

Chief Minister



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

Senator Kristina Moore  
Chair, Government Plan Review Panel

BY EMAIL

6 December 2021

Dear Chair,

Thank you for your letter of Thursday, 18 November.

**1. In the Joint Ministerial Response to the Panel's review of the Government Plan 2021-2024 it was stated that an agreed Memorandum of Understanding between Scrutiny and the Chief Minister 'supported improvements in co-ordination and co-operation over the process for the Government Plan'. It is the Panel's understanding that you made the decision that no MoU was necessary for the Government Plan 2022 – 2025. Please explain the changed circumstances which make this agreement unnecessary?**

**a. Please detail the support and resource which has been put in place to ensure that Scrutiny's requests for information will be dealt with in a timely manner and within the code of practice for engagement?**

**b. What directions have been provided to Ministers and officers to ensure their availability to standing Panels during the course of their Reviews of the Government Plan?**

**c. What consideration was given to extending the lodging period of the Government Plan 2022 - 2025?**

The Memorandum of Understanding for the 2021 – 2024 Government Plan proved to be a useful document in 2021 to help mitigate a shortened lodging period in light of the pandemic. However, that is not the case this year, as the normal statutory lodging period applies, hence the rationale for an MoU does not seem to apply. In saying that, I expected the 2022 – 2025 Government Plan process to adopt similar principles to last year's MoU this year, including the soonest access to information and keeping panels informed on developments.

In terms of the support and resource in place to ensure that Scrutiny's requests for information are dealt with in a timely manner and within the code of practice for engagement, the Ministerial Office is adequately resourced to process these requests, working with colleagues in the treasury and policy departments, including a central coordinating function around correspondence and information requests, and processing amendments. However,

we rely on operational departments to produce information – and given the wide and extensive questions from panels, we cannot increase resource in every department. We have nevertheless prioritised requests for information, as you would expect.

This desire to be helpful extends to hearings. We worked with your officers before the summer recess to ensure the appropriate hearings were in place so Panels could hit the ground running as soon as the Government Plan was lodged, making clear that hearings are a priority. I accept that some hearings have had to be rescheduled, but I believe that has been both on the part of government and Panels.

As to extending the Government Plan 2022 – 2025 lodging period, I am unsure why this year would require us to depart from the statutory deadline agreed by the Assembly. We did this last year because of the pandemic, and we will do it next year in light of the election, but I do not think that we should move away from the legal lodging period every year. Instead, we will work with you as best as possible to support your work.

**2. Throughout the Government Plan, there are references to a ‘Sustainable Wellbeing Impact Assessment’ as a critical aspect of assessing proposals. It is the Panel’s understanding that the assessments are a response to the requirements outlined in paragraph 9 of the Public Finance Law. Please can you explain:**

Article 9(9) of the Public Finance (Jersey) Law 2019 provides that:

“The Council of Ministers must –

(a) in preparing the government plan, take into account the sustainable well-being (including the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being) of the inhabitants of Jersey over successive generations; and

(b) set out in the government plan how the proposals in the plan take that sustainable well-being into account.”

As set out at page 29 of the Government Plan, we have taken into account sustainable wellbeing by using the structure of our Common Strategic Policy priorities, which allowed us to focus on the contribution of additional funding to the challenges we face, as set out in the Business Cases (see Government Plan 2022-25 Annex), and by recognising and responding to longer-term macro-economic challenges such as climate change and changes in the international economy.

**a. The level of assessment on projects varies quite widely and there does not appear to have been a consistent approach taken to producing them. Please can you explain the direction given to accountable officers on how the assessments are done to ensure that they are meaningful?**

In 2020, during the preparation of the Business Cases for the Government Plan 2021-24, the following guidance was provided to Departments with regard to the Sustainable Wellbeing Impact Assessment:

“Outline the ways in which the proposed change will impact positively or negatively on the sustainable wellbeing of current and future islanders.

- Which wellbeing domains will be impacted and how? (link to the Jersey Performance Framework)
- Which groups will be most affected? (e.g. any particular impact on race, sex, age etc?)
- Over what timeframe are the impacts anticipated?

Wellbeing domains are as follows:

- Community wellbeing – the quality of people’s lives
- Environmental wellbeing – the quality of the natural world around us
- Economic wellbeing – how well the economy is performing”

In 2021, during the preparation of the Business Cases for the Government Plan 2022-25, additional guidance was provided to Departments with regard to the Sustainable Wellbeing Impact Assessment:

**“Measuring Sustainable Wellbeing of the Business Justification Case (BJC).**

This section is essential in demonstrating compliance with Article 9(9) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019 which requires that the Council of Ministers must: in preparing the government plan, take into account the sustainable well-being (including the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being) of the inhabitants of Jersey over successive generations; and set out in the government plan how the proposals in the plan take that sustainable well-being into account.

Outline the ways in which the proposed change will impact positively or negatively on the sustainable wellbeing of current and future islanders.

- Which wellbeing domains will be impacted and how? (link to the Jersey Performance Framework)
- Which groups will be most affected? (e.g. any particular impact on race, sex, age etc?)
- Over what timeframe are the impacts anticipated?

Wellbeing domains are as follows:

- Community wellbeing – the quality of people’s lives
- Environmental wellbeing – the quality of the natural world around us
- Economic wellbeing – how well the economy is performing

When writing this section, please use data to support your consideration of the sustainable wellbeing impact of the business case. For example:

- Which Island Outcomes and Indicators (as set out in the Jersey Performance Framework) is the business case seeking to impact?
- Which Service Performance Measures (found in your 2021 Business Plans) is the business case seeking to impact?
- Which other data relating to sustainable wellbeing or service performance (positive or negative) should be taken into account when considering the sustainable wellbeing impact of the business case?
- What sustainable wellbeing or service performance impact do you expect as a result of the implementation of the business case?
- How will you monitor the sustainable wellbeing or service performance impact?”

As noted by the Director General, Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance at the public hearing of 10 November, the Sustainable Wellbeing Impact Assessments are the first stage in bringing into place a more holistic approach to wellbeing assessments. As he said, we have started that process so that efficiency measures are tested against their impact upon the outcomes and by requiring Business Cases to articulate how they contribute towards the outcomes. However, as he acknowledged, although we have started the process of embedding that sustainable wellbeing perspective into the routine way in which we go about making these proposals on expenditure, there is still more to do. The next steps in this long-term journey are under consideration by Officers.

#### **b. How are they monitored over time?**

As set out at page 29 of the Government Plan 22-25, over time, we are able to assess our sustainable wellbeing by monitoring a wide range of indicators that measure how Jersey is progressing towards the Island Outcomes. The Island Outcomes describe the population-level wellbeing conditions that Islanders would like to see in the future. The full set of metrics and data is available on Jersey’s Performance Framework.

In regard to specific projects and programmes, as set out in the guidance above it is for Departments to consider how to monitor the sustainable wellbeing or service performance impact of the project or programme.

The tracking of benefits is part of robust programme and project management being rolled out through the Corporate Programme Management Office. Part of embedding of the use of

Business Cases across the organisation is the better articulation of benefits to be tracked, both during the programme and after its completion.

**3. On p87 of the Government Plan it states that: 'Over 2020 and 2021 £123 million has been injected into the Government of Jersey across many initiatives and projects, including significant investment in capabilities (technology and people). It has been assumed that these investments should drive increases in productivity including, but not limited to, increasing automation, streamlining processes and improving the quality of data and information provision/compilation.'**

- a. The Panel would therefore like to understand the rate of progress of the Technology Transformation Programme for the investment made and intended over the life of the Government Plan and how its impact on the increases in productivity outlined in this paragraph are being measured.**

The Technology Transformation Programme included six projects in the Government Plan, three began in 2020 and have continued into 2021:

- Integrated Technology Solution
- Cyber Security
- Microsoft Foundations

A fourth initiative, Service Digitisation, began in 2021. All four initiatives will continue into 2022.

A fifth initiative, Electronic Document Management, was due to begin in 2021 but has been deferred until 2022 due to other more urgent demands, such as Test, Track and Trace. The development of the Full Business Case is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Work on developing the business case for CRM will begin in 2022.

New understanding of the breadth of the technology estate means that we will update the strategy from 2019, and intend to do this by end 2021.

The TTP was developed to address the technical debt that gave significant risk to the Government of Jersey. The TTP is targeted at reducing risk to the Government of Jersey by putting in place modern infrastructure and applications to support key citizen and employee services:

- The Cyber programme is in place to reduce our risk in relation to Cyber Attacks. Productivity is hard to measure as we are protecting against infrequent, but high impact events. Attached is an example of the costs recently associated with the Health Service in Ireland: [Cyber Attack: Irish HSE faces final bill of at least €100m](#)
- Microsoft Foundations has been targeted at enabling employees to work from any location which was achieved for many during Covid with the use of Teams.
- ITS is focussed on reduction of risk related to replacing current out-of-support platforms.
- Performance of the other projects will be considered as we develop their plans, in line with the development of modern infrastructure and applications.

**4. Please provide the minutes of the Council of Ministers meeting(s) at which the Future Hospital Review Panel's amendment to P80/2021 – Our Hospital Budget, Financing and Land Assembly was discussed and also any discussion on:**

- a. an amendment to that amendment**
- b. any amendment to the budget envelope for the project.**

Given that the Assembly rejected the Future Hospital Review Panel's amendment and the matter was fully aired in the Assembly, I should be grateful if you could clarify the relevance of this particular query to the review of the Government Plan.

Yours sincerely,



**Senator John Le Fondré**  
**Chief Minister**