



States Greffe: Scrutiny

Senator John Le Fondré  
Chief Minister  
By email

21st May 2021

Dear Chief Minister

**Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel**

**Consultants: Reporting on their use by the Government of Jersey**

The Panel writes in relation to the proposition [P.59/2019] and subsequent reports [R.149/2019, R.63/2020 & R13/2021] regarding the use of consultants. The Panel has identified a number of questions which it would like to address as follows:

**Table 1: Consultancy Services Provided by a Supplier – General Questions**

1. In R.149/2020 various specified suppliers had an expected end date to be included in R.13/2021. However there appears to be minimal crossover for some of the suppliers into these reports. Could you clarify what has happened to these suppliers?
2. As highlighted in our previous letter on this subject, the Proposition (P.59/2019) requested that the final total cost of the engagement be specified. Would you be able to provide information in the spreadsheet to highlight those contracts which were completed in 2020?
3. As opposed to R.149/2020, there is no split in R.13/2021 between Agency Nurses and Social Agency Nurses. Why was this change made and have there been any changes to the recruitment policy for agency nursing staff?
4. We note that the Director General for CYPES is still listed as a consultant. Is work underway to transfer this position to a permanent contract?

**Table 1: Consultancy Services Provided by a Supplier – Departmental Totals**

5. Consultant costs within Infrastructure, Housing and Environment appear to have increased significantly despite a staff increase of only 1. Could you please explain why this is the case?
6. There is an increase of 31 consultancy staff across the Government of Jersey between R.13/2021 and R.149/2020, with a decrease in costs of £1,452,656. Could you please outline which contracts contributed to such a significant reduction in costs?
7. When contracts are transferred from one department to another, is there a change in the responsible Accountable Officer? How is this tracked and reported on?

## Data Review Issues

8. It is unclear when each contract started or whether they carry over from previous contracts. What work is underway to amend this in the report?
9. What consideration has been given towards the use of a key to indicate which services have been procured for reasons relating to COVID-19? Will such a system be available in future reports?
10. We note that several consultancy costs, including for the Revolving Credit Facility, have been redacted for commercial reasons. Would you be able to provide these in confidence to the Panel?
11. Why is the final, total cost of engagement not provided for tendered contracts?
12. You note on page 11 that a “data cleanse” exercise is ongoing for Table 3. Please could you elaborate on what this involves and how it will improve the quality of reporting for future reports?

## Structured Needs Assessment and Post Consultation Analysis

13. R.13/2021 notes that “While there is no common definition of a Structured Needs Assessment (SNA) across the organisation, a significant number of SNAs have been completed”. Why is it the case that there is no common definition of a structured needs assessment? Is one being developed?
  - a. Could you please provide clarity on why some contracts are marked as “n/a” for whether they have been provided with a Structured Needs Assessment, and not given a clear binary of “yes or no”?
14. What are the reasons for various contracts being marked as “n/a” for Post Consultation Analysis? What system is used to determine whether one is needed?
  - a. Are preliminary decisions made when a contract is signed as to whether a Post Consultation Analysis is needed?
15. What work has been undertaken to minimise the number of contracts where certain actions are listed as “n/a” in these reports?
16. The report notes that you have been unable to provide information as to whether consultants were procured through a tender or quotes selection process as requested in the original proposition. Why is this the case? What work are you undertaking to mitigate this?
  - a. Why is each contract not clearly marked as to whether it has been facilitated through a tender or quotes selection process?
  - b. Is the same group responsible for reporting on contracts also responsible for collating the information regarding their procurement? If not, what crossover exists to ensure successful, collaborative working between departments and working groups when reporting on contracts?

## Report Data

17. The reports do not appear to carry any identifying codes or numbers, making it difficult to cross-reference overlapping contracts between each report. Please could you confirm how individual contracts are identified, and what work is being undertaken to codify each consultancy contract?
18. Could you clarify the quality assurance process which the reports underwent prior to release?
19. Could you clarify the retainer category criteria regarding reviews and assessments?
20. In the future is it possible to provide the Panel with the spreadsheets of the data prior to the report being released in order that Scrutiny can review content?

## General

21. Has each contract been passed by the Head of Procurement or an individual designated by the Head of Procurement to oversee these contracts?
  - a. We note that there have been recent recruitment campaigns for procurement-oriented roles within the Government of Jersey. How will these roles affect the contract compilation and reporting process for consultants?
  - b. How much does it currently cost to produce the report on consultants?

The Panel would appreciate a response to these questions by close of business on Friday 28th May 2021.

Yours sincerely

Senator Kristina Moore  
Chair  
Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel