislation would require assent of the States Assembly. Rent stabilisation is one of the themes emerging from the work of the Housing Policy Development Board.</li> <li>• Homelessness Services: Separate bids submitted for policy evaluation of appropriate structured pathway for individuals to access housing and co-ordinated support, as well as staff and administrative costs. Bids are consistent with the independent Jersey Homelessness Strategy.</li> <li>• Housing Advice Service: As recommended by the Review of Social</li> </ul>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		<p>Housing in Jersey (2019) and the Independent Jersey Homelessness Strategy. It will go live in Q1 2021. Key elements of the service are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A Web page and online form to support self-help/low need cases on a variety of housing issues;</li> <li>- A Housing Support Officer to manage high need emergency housing cases;</li> <li>- Advisor support to manage telephone and email resources, aimed at medium need cases seeking advice, sign-posting and handover to other services.</li> </ul> <p>These bids reflect current housing policy priorities and are assessed as sufficient to deliver the activities set out. The report of the Housing Policy Development Board has been submitted to the Chief Minister and is expected to be published in the early 2021.</p>
5	<p>External stakeholders were not consulted at an early stage on the plans to introduce a new Housing Advice Service and therefore have not contributed to shaping how the new service will be delivered.</p>	<p>Two independent reviews have identified the need for the Government of Jersey to provide a housing advice service: the 2019 Review of Access to Social Housing and the 2020 Independent Homelessness Review and Strategy. The previous and current Ministers accepted the need to improve the advice, guidance and support provided to the public on housing matters across a range of tenures, especially urgent housing needs when a person is at risk of becoming homeless. The reviews have, therefore, provided a helpful overview regarding how a housing advice service could work in Jersey and have informed the development of a new service at Customer and Local Services. Both reviews have been developed with considerable engagement from stakeholders – indeed, the Homelessness Strategy has been co-produced by the public sector, charitable organisations, social housing providers and private sector.</p> <p>The first stage in developing a Housing Advice Service is to improve the housing services provided internally by Government, including a new housing portal on-line and employing a dedicated housing support officer in CLS to support service users. Stakeholders have been</p>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		<p>engaged in the proposals for this service, and were asked for their views, for example, on the design of the online portal.</p> <p>The Housing Advice Service is in its early stages based on 2020 Government Plan funding. As the service is developed in 2021 (with funding earmarked in the 2021 to 2024 Government Plan) there will be further opportunities for stakeholders to be involved. Considerable engagement is anticipated with organisations such as the Shelter Trust as work commences to design new homeless services.</p> <p>A high-quality Housing Advice Service cannot function effectively without there being appropriate referral mechanisms and referral pathways in place to support service users. Partnership working between organisations is, therefore, essential at all stages – from policy development, through to implementation and delivery.</p>
6	<p>The Panel’s initial concerns that at least one initiative (strengthening environmental protection against Japanese knotweed as an invasive species) which proposed to be funded by the Climate Emergency Fund did not appear to meet the Terms of Reference of the Fund. These concerns have been alleviated and the Panel is satisfied that these initiatives are linked to responding to the impact of climate change.</p>	<p>Nothing further to add as finding now resolved in follow up by letter between the Panel and Department as acknowledged.</p>
7	<p>The Minister for the Environment is the lead Minister for the ‘assessment of public infrastructure and resources’ programme. However, there is uncertainty as to how much joined up working there is between the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Infrastructure in relation to the crossover of remits within this programme.</p>	<p>The Corporate Asset Management Board, a central pillar of the Estate Strategy recently approved by the Council of Ministers, facilitates the cross department working between Ops and Transport, Jersey Property Holdings and the officers supporting the Environment Minister’s remit. In addition to this formal mechanism, there is close informal working at officer level. The separation of ministerial responsibility inherent in IHE is unduly complicated and should be reviewed. Policy should be set by the environment minister and operational matters by the Minister for Infrastructure.</p>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		It is the Minister view that the separation of ministerial responsibility inherent in IHE is unduly complicated and should be reviewed. In their view, policy should be set by the Environment Minister and operational matters should be the remit of the Infrastructure Minister.
8	Progress is being made in relation to the objectives of the Jersey National Park project, however, due to the Covid-19 restrictions there have been limited opportunities for education and interpretation events.	Covid restrictions continue to limit opportunities for education and interpretation events. However, progress has been made in preparation of facilities (Frances Le Sueur Centre) which will be fully utilised as soon as the Covid situation allows.
9	There are concerns of inadequate support being provided to Jersey National Park with it being noted that there is a lack of contact and participation on a practical level from the IHE Department.	Appointment of new posts within the Economy Department in Q4 2020 has enabled the delivery of more support to the JNP management team with increased contact and participation on a practical level by Government officers.
10	There is a lack of clarity as to whether the reduction in funding from £1.5m to £1m in 2021 will be sufficient to meet the aims of the Drainage Foul Sewerage Extensions capital programme which seeks to extend and enhance the sewerage network to keep pace with continued growth in population size.	Most of the population growth is occurring in areas already connected to the foul sewer network. The drainage extensions are to outlying properties. Jersey does have a high connection rate with 92% of the properties connected. This programme must run in parallel with the infrastructure vote as the infrastructure vote frees up capacity in the downstream network by reducing the amount of surface water ingress into the system. £1m is sufficient and will deliver approximately one scheme per annum.
11	There are substantial reductions proposed in relation to funding for the Island Public Realm capital project and a lack of clarity as to whether the revised funding will be sufficient to meet the project's aims.	The Public Realm Delivery Pipeline has been developed so that the delivery can be scaled to meet the requirements of the available budgets, the schemes brought forward will be coordinated with Planning Obligation Agreements from private developer where appropriate, so that so that the whole benefits provided are greater than the constituent parts.  The programme being developed is affordable and will deliver meaningful benefits.
12	The Minister for the Environment was not aware of the reductions in funding	The purpose of the Regeneration Steering Group is to provide political guidance in order to inform

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	<p>for the Island Public Realm capital project, suggesting a lack of collaboration and joint working with the Minister for Infrastructure who is lead Minister for this capital project and raising concerns of an ongoing silo approach within Government.</p>	<p>the policy guidelines for all major Public property and regeneration projects in Jersey. This will in practice mean that the Regeneration Steering Group translates Masterplans and supplementary planning guidance proposed by the Minister for the Environment into workable and viable Development Plans.</p> <p>In the case of Island Public Realm work, this is informed by the St Helier Public Realm and Movement Strategy commission jointly by the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Environment as part of the development work for the Island Plan.</p> <p>The Regeneration Steering Group is composed of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chief Minister (Chairman)</li> <li>• Minister for Treasury and Resources</li> <li>• Minister for Economic Development</li> <li>• Minister for Infrastructure</li> <li>• Connétable of St. Helier</li> </ul> <p>The Minister for Environment is excluded from this group and its decisions to avoid conflicts of interest where planning approvals are required. The Minister for the Environment considers this artificial split unnecessary and bound to lead to dysfunctionality. The Minister for the Environment has no role in deciding Planning applications, except in cases where they may come to him to decide an appeal and sets planning policies. It would be more sensible to try to align both asset use and planning policies. It should be noted that the set-up of the Regeneration Steering Group and the Minister for the Environment exclusion said group was by design when the States of Jersey Development was formed.</p> <p>The decision to reduce funding for the Island Public Realm within the Government Recovery Plan 2020 – 2023 was undertaken in line with standard Treasury procedures and approvals for proposed changes to budgets within the Government Plan process.</p>
13	<p>There has been a funding increase from what was projected in the last Government Plan for the Replacements</p>	<p>The additional funding was re-allocated from the Infrastructure Head of Expenditure as the department was concerned about the budget</p>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	and Minor Capital for 2021 (2,862,000) to what is now being requested for 2021 (£3,500,00), however, the Panel is advised that even this amount might not be sufficient to meet the project's aims and that realistically £5,000,000 is required.	originally allocated for 2021 in the GP 20-23. Additional funding is being requested to be carried forward from 2020 in order to meet some of the needs identified and mitigate the potential shortfall in budget allocated in the Government Plan 2021-24. Reprioritisation of all the IHE Heads of Expenditure may be required in the new year should funding still be insufficient.
14	Funding of £3.7m which was projected in the capital programme for 2022-23 for refurbishment works of Elizabeth Castle in the 2020 Government Plan has been cut in the 2021 Government Plan projections. No explanation was provided for this in the Government Plan; however, the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture has indicated that there are other possible funding options available.	The funding for the Elizabeth Castle project was resolved through an amended amendment to the Government Plan. The Heads of Expenditure for Financial Services and Digital will be increased by £750,000 in 2021 in order to fund the development of Elizabeth Castle, including the Hospital and Officers' Quarters and the revised business case for the Castle, with a commitment that funding shall be provided in subsequent years to complete the development, no later than the end of 2025, subject to agreeing the updated business case and after the Jersey Heritage Trust and Ministers have worked together to thoroughly investigate other potential funding mechanisms, and that any such funding shall be over and above the 1% allocation for Culture, Arts and Heritage of overall expenditure.
15	The Vehicle Testing Facility Capital (Major) Project has been deferred in full, including the associated funding. The outcome of the Options Appraisal study is likely to be known in March 2021.	Options Appraisal delayed due to COVID but work well underway now.
16	There is a lack of clarity in the reduced funding proposal for the deferred status of the Courtroom 1 – Magistrates Court capital project in relation to a discrepancy of a reduction in £10k which does not appear to be accounted for.	£10k was spent in 2020 and therefore was not available for spend again in 2021. Overall, the project budget remains unchanged, when both years are taken into account as the amount allocated over the period remains £450k.
17	Although it is accepted that there is an expectation that the prefeasibility study for the Picquet House Family Court capital project is unlikely to conclude and that the project is unable to be undertaken, without the outcome of the feasibility study being known, there remains a degree of uncertainty in	The prefeasibility study will be a relatively simple affair that will consider the practicality of the internal works required to deliver a Family court. It is assessed that there are sufficient funds available.

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	regard to whether the funds would be sufficient for the project's requirements.	
18	With the outcome of the prefeasibility study currently unknown, there remains a degree of uncertainty in regard to whether the funds would be sufficient for the requirements of the eventual Rouge Bouillon site outcome.	There are 2 dependent pieces of work relating to the Rouge Bouillon site. The first is considering the location for a joint Fire and Ambulance Station dependent on response times and incident risk assessments. If this shows that the most effective location for the combined facility is elsewhere, then there will be an assessment of what would be the most effective use of the site. If the JHA assessment shows that Rouge Bouillon is the best site for the emergency services, then here will be no second feasibility study.
19	In relation to Fleet Management, there have been delays experienced in committing to new or replacement vehicle assets and the associated revenue leasing charge. As well as a resultant carrying forward of unallocated budgets, there is a degree of uncertainty regarding the allocations.	The vehicle replacement programme is progressing, and delays have largely been due to uncertainty in client departments during periods of TOM restructure and service reconfiguration. The sums already allocated by the States to the vehicle replacement programme are rolled forward within the trading operation and form part of the trading fund balance. A review of the programme and the funding is being undertaken presently to inform the next Government Plan in more detail.
20	The Jersey Car Parking Fund has suffered a loss of income due to the Covid-19 pandemic which is likely to impact significantly on its capacity to fund capital refurbishment of the parking estate going forward.	<p>The impact of Covid-19 on the trading operation has been significant, with a predicted loss of £3.1m income for 2020. It is also expected that until a "return to normality" revenues will continue to be impacted. In addition, behaviour change amongst commuters in particular is likely to have a longer-term impact as increased working from home and alternative modes of travel become more prevalent.</p> <p>However, in good part due to the historic good stewardship of the multi-storey structures by the Department's engineers, it is not at this time anticipated long-term maintenance programme will be adversely affected or service life of the buildings reduced.</p> <p>In the shorter time, some plans to modernise the parking estate may need to be rescoped or deferred.</p>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
21	<p>The exact future use of the 28-30 Parade office building is uncertain at present and assurances could not be provided as to how this arrangement would ensure value for money for the taxpayer.</p>	<p>28-30 the Parade was originally procured for a previous hospital project. When that project was cancelled the government was unable to cancel its obligation. The building has however been used productively for the regulation department and Team Jersey and has provided much needed space for the COVID response, in both track and trace teams and media facilities. It is currently being considered for use by Medical teams relocating from Overdale. The premises are being used constructively to avoid additional cost to the taxpayer.</p>
22	<p>The Covid-19 Bus Contract is a new programme in the Government Plan 2021-24 which seeks approval for additional revenue funding of £2m in 2021 to subsidise the bus operator to enable them to break-even due to the significant impact on bus ridership resulting from the impact of the pandemic.</p>	<p>Since early March 2020, the effect on the bus service of the Covid-19 outbreak and Government Emergency Regulations has been two-fold: reduced demand as a result of the need to restrict the numbers of people in close proximity to one another, and a downturn in economic activity throughout the island arising from businesses suspending operations, office staff working from home, schools and leisure facilities closing, tourist volumes falling away. These double impacts are placing acute pressure on the bus network as passenger numbers fall</p> <p>However, the public bus service remains a strategically important service, it contributes to community wellbeing, being a vital means of travel for many people who do not have access to personal transport. It is a vital resource for keeping the Island's community moving and able to access shops, Government services such as Health and Education and the workplace.</p> <p>It contributes to the aims of the sustainable transport policy, providing both environmental and social benefits and reducing congestion on the roads and in public car parks.</p> <p>The bus service also provides employment and training opportunities for in excess of 140 staff, including local transport management training.</p> <p>The funding is to be drawn down upon it required, without this significant changes and reductions in services would be required, and redundancies would have to be made. This would reduce the service below 2013 levels and there could be a</p>

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		<p>“spiral” effect whereby the levels of service reduce desirability of travel, leading to a further reduction in income.</p> <p>The objectives of the funding are to:</p> <p>1 – ensure a bus service remains in service that is capable of servicing routes at frequencies that means it remains a viable alternative to the car, meeting the aims of the Sustainable Transport Plan and environmental goals for the future</p> <p>2 – maintain public confidence in the bus service to ensure that the service provided is capable of being scaled back up to pre-covid-19 levels as demand increases</p> <p>3- provide essential transport for those that rely on the service, including the elderly, school children and commuters, meeting the needs of those particular groups.</p>
23	<p>The bus operator is a social enterprise and has returned a profit share to Government of in excess of £1.4m in the last five years, however due to the impact on its commercial operations it is not envisaged that there will be profit share return for the period April 2020 – March 2021 and it will depend on Covid-19 restrictions in place in any given financial year and the levels of ridership as to whether this will be the case for future Government Plans.</p>	<p>The position will be kept under review and appropriate measures will be put in place to reduce costs and keep the level of support required within reasonable levels.</p> <p>It is not expected that a profit share will be returned in relation to 2020-21 as stated.</p>
24	<p>It is not entirely clear how the 1.4m profit share returned from the bus operator to Government has been spent and that prior to 2020 will have been consumed within the year and included within the revenue income and expenditure of the IHE Department.</p>	<p>Due to the Government accounting policies (no ring fencing of funds) it is not possible to directly attribute costs to income and the budget line for income in the departmental accounts is offset by a number of revenue expenditure items including concessionary fares, STP projects and initiatives and support for bus management, research and development.</p> <p>WQ.384/2019 and WQ.386/2019 provide further detail</p>
25	<p>The business case contained within the Government Plan 2021-24 was unclear as to what the proposed funding would be spent on. It was identified during</p>	

	<b>Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	the Panel's review that the funding will cover various water management initiatives.	
26	The funding bid for Marine Resources Management proposes to fund a vessel monitoring system, in addition to the recruitment and retention of two fisheries officers, in response to foreseeable implications related to Brexit.	This is correct.
27	Government currently utilises independent research through third party organisations and university bursaries in relation to Marine Resources matters, although the Minister advised there is a move to internalise this work where possible.	Some work can be done "in house" but there will always be specialisms that require assistance from external agencies.
28	Spend reductions in relation to the maintenance and upkeep of condition of the government's property estate are likely to impact on the prioritisation of sites for maintenance and repair and this could lead to maintenance being delayed on some sites which may be deemed less or a pressing priority for repair.	The backlog maintenance funding being released is partly offset by capital allocations in the HCS budget and the "hub and spoke" model for hard facilities management and maintenance should introduce efficiencies by adopting the OneGov model for service delivery.
29	There are no efficiencies assigned to the Minister for the Environment, only a joint efficiency with the Minister for Infrastructure and Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and culture in relation to the Target Operating Model for the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment Department.	Agreed.
30	The £25k spend reduction by deferring policy development under the Housing Policy Development Board is not considered to have an impact on the overall housing programme.	The £25K reduction (rebalancing) is not considered to have an impact on the overall housing programme.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
1	The Chief Minister, together with the newly appointed Minister for Children and Housing, should publish the findings and recommendations of the Housing Policy Development Board's report as soon as practical.	CM / MC H	Accept	The report of the Housing Policy Development Board has been submitted to the Chief Minister for his consideration and will be published in due course.	March 2021
2	The Minister for Children and Housing should ensure, going forward, that engagement and consultation with external stakeholders (such as social housing providers and private landlords) happens in the early stages of policy development in order to provide valuable contributions to the delivery of policy outcomes.	MC H	Accept	Minister for Children and Housing will continue to ensure that government officers consult with external stakeholders as necessary at the most appropriate stage of policy development. Stakeholder engagement features throughout a project and is detailed in the Business cases.  I would like to thank officers, who despite the challenges Covid-19 brought, ensured that Stakeholder engagement was maintained.	N/A
3	The Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Economic Development, Tourism Sport and Culture should, by the end of Q1 2021, put in place suitable protocols to ensure a more collaborative approach to their involvement in the Jersey National Park project and in the support extended to the Jersey National Park.	ME NV / ME DT SC	Accept	Collaboration on the JNP in Q1 2021 is enhanced through the requirement to develop a revised Rural Economy Strategy (RES), for introduction in 2022. Officers of both departments are currently engaged in updating the framework for JNP policy which is contained in the RES.	Ongoing
4	The Minister for Infrastructure should, by	MI NF	Accept	The foul sewerage system is coping well apart from in heavy rainfall high water table areas. There is now an	End of Q1 21

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
	end of Q1 2021, provide the Panel with a detailed analysis on how the foul sewerage system together with the surface water system is coping with demand, as well as further details on the rationale for the decrease in funding in this area, given projections of growing population size.			annual ongoing CCTV survey contract to determine areas which need repairs or relining. A number of relining projects have been carried out in 2020 and this will continue into 2021. The new sewage treatment works due in operation early 2023 will allow for the Islands increasing population. Flow meters are being installed in the major surface water systems in the island. This will inform a climate change study and surface water management plan. This will enable IHE to determine what funding is required for future surface water management giving the changing climatic conditions.	
5	Given the extensive crossover between the two remits of Infrastructure and Environment, both Ministers should put in place suitable protocols to ensure more joined up working, with a greater emphasis on breaking down silos and adopting a more collaborative approach. Both Ministers should report back to the Panel by the end of Q1 2021 with an action plan as to how this will be achieved going forward.	ME NV / MI NF	Reject	The Director General for IHE meets weekly with the Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for the Environment, Minister for Children and Housing, and also the Assistant Minister for EDTSC with responsibility for Sport. In this role, he ensures cross portfolio briefing occurs on a weekly basis on IHE issues between ministries. As mentioned previously in the response, in the Minister for the Environment's view the separation of ministerial responsibility inherent in IHE is unduly complicated and should be reviewed.	Not applicable.
6	The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture should clearly outline, in writing, the reasons and potential detrimental effects of the cut in funding to the Elizabeth Castle capital	ME DT SC	Not applicable	This has been superseded by the amendment to the Government Plan.	Not applicable

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
	programme in the Government Plan 2021-24 to both the Panel and Jersey Heritage before the end of December 2020.				
7	The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture should investigate other possible sources of funding to facilitate the refurbishment project and inform both the Panel and Jersey Heritage, in writing, of any such outcome before the end of Q2 2021.	ME DT SC	Not applicable	This has been superseded by the amendment to the Government Plan.	Not applicable
8	The Minister for Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture should, without delay, ensure that suitable protocols are put in place to ensure open lines of communication with Jersey Heritage, as well as all key stakeholders, to ensure proper engagement and consultation is carried out.	ME DT SC	Agreed	This will be addressed by the new Assistant Minister, who was formally confirmed on 8th December 2020, with the recently recruited new sector lead, once they are in post, together with the existing officer.	Ongoing
9	The Chief Minister should, by end of Q4 2020, provide an explanation as to the rationale for the £10k reduction in funds from what was anticipated in the 2020 Government Plan to what is being requested now. Further consideration should also be given as to how, in	CM	N/A	The conversion of the magistrate's court is a non-ministerial project and the amount included in the Government Plan represents the costings provided to the Government by the relevant department. In this case, it is understood that £10k was spent on the project in 2020, with the remaining budget of £440k deferred to 2021. There is therefore no reduction in budget. Further questions on the project and associated budget would	N/A

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
	future Government Plans, the figures can be provided with clear explanation as why they might differ from previous year's projections.			need to be directed to the Judicial Greffe.	
10	The Minister for Infrastructure should provide the Panel, by the end of Q4 2020, with further information as to how the proposed funds have been calculated and determined given that the outcome of the prefeasibility and the future use for the Rouge Bouillon site is unknown.	MI NF	Accept	The funds were bid for by other departments and whilst in due course the Estate Strategy and the One Gov approach to use of the estate will allow a coordinated view of the future of strategically important sites, at the moment this is not possible	N/A
11	The Minister for Infrastructure should ensure that further detail be provided in future Government Plans in relation to the distribution of funds across the Fleet Management programme.	MI NF	Accept	Noted, more detail will be provided in the next Government Plan	To be provided in GP 2022-25
12	The Minister for Infrastructure should, by the end of Q1 2021, provide further information to the Panel regarding the potential impact the lack of sufficient funds is likely to have on the allocation of funding for the Jersey Car Parking Fund in future Government Plan bids.	MI NF		Noted	End Q1 21

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
13	The Minister for Infrastructure should ensure that further information is provided in the next Government Plan Progress Review update, as well as any future Government Plans, as to how 28-30 The Parade will be utilised and how the arrangements will provide the best value for money.	MI NF	Accept	Noted	To be provided in GP 2022-25
14	The Minister for Infrastructure should ensure that going forward any future profit share returned to Government under the bus contract is, for transparency, clearly accounted for in terms of demonstrating how this money is invested back into sustainable transport initiatives for the benefit of the island. Furthermore, the Minister should ensure there is greater transparency surrounding the sum returned by the bus operator to its UK parent company so that a clear distinction can be made between what is reinvested for the benefit of the island and what sum is distributed out of the island back to the parent company in the UK.	MI NF	Noted	The income from the profit share is paid into the Transport revenue budgets, which is responsible for delivering the activities within States Sustainable Transport Policy. It is not possible to disaggregate the funding contribution into individual initiatives, to try to do so would be artificial and be unlikely to be representative, particularly as many projects have multiple funding sources such as Planning Obligation Agreements and run over more than one year.	N/A
15	The Council of Ministers should ensure that all	Co M	Reject	Summary information is already provided in Annex to the Government	N/A

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
	future Government Plan bids include detailed information of what the funding is intended to cover, why the funding is needed and a breakdown of all associated costs. This should be rolled out in time for the Government Plan 2022.			Plan and detailed information is available to Scrutiny in the detailed Business Cases. However, given the scale and complexity of the Business Cases and, in some cases, the sensitive or commercial information contained in Business Cases, it would not be reasonable or practical to put it into the Government Plan document.	
16	The Minister for the Environment should seek to ensure going forward that a wide variety of reputable, independent research on marine resources related matters is drawn upon by Government, and given the implications arising from Brexit, endeavour to find ways to collaborate and engage with voluntary and third sector organisations to form mutually beneficial partnerships and new, innovative ways of working.	ME NV	Accept	Existing research programmes and new ones driven by external influences will be sought from the most reputable providers to ensure that sound science underpins policy and legislative decision making. In many instances partnership working will assist in delivering local datasets which will form the basis of this research. Brexit and implementation of the TCA agreement on fishing requires substantial additional investment in scientific resources,	Throughout 2021 and the government plan period dependent on research required.
17	The Minister for the Environment should seek to ensure that, now and post-Brexit, suitable engagement and support is extended to the fishing industry, given the significant implications this will inevitably have for the industry.	ME NV	Accept	Engagement with and support to the fishing industry is currently in the spotlight. Although the provision of such support is not within the Minister for the Environment's responsibility, the underpinning workstreams and liaisons with industry and government departments alike are being undertaken by officers. Since the publication of the Government Plan, the Minister for the Environment is seeking admin, financial, and infrastructure support for fishing and aquaculture. It is the Minister's view that political responsibility for these	Quarter 1 2021 and ongoing

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
				resources should sit within their portfolio.	

### **CONCLUSION**

The ministers thank the EHI Scrutiny Panel for its review. The ministers and their officers have given the comments and recommendations careful consideration.