

19-21 Broad Street | St Helier
Jersey | JE2 4WE

Deputy I Gardiner
Chair of the Public Accounts Committee

Via Email

14th January 2022

Dear Deputy Gardiner

PAC Review of Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries

Further to your letter dated 21st December 2021, I provide the following detailed responses to your further questions in relation to the Government of Jersey's use of Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries.

1. What process is followed when a need has been identified to increase the budget of each Citizens' Panel/Assembly/Jury? How were these needs identified?

There is no process for identifying additional spend that is specific to all deliberative exercises. Each deliberative exercise is bespoke and additional expenditure might be required for a wide range of reasons and identified in many different ways.

a. Who authorises additional expenditure?

To date, all deliberative exercises have been funded from resources identified for an associated programme or for policy development generally. As such, additional expenditure is authorised by an appropriate official as defined by the Public Finance Manual and the relevant department's scheme of delegation.

b. What process is followed to approve any additional phases of work undertaken by a Citizens' Panel, Assembly and Jury?

A requirement for additional work might be identified by the commissioning department (including ministers), by associated advisors or by the deliberative body itself. Related costs would be assessed and, where it was considered appropriate, additional expenditure would be authorised by an appropriate official as defined by the Public Finance Manual and the relevant department's scheme of delegation.

c. What involvement does the Minister for Treasury and Resources/Treasurer of the States have in these instances?

The Minister for Treasury and Resources and the Treasurer of the States would be involved if, in order to meet the additional expenditure, it became necessary to move money between heads of expenditure; or if additional investment was sought through the Government Plan.

d. When additional funds are required, are these accompanied by a business case? If not, why not? If it is not a business case, please advise what documents should be presented to allow extra spending?

Not all additional funds require a business case, for example, where the amount required is available within the existing head of expenditure. However, appropriate consideration is always given in some form as to why additional funds are required and alternative options to achieve the same objectives.

e. Are these decisions recorded and used? If so, how are they used to obtain additional funds, and would the PAC be able to receive copies of these records?

The reason for the additional expenditure should be clear and the authorisation to expend should be recorded in a proportionate way. A substantial additional area of work would generally be supported by a proposal, where this funding is accessed through an existing head of expenditure. Where the additional expenditure is required from a different head of expenditure it would be accompanied by a business case.

2. What autonomy does each Citizens' Panel/Assembly/Jury have in controlling and coordinating the use of its own budget and other funds supplied to it by the Government of Jersey?

Deliberative bodies have no autonomy in this area. Where they wish to conduct their business in a way that creates additional costs, these costs (and hence the associated activity) must be approved by an Accountable Officer (or their delegate) in line with public finance procedures. Given that it is important for deliberative bodies to have a degree of flexibility to self-direct their enquiries, reasonable requests – should as for additional sessions or to hear from a particular speaker – should generally be supported.

The evaluation of the climate change and assisted dying deliberative processes recommends that future exercises plan in 'free' sessions for the group themselves to direct, which would ensure that likely additional costs were anticipated at the budgeting stage. It may also be sensible to provide a contingency budget for associated additional speaker and other costs.

a. Do the members of these bodies have the option to override officers when requesting additional funds, officer resources, or additional external support (such as recruiting another independent expert)?

As noted above, it is important for deliberative bodies to have a degree of flexibility to self-direct their enquiries, so reasonable requests – should as for additional sessions or to hear from a particular speaker – should generally be supported.

Where such requests create additional financial implications, deliberative bodies do not have the authority to override a decision of an Accountable Officer (or their delegate).

b. Are these decisions recorded? If so, how are they used to obtain additional funds, and would the PAC be able to receive copies of these records?

As above, such decisions are not possible.

c. How do you work to ensure that the autonomy of Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries complies with the Public Finances Manual?

As above, all spending is agreed and administrated by Accountable Officers (or their delegates) in line with public finance processes.

3. We note your response to our question on the use of the Public Finances Manual in your letter on the 12th May 2021. In hindsight, has there been any reconsideration on your position on the use of the Public Finances Manual in establishing future Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries?

The Committee asked previously, *what internal guidelines are followed to ensure that the bodies described above meet the designed input conditions and succeed in their designated function? Is there a document similar to the Public Finances Manual to achieve this?*

As noted in response, *as they are bespoke rather than standardised processes, there is no equivalent to the public finance manual.*

This remains the case. The Public Finance Manual governs financial management and decision making, rather than policy development, which is a politically directed process.

a. What formal processes are currently and consistently applied across the Government of Jersey when it comes to seeking the formation of a Citizens' Panel, Assembly or Jury, particularly if these bodies can be led by different departments and teams within the Government of Jersey?

As noted in the letter of 12 May, the creation of a citizens' body is a political act that: *may occur as the result of a decision by ministerial body, such as a political oversight group of Council of Ministers; as a Ministerial Decision by an individual Minister; or as a decision of the States Assembly. There may be other appropriate ways to constitute a citizens' body, depending on its scope, remit and intended influence. Each citizens' process will have its own purpose and terms of reference, which will be established under appropriate political governance and made available to participants, States Members, and other interested parties. These steps, together with the ministerial and official codes of conducts, ensure that each body is appropriately and transparently constituted.*

b. Will the ongoing evaluation of the Citizens' Assembly and Citizens' Jury include consideration of formalising the ways that triggers used to establish Citizens' Panels/Assemblies/Juries, to ensure that there is consistency across the Government of Jersey, particularly if future Panels/Assemblies/Juries are to be led by different departments or teams within the Government of Jersey?

This question is not in scope of the planned evaluation, the first phase of which has considered the processes around delivering the jury and the assembly, and the second phase of which is expected to consider the impact the deliberative processes had on policy outcomes.

Given that establishing a deliberative process is a political act, it is not considered appropriate to 'formalise triggers' that might impinge on the ability of elected politicians to make such a decision.

c. Have you considered developing an internal code of practice for the establishment of future Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries?

A process of sharing practice between different deliberative processes is facilitated by the Government's Policy Community of Practice. An example of this is the recent evaluation of the climate change and assisted dying processes, which will with policy officers across government.

4. In your letter dated 6th September, you advised that an evaluation of the Citizen's Assembly on Climate Change and the Citizen's Panel on Assisted Dying will be undertaken. The first part of the evaluation (relating to costs and logistics, structure and process and the experiences of those involved) was expected to be completed by the end of 2021. The PAC wish to request a copy of the evaluation, and any related papers, once completed.

A copy of the evaluation report was provided to the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel on 10 January and a copy is provided to the Committee alongside this letter. A note on the costs associated with the Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change is also provided.

5. Do you intend to introduce new, specific categories within the Government of Jersey recommendations tracker to include and monitor recommendations made by Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries?

The Government of Jersey Tracker is intended to capture recommendations made as part of statutory processes.

As non-statutory policy development exercises, it not intended, at this point, to track the recommendations of deliberative bodies. The priority and focus of the Tracker over the next 12 months are to continue to improve and embed governance arrangements around the implementation of recommendations currently captured; and further enhance the Tracker updating processes and functionality.

6. Noting the published minutes of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel, are all meetings of Citizens' Panels, Juries and Assemblies minuted? If so, are there any plans to publish these on Government of Jersey website, even in redacted form?

It is good practice to publish minutes of the meetings of deliberative bodies. Publication would follow the usual practice in relation to the content and minutes and the timing of their release relative to policy development

The minutes of the Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change plenary sessions are published on www.climateconversation.je under each block - e.g. [Block-1-Citizens-Assembly-on-Climate-Change-Minutes.pdf](http://www.climateconversation.je/Block-1-Citizens-Assembly-on-Climate-Change-Minutes.pdf) ([climateconversation.je](http://www.climateconversation.je))

Given the sensitive and personal nature of the discussion in the assisted dying citizens' jury, the sessions were not minuted. However, notes of the jury discussions for the final two sessions (9 & 10), where participants discussed their views before and after voting on their recommendations are published in the [final Jury report](#) – see section 3 of the report *Recommendations from the Jury*, plus appendices C, E and H.

7. We note that a Citizens' Panel was previously used for developing a Mental Health Strategy in 2015. We understand that, during the development of the strategy, a citizens' panel made up of different people from across the island, chosen at random, worked together to identify key features that should be considered when planning improvements to mental health services. The recommendations from the citizens panel were used to decide the priorities identified in the Mental Health Strategy. Was this the first citizens' panel to be established in Jersey?

The Citizen Panel insights which informed the Mental Health Strategy (2016-2020) pre-dates many of the previous examples described to PAC. Whilst it may have been an early example of this type of approach in Jersey, similar methods have been used in policy and practice in other jurisdictions for some time.

a. What lessons were learned from this Panel, and how was this learning used to develop subsequent deliberative democratic approaches, including the following Citizens' Panels, Assembly, and Jury?

The contribution of the panel to the final Mental Health Strategy (2016-2020) showed how deliberative methods can be used to progress policy and strategy locally, in ways that are reflected in the design of subsequent deliberative exercises, including in areas such as (i) inclusive application process to join the Panel which enabled a diverse group of people to be brought together and share different insights and experiences (ii) participant payments (iii) Expert facilitation (iv) Consensus driven recommendations (v) Final Report.

Taken alongside other elements of the review work at the time (which included Action Learning Sets, Literature Review, Engagements Days) the golden thread from Citizen Panel recommendations into the final Mental Health Strategy is apparent and evidenced in the published Strategy.

<https://www.gov.je/Government/Pages/StatesReports.aspx?ReportID=1710>

b. Please could you provide information on the costings, membership, and evaluation reports resulting from this Panel.

The costs for the Citizen Panel were incorporated as part of the larger fee of the Mental Health Service Review which was contracted (competitive process run through open procurement) and delivered by a commissioned provider. Allocated costs were approximately £9,000 made up of 12 days of planning and facilitation and £3,000 non-staff costs which included participant expenses, voucher system for attendance, room hire, materials and refreshments. An extract of from the contract procuring the delivery of the Mental Health Service Review (including the Citizen Panel) is embedded immediately below. Specific costs highlighted in yellow.



Extract from MHSR
Contract 2015.pdf

The approach to recruitment and panel membership are described in the Citizen Panels Final Report which is available via the link below.

<https://www.gov.je/SiteCollectionDocuments/Health%20and%20wellbeing/R%20Mental%20Health%20Strategy%20Summary%2020151105%20LJ.pdf>

Our Hospital Citizens' Panel

8. The Committee would like clarity regarding the Senior Officers with direct responsibility of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel? for:

- Formation;
- Operation; and

- Oversight

The lead officer for the formation and operation of the Panel was the former Director of Communications (Stephen Hardwick).

The Our Hospital Senior Officer Steering Group provided oversight of the Citizens' Panel.

9. Why was Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance not asked to create, facilitate and oversee the Panel?

The Our Hospital (OH) Citizens' Panel was part of the site selection process as part of the Our Hospital project. Officers from SPPP were not members of the OH project team, and the Panel was not convened as a policy development exercise.

The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel had a distinct remit to identify and develop the criteria which could be used for site selection, and hence was quite different to the deliberative processes that were led from Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance (SPPP). Equally, as a programme (rather than a policy) requirement, the OH Citizens' Panel process was required to conduct its business to a timescale consistent with agreed programme milestones.

All areas of government have a responsibility to engage the public in a proportionate and appropriate way in the development of decisions. It isn't the case that, because such an engagement might take the form of a citizen-led deliberative process, it should come under any particular department.

10. What were the specific roles and responsibilities of the Our Hospital Project Team in respect of the formation, operation and oversight of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel?

In addition to the SRO and oversight roles described above, the OH Project Team provided general administrative support to the Panel once it had been formed. This included the development of papers to support the Panel's discussions, and development of the draft site selection questionnaire (which was subject to review and agreement by the Panel itself).

In addition, the published Terms of Reference note that the Citizens' Panel was ultimately accountable to the OH Project Team, and that minutes and actions from Panel meetings (which were prepared by the independent facilitator) would be shared with the Project Team within five working days.

11. How was Francis Le Gresley selected to oversee the anonymised selection of members of the Citizens' Panel? Please could you also identify:

Francis Le Gresley was approached on the recommendation of the OH Political Oversight Group as a member of the community of impeccable standing and service.

- a. How the position was advertised;
- b. Who led the recruitment process;
- c. Who was involved in the selection process;
- d. How many other candidates were considered;

A full, traditional recruitment process would have been disproportionate given that the role was non-remunerated nature and focused on specific task of very limited scope and duration, and in light of the clear recommendation from the Political Oversight Group.

e. Who else was involved in the anonymised selection process of the panel; and

The Our Hospital Project's Communication and Engagement Lead and a member of People Services assisted Mr Le Gresley in the anonymised selection of members of the Citizens' Panel.

f. What Office support they received?

Unfortunately, this is not known.

g. Please could you also provide, in confidence, the minutes of meetings with Francis Le Gresley on the selection of members, and the minutes of the body used to decide on the selection of Francis Le Gresley.

The Panel selection process was not minuted as it was not a discussion, but involved randomly selecting numbers that were then anonymously compared with demographic characteristics.

While the process was not separately minuted, it was conducted in line with the selection methodology that was agreed in advance and is set out in published report, *Our Hospital Citizens' Panel – Selection methodology*. This included:

- a first anonymous sift, in which the long list of applications was reviewed against published criteria
- a second anonymous sift, in which applicants were selected from the short list in line with published demographic criteria in order to produce representative Panel membership.

12. What was the recruitment process used for the procurement of an External Facilitator for the Citizens' Panel?

An invitation for expressions of interest was extended to members of the UK based Association of Facilitators whose website can be found [here](#). Of the facilitators who expressed an interest the candidate with the most health-related experience was appointed.

a. How many applications did you receive?

Three external facilitators expressed an interest in becoming involved in the project.

b. Who was responsible for selecting the successful application? Who was involved in the selection process?

Project Director (Richard Bannister); Communications and Engagement Lead (Carl Walker); and Director of Local Services (Sean McGonigle).

c. What was the cost of the selection process?

There were no costs incurred in the selection process.

d. Please could you provide a copy of the advertisement used to advertise this position and copies of any other documentation used in the recruitment of this facilitator?

An approach was made to the Association of Facilitators, who made its members aware of the opportunity to facilitate the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel work in Jersey.

e. What Terms of Reference and Service Level Agreements were provided between the Government of Jersey and the External Facilitator?

These were established in numerous telephone conversations and online meetings with the facilitator before a programme for the Citizens' Panel sessions was jointly formed.

f. Why was it decided that an External Facilitator would be necessary in assisting with the operation of this Panel?

It was essential that the work of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel could be undertaken without any risk of influence, perceived or otherwise.

13. Who was responsible for establishing the criteria for site shortlisting, as used by the Citizens' Panel? What role did the External Facilitator have in delivering this?

Draft site selection questions were prepared by the OH Project Team. In preparing these questions it was noted that:

These questions are to be considered by the Citizens' Panel and may change subject to their comments and input. The facilitation of the Panel will encourage discussion to ensure that the Panel understand the relevance of the questions in relation to identifying a site and to achieve endorsement by the Panel.

14. Were you successful in meeting the recommended selection criteria for the Panel's membership, as outlined in the Panel's selection methodology, in respect of:

- Gender;
- Age;
- Location (6 members from St. Helier, the rest from other Parishes); and
- Ethnic Background

From the Selection Methodology (page 3):

Age	Population	Percentage of Total Population	Recommended Number of Panel Members
15-24	11,439	12%	2-3
25-44	29,529	30%	6
45-65	27,247	28%	6
65+	14,473	15%	3

The selection process was successful in meeting the criteria for the Panel's membership in full.

a. Please advise where you were not successful in following these criteria. What was the final variance between the recommended selection criteria and the Panel as constituted?

There was no variance from the recommended criteria.

15. In the Director General for Infrastructure, Housing and Environment's letter on the 1st December 2021, it is noted that advice was followed from Scrutiny and Statistics Jersey regarding the use of a randomised selection process. Please could you provide a copy of advice that you received from both stakeholders?

All the advice received was given verbally and referenced existing published data.

Care Inquiry Legacy Citizens' Panel

16. In relation to the Care Inquiry Legacy Citizens' Panel, we note that the original budget for the first phase of the work was total £32,125. It is understood that SPPP determined that the work should be extended beyond the terms of the initial contract with Contact Consulting in respect of further delivery and timescales. This led to the contract being extended 3 times into a second and then third and final phases with the core cost identified as £153,350 (to October 2021).

- a. Who authorised additional expenditure for the second, third and final phase of the work?

Second Phase (2018-2019): Tom Walker, Director General, SPPP

Third Phase (2020): States Assembly – via Government Plan

Final Phase (2021): Tom Walker, Director General, SPPP

- b. Please provide a description of the process followed when each additional phase of work was approved, including minutes of meetings where this was considered and decided.

Second Phase (2018-2019)

Following presentation of the recommendations made by the Citizens Panel to the Council of Ministers on 4 July 2018, Officers were asked to scope the means of implementing the recommended four-part legacy project. In developing proposals for Ministers to consider, it was considered appropriate to test these with the Citizens Panel and to involve them in the process of implementation to ensure that there was a strong survivor voice in delivering the Legacy. The Panel was therefore reconvened for the period to the end of 2019 using IJCI contingency monies; a new contract was entered into with Contact Consulting, with the appropriate exemption in place (see 17 below).

The extended facilitation of the Legacy Citizens Panel also gave rise to requests from both the Council of Ministers, Scrutiny and the returning IJCI Panel for survivor perspectives on pertinent policy issues and reviews of the implementation of the IJCI recommendations, all of which were supported and complied with.

Third Phase (2020)

During early 2019 it became evident that the Legacy Project would not be achieved within the year and that the ongoing involvement of survivors remained integral. A bid was therefore made for 2020 funding (£60K) through the 2020-2023 Government Plan which was debated and approved at the end of that year. See p.19:

GOVERNMENT PLAN 2020–2023: FURTHER INFORMATION ON ADDITIONAL
REVENUE EXPENDITURE AND CAPITAL AND MAJOR PROJECTS EXPENDITURE

Final Phase (2021)

Due to the disruption resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, Ministerial changes and public opposition to the planned Jersey Care Memorial culminating in a demonstration held at the Weighbridge, the planned programme of work for the Citizens Panel in 2020 could not be completed. Following the decision to pause the Jersey Care Memorial project in late 2020, additional time was needed to engage with a wider group of survivors to understand whether a consensus could be reached regarding how Jersey should remember past abuse. Progress on other elements of the Legacy Project, in particular recommendation 3, had also been slowed by the need to focus on the memorial and the challenges imposed by Coronavirus restrictions. These issues were discussed by the Citizens Panel Oversight Group in late 2020 and a decision was taken to extend the contract with Contact Consulting for a final time with a view to drawing the process to a close by the end of 2021.

- c. Did the Minister for Treasury and Resources and/or the Treasurer of the States have any involvement?

A number of presentations were made to Council of Ministers regarding the work of the Citizens Panel at which the Minister for Treasury and Resources is likely to have been present. Presentations were also made to CSB which is ordinarily attended by the Treasurer of the States.

The 2020-2023 Government Plan containing the business case to fund the Legacy Citizens Panel's facilitation in 2020 was proposed by the Minister for Treasury and Resources.

- d. When additional funds were required for each additional phase of this work, where did the funds come from? Please indicate where additional funds were secured from, and what costs were absorbed into your department's budget.

First and Second Phases (2018-2019)

Funding for the Citizens Panel was drawn from the allocated contingency funding for the implementation of the Care Inquiry's recommendations. The Citizens Panel was convened in response to IJCI Recommendation 8b.

Third Phase (2020)

Funding in the sum of £60,000 was secured through the Government Plan process. The Business Case can be found on p.19 of: GOVERNMENT PLAN 2020–2023: FURTHER INFORMATION ON ADDITIONAL REVENUE EXPENDITURE AND CAPITAL AND MAJOR PROJECTS EXPENDITURE

Due to the disruption caused by COVID-19 (see section b above) the monies secured via the 2020 Government Plan were not fully spent and were not eligible to be carried forward into 2021.

Final Phase (2021)

In 2021 the Final Phase of the Citizens Panel process in 2021 was funded from the SPPP Departmental budget.

- e. How was each decision tracked and reported to key internal stakeholders, such as the Chief Executive, Treasurer of the States, and Council of Ministers? What oversight did they have of the decisions made to extend the Panel's operations and access additional funds?

In 2018, the decision to reconvene the Citizens Panel for the 'Second Phase' of work was shared with the Corporate Strategy Board (CSB) in September 2018 and the Council of Ministers in November 2018 (minutes embedded below). This enabled Officers to share details of planned implementation which had been tested with the reconvened Citizens Panel ahead of work progressing in 2019.



Min Council of
Ministers minutes 20'

Agreement to proceed with the Third Phase of the Panel was escalated through the Government Plan process, with appropriate Departmental and Ministerial (MCH and COM) approvals secured.

Funding for the 'Final Phase' of the Panel was approved by the Accountable Officer for SPPP as Departmental funds were applied to this work. Following the resignation of Senator Mézec, both incoming Ministers for Children (Deputy Maçon in late 2020 and subsequently Deputy Wickenden in early 2021) were briefed regarding the work of the Citizens Panel as part of their introduction to the Children's portfolio.

17. In relation to the tendering process, were all phases submitted for tender? If not, please explain why.

The Invitation to Tender (attached beneath) for the Design and Delivery of a Citizens Panel was launched on the CI Tender Portal in accordance with Financial Directions in December 2017 with the reference CP17/12/558.



2017-12-18 CCA
Citizens panel FINAL.c

The second and subsequent phases of the Citizens Panel process were not submitted for tender as exemptions (attached beneath) were agreed to renew the contract with Contact Consulting. Most Citizens Panel members were Survivors of historic abuse in the Island's Care System or had other close connections to the Care System. Panel Members had formed trusting relationships with Contact Consulting's independent facilitators during the initial phase of work in 2018. Due to

the sensitive nature of the issues under consideration it would not have been possible or appropriate to reconvene the Panel in late 2018 using an alternative provider. The continuity of support provided to Panel Members during and between meetings by the Panel Facilitators Peter Bryant and Claire Mason was integral to the Citizens Panel process.



20181030 Exemption Form - Contact Consu



BE-250457210 -

Citizens Panel Phase 2



BE-284053683 -

Extension to CS20091

Citizen's Assembly on Climate Change

18. In relation to the Jersey's Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change, we note that the original core costs were £86,086 (+£30,900 honoraria) totalling £116,986. In your letter dated 12th May, you explained the difference between the core costs and the overall costs (a total of £389,008).

In an email from Louise Magris, the Director of Environmental Policy, dated 20th April 2021, it was outlined that the independent design and facilitation was £172,320, compared to the original £86,086.

Please explain why there is such a significant difference between the core costs and the overall costs, including the final cost of the independent design and facilitation, and how it was determined what would be classified as a core cost.

The independent design and facilitation line is not equivalent to the core costs of the citizens' assembly on climate change. An explanation, which reconciles both budget descriptions, is provided in the evaluation report and the accompanying note on budget.

a. Who authorised additional expenditure? Please can you provide a description of the process followed as the costs rose during a short period of time. Please provide Minutes of the decision-making process to evidence your answer.

In line with the SPPP scheme of delegation, additional expenditure was approved on behalf of Tom Walker (Director General, SPPP and Accountable Officer) by Steve Skelton (Director of Strategy and Innovation, SPPP), having consulted with the Minister for the Environment.

b. Please advise what, if any, involvement the Minister for Treasury and Resources and/or the Treasurer of the States have?

The Minister for Treasury and Resources and the Treasurer of the States were not involved as sufficient funding was available within the same head of expenditure.

c. Where additional funds were required for each additional phase of this work, where did they come from? Please indicate how and when they were secured, including what costs were absorbed into which individual departmental budget(s).

All costs were met from the Climate Emergency Fund, except £7,536 (the cost of printing the invitations) which was met from the Strategy and Innovation budget in SPPP.

d. How was each decision tracked and reported to key internal stakeholders, such as the Chief Executive, Treasurer of the States, and Council of Ministers? What oversight did they have of the decisions made to extend the Assembly's operations and access additional funds?

No decision was taken to extend the Assembly's operations. The reasons for the additional expenditure are explained in the accompanying note on costs.

e. Please provide a breakdown of the costs of each meeting held by the Citizens' Assembly.

It is not possible to break down the costs in this manner as delivery costs and consultant / expert support were provided for the overall delivery rather than each session individually.

f. Please could you provide details of the individual payments provided to the expert advisers and the individual payments provided to each member of the Citizens' Assembly?

This is provided in the note on costs shared alongside this response.

i. Please could you also explain why the original estimate for the payments to the Citizens' Assembly's participants and expert advisers increased from the budgeted £30,900 to £79,561?

This is provided in the note on costs shared alongside this response.

g. When tender process took place, when contract was signed, what was total contract agreement

The procurement process opened on 25 October 2019 and closed on 18 November 2019. The tender evaluation process concluded on 10 December 2019.

The contract was signed with Orbell & Company (trading as New Citizenship Project) on 20.2.2020. The contract reference is CS20/02/020 with the total contract value of £249,938 (which includes the core costs for the Assisted Dying Citizen's Jury).

h. Please could you provide a breakdown of the overall fees provided to the New Citizenship Project (including Involve and the Sortition Foundation,) and identify how this reflects the fees originally agreed as part of the tendering process?

New Citizenship Project were initially appointed in June 2019 to support the development of the people-powered approach that is at the heart of the Carbon Neutral Strategy. This work cost £11,400 and ran until October 2019.

Following the procurement process described above (question 18g), the NCP consortium were paid actual amounts as set out in the table below:

NCP consortium contract spend Feb 2020 - end 2021	Cost	Notes:
Participatory democracy as whole	£22,083.67	Contract costs - incurred across all projects after contract was signed in February 2020 prior to lockdown in March 2020 but from CEF budget
Climate project	£172,580.00	
Assisted dying project	£54,916.00	Note that costs did not come out of CEF BU
Total spend within contract (Feb 2020-end 2021)	£249,579.67	Total paid invoices to Orbell / NCP-C from Feb-2020-end 2021

This represents an increase of £580 over the value anticipated at the point the contract was signed (which was £249,000) but is within the maximum contract value (£249,998). It is notable that the contract was signed before the start of the pandemic and the work was significantly re scoped in Autumn 2020 to ensure it could be delivered in a manner compliant with public health guidance, while remaining within the agreed contract value.

i. The PAC notes that a series of Parallel Projects were run in tandem with the Citizens' Assembly. Please could you confirm how these factored into the Citizens' Assembly?

This is provided in the note on costs shared alongside this response.

19. How have you separated spend and corporate understanding between the Citizens' Assembly and the wider Jersey's Climate Conversation project?

This is provided in the note on costs shared alongside this response.

Citizen's Panel on Assisted Dying

20. The Committee would also welcome an update on the second part of the evaluation that will look at how the citizen processes worked with and influenced existing policy making systems.

As noted in the accompanying the evaluation report, it will be possible to start the second part of the joint internal evaluation process will take place in April 2022, once the States Assembly has had the opportunity to consider both policy issues (Assisted dying *and* the Carbon Neutral Roadmap). It may be that the evaluation cannot be concluded until the Assisted Dying policy process is fully complete. The actual timing of this evaluation will depend on priorities and the availability of resources at the time.

21. Now that the Citizen's Panel on Assisted Dying has completed its work, please could you provide a full breakdown of the costs incurred?

See below, taken from figure 3 (p.10) in the accompanying the evaluation report:

Resource	Cost	Detail
Sortition Foundation	£8,191	Recruitment & screening of participants via civic lottery (random stratified selection process)
Involve	£46,725	Design, facilitation, participant support etc.
Printing costs	£1,533	Printing 4,600 invites and envelopes
Postage costs	£2,254	Postage of 4,600 invites
Participant support	£49	Loan of webcam for 1 x participant
Honoraria	£7,200	£300 per participant x 23, plus administrative costs
Total	£65,952	

22. In the spreadsheet provided to the Panel that outlines the details of the three Citizens' groups, you note that the final figure was "£54,916 (or £58,684)", with the additional figure inclusive of printing costs. Please could you confirm that £58,684 is the final, actual cost of the Citizens' Jury, and that all other costs provided to the PAC have been inclusive of printing costs?

As noted in response to 21 above, £54,916 was the final figure paid to New Citizenship Project (divided into £8,191 to Sortition Foundation and £46,725 to Involve). The total of £65,952 (from Figure 3 in the evaluation report includes payment to NCP (Sortition Foundation and Involve) plus printing, postage, and participant support costs, plus honorarium payments.

I hope the above responses provide you with the information you require.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul Martin', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Paul Martin
Interim Chief Executive and Head of the Public Service

D +44 (0)1534 440129

E paul.martin@gov.je

