

Chief Minister



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

Senator Kristina Moore

Chair, Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel

BY EMAIL

15 April 2021

Dear Chair,

CORPORATE SERVICES SCRUTINY PANEL PUBLIC HEARING – OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

Office Modernisation Project

1. It has been claimed that a delay for scrutiny could cause difficulties with the contractor, why is this, given that the current preferred bidder was only selected last month, after discussions with the original preferred bidder came to an end?

[Further to the P.18/2021 debate, this is no longer an issue.](#)

2. It has been indicated that the costs and risks of the project to the Government of Jersey were negated by the funding mechanism, in that no form of payment is required until 2024. Why, therefore, have the costs of £1 million per month of delay for public scrutiny of the final decision been brandished?

[The funding arrangements means that GoJ will not need to make any payment to the Developer until 2024 - after practical completion. Initially, this will be costs for rental unless GoJ exercises the option to purchase the building on practical completion at an agreed price, in which case costs will be included in future Government Plans. This arrangement protects the Government from the risk of cost increases owing to planning conditions, build cost inflation, material/labour shortages, supply chain disruption and delay, which are transferred to the developer.](#)

[The estimated cost of £1m per month of delay if Scrutiny were to undertake a review are made up of increased team costs due to an elongated programme, increases in rental costs for the building - which are linked to inflation, an anticipation that the developer would seek to negotiate an increase in option price for the building due to a delay, and lost operational savings that will be enabled by the project.](#)

Technology Transformation Programme & Digital Identification

3. The Panel was previously informed the Technology Transformation Programme was progressing well, with only a delay of 3-months over the multi-year programme, is this still the case?

The Technology Transformation Programme in total encompasses ten key initiatives (of which six are explicitly included in the Government Plan) that will enable the GoJ to substantially deliver the outcomes we have identified in our ambition for One Government. These are necessary to address historical under investment in technology, to enable modernisation of the GoJ and reduce operational risk.

Three initiatives were scheduled to begin in 2020:

1. Integrated Technology Solution (“ITS”)
2. Cyber
3. Microsoft Foundations

All three initiatives started as planned in January 2020 however each has been impacted by Covid-19 and has required re-planning. In all cases, the re-planning has enabled the initiatives to continue to progress and maintain key dates.

Two further initiatives are scheduled to begin in 2021:

1. Electronic Document Management System (“EDMS”)
2. Service Digitisation

ITS

The ITS procurement and business readiness activities that were scheduled for 2020 have largely been completed. The Delivery Lead (Keytree), the software (SAP) and the Programme Management Partner (Ernst & Young) have been selected and contracts signed.

The Delivery Phase of the ITS Programme commenced under a Letter of Intent on 27 January 2021 and the Delivery Lead and the initial software contracts were finalised on 08 March 2021. The Programme will take approximately 3 years and remains on track to complete by the end of 2023. That is in line with what was proposed with the Government Plan in 2021 – 2024.

Microsoft Foundations

Microsoft Foundations Programme has continued with the implementation of Microsoft 365 (“M365”) across remaining users, primarily in Health & Community Services (“HCS”) and manual / field-based workers with no access to GoJ provisioned end-user devices.

It is intended M365 rollout will be complete by the end of Q3 2021 in line with remaining upgrades of end user devices to Windows 10 and the rollout of the Clinical Work Environment across HCS. In addition, the programme continues to work to remediate outstanding security recommendations, plus recommendations from Microsoft conducted audit. This will be complete by the end of Q2 2021.

Work on the Azure migration project is underway with procurement in progress to select a Delivery Partner to be mobilised in Q2 2021. Scoping is also underway for a Sharepoint migration project to migrate on-premise Sharepoint sites and other unstructured data sources to cloud based Sharepoint. This is all expected to conclude by the end of Q1 2022, approximately 3 months later than originally planned.

Cyber Security Programme

The Cyber Security Programme is currently nearing the end of delivery for the tranche one activities (secure) and is on target to commence tranche two activities (develop) this quarter.

The programme was originally due to finish in June 2022 however this has been extended a further 6 months to December 2022. This extension is required because of resource constraints within the department which may delay delivery of some aspects of the programme into BAU. This reforecast does not add to the cost of the programme nor does it delay the improvements in the security landscape.

EDMS

The Electronic Document Management Solution is currently in the planning phase. Once the tender process is complete for all three lots (digital scanning bureaux, software vendor and business change) the project will commence with a target delivery for the first tranche of document digitisation of December 2023.

Service Digitisation

The first element of service digitisation is the launch of JerseyMe (see below) and this is due to launch during Q2 2021. Scoping for the remaining activities which will be delivered in 2021 and 2022 is underway and expected to be delivered to plan.

4. The Comptroller of Revenue has highlighted that some Islanders are resistant to the Yoti App currently used for Digital Identification in accessing online government services, what is being done to mitigate this? Will any additional cost be funded through existing allocations?

We continually work with Yoti to look at changes to the service based on the feedback that we receive from users. However, in many cases this doesn't overcome the concerns with some users that the

support provision is remote, not on island, and does not accommodate those users that don't have a smartphone.

To address this, we are developing an alternative digital ID solution (JerseyMe) to sit alongside Yoti. This will be web-based so Islanders can use more devices to set up their digital ID and does not require the user to have a smartphone.

More support channels will be available for users who require it when registering and using the new solution. This will include both an on-Island helpline and face-to-face in partnership with Jersey Post via the Broad Street post office. This is due to be launched during Q2 2021.

This is being delivered as part of the Service Digitisation project of the Technology Transformation Programme (TTP), which holds the funding provision.

This approach will provide islanders with choice of Digital ID provider with a differentiated offering and ensures that GoJ has contingency built into its digital services.

5. What would be the costs and implications of a “do minimal” strategy in the Integrated Technology Solutions programme, or if it were spread over a longer time frame to ease the cost implications on the public purse?

The minimum option is to replace or enhance a number of systems, most notably the JD Edwards system supporting financial, procure-to-pay activities, and inventory management in order to remain compliant and secure. This would be a substantial undertaking but would not fully resolve the issues around risk to continuity of services, lack of integration and would not enable the core programme outputs.

The OBC provided indicative costs for a do minimum option of £34m. As this option would not deliver any benefits, nor fully remove the associated GoJ risks and would constrain future flexibility, it was not taken to market and further detailed costs were not collated. The understanding of costs and benefits associated with the programme has evolved significantly since the Outline Business Case and it would be expected that GoJ resource costs would increase by circa £6m due to the work involved in re-platforming JD Edwards and integrating with existing systems. As such, an estimated do minimum cost would be £40m.

The Programme Plan has been developed in collaboration between GoJ and the Delivery Partner. It is based upon an agreed programme timetable and sequential contractual commitments entered into on a Release-by-Release basis. Should the delivery schedule be extended both GoJ and supplier resource costs are likely to increase, thereby increasing total programme costs. The panel will be aware that within the business case (Section 4.10) a sensitivity analysis was undertaken and that a 12 month overrun would add c.£15.4m to the costs. Obviously, this is based on an unplanned extension to timing and a planned extension would cost less but this does provide an indication of the level of additional costs likely to be incurred if the programme was delivered over an extended timeframe.

6. Has a second opinion been sought with regards the latest assumptions of the cost of this programme?

Credera (formerly known as The DMW Group) supported us with the development of the Full Business Case. They used their experience from similar programmes to inform the assumptions and scenarios used.

During the procurement process we also engaged with a number of other organisations (seven in total) recommended by the last two bidders who implemented similar programmes. We have taken into account their lessons learned, budgets and timelines to inform our assumptions.

The procurement process was based on an extensive dialogue process with the last two bidders. During the dialogue the bidders not only provided refined costs for their services, but they also provided detailed estimates of the resources required by GoJ to complete the programme, and risks that may materialise, which informed the costs and contingency provisions.

A senior Gartner representative has also been a member of the ITS Programme Steering Board throughout the procurement process.

7. What benefit will the average Islander see from the Integrated Technology Solutions programme?

The ITS Programme will deliver significant changes in the way that the Government manages Finance, Human Resources, Assets, Inventory and its Commercial activity. The ITS Programme outputs will enable transformation across multiple areas including greater use of mobile working and self-service by employees, islanders, and businesses. As a result of the transformation, benefits to islanders are:

- Enabling transactions with the GoJ in a simple and convenient way.
- Providing information once, in an electronic format, that allows monies to be paid/received and queries answered efficiently and effectively.
- Improved mechanisms for suppliers to the government to engage with greater consistency and less errors. The new solution will enable suppliers to submit invoices and receive payments electronically.
- Better Government asset performance and reliability enabled by improved data and information relating to critical Island infrastructure (such as pumping stations), what equipment they comprise of, their service history and maintenance schedules, and when they need to be replaced. This will enable a better-informed investment strategy and more effective use of Capital funds. It should also reduce breakdowns and disruptive maintenance.
- Improved Inventory Management capabilities that will enable better planning and mitigate risks including stock shortages of essential items such as supplies for key workers, or expiration of inventory stock. For example, this should reduce the risk that medical procedures have to be postponed or cancelled because the necessary supplies are not available.

Additionally, Service providers are contracted to deliver Social Value to the island alongside their core service commitments. The Delivery Lead, working with their consortium members including

WARM (a Jersey based tech MSME firm) have a range of initiatives that form part of their contract with the Government of Jersey. Further key Social Value initiatives include:

- Learn2Code courses run in conjunction with Digital Jersey and Skills Jersey.
- SAP Education learning platform to introduce Highlands Students to the SAP technology.
- Mentoring and business advice for local businesses and community organisations.
- A food distribution platform that brings business and charities together to provide food to Islanders in need.
- Carbon offset fund to support environmental initiatives.

8. Once funding necessities of the Integrated Technology Solutions programme were approved by departmental Accountable Officers, how were they reviewed and checked by the Principal Accountable Officer to ensure funds were used economically, efficiently and effectively to ensure alignment to the requirements of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019?

The Principal Accountable Officer and Treasurer have reviewed the costs of the Integrated Technology Solution Programme as part of their review and appraisal of the Full Business Case. The costs as included in the Full Business Case reflect the outcome of ongoing programme development, procurement, and contract negotiations. A review of the Full Business case was undertaken by Strategic Finance (Part of Treasury and Exchequer) and this review was provide to the Principal Accountable Officer and Treasurer in addition to receiving the Full Business Case.

The Full Business Case assesses value for money based upon a consideration of many factors including programme costs, benefits and its ability to deliver against programme objectives.

The Full Business Case is a key requirement of the Public Finances Manual and Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019 and was completed in line with the Treasury Green Book recommendations.

States Employment Board

9. 53% of staff who completed the 2020 Be Heard survey felt they were 'emotionally connected' to the organisation, is this an acceptable figure?

This overall engagement figure is in line with other organisations completing the Best Companies Be Heard employee survey for the first time and is an increase on similar metrics in previous surveys which recorded engagement of approximately 50% (see c) below).

The engagement figure is based on how employees have responded across a number of factors and is what they consider to be true based on their experiences at the point in time that they completed the survey.

It is important that we accept the figure as feedback from a point in time, and that we now actively work with colleagues to seek to understand the details and experiences behind the responses so that we can work together and make improvements where possible.

In addition to the overall 3 percentage point difference in engagement rates and 6% increase it is important to note that there have been particularly positive results in terms of the level of commitment from our employees and that they feel they are able to make valuable contributions in their work. The results show positive views of the government; that employees are increasingly proud to work here and that there is a strong sense of team working, support and care.

- a. There was only a 3% rise in staff who were “engaged” over a two-year period, this would indicate a 10-year period until two thirds of employees were engaged, is this an acceptable time frame, if not what will be done to reduce it?

Whilst it is difficult to directly compare the surveys, it should be noted that there was an overall 3 percentage point difference in engagement rates, notionally representing a 6% increase in engagement compared to 2018's survey. Increases in employee engagement scores do not typically follow a linear, time-bound and set percentage increase pattern. Changes in engagement levels, both up and down, are as a result of the different experiences that employees have across a number of factors over a period of time. These are the 8 engagement factors used in the Be Heard survey, and the correlated results provided across all of these factors at department and directorate level provide insight on where best to focus improvement efforts so that will have the biggest impact on increasing engagement, which will be reflected in improved scores in future surveys.

Departments have cascaded results and are in the process of scheduling workshops to explore their respective results with employees with a view to co-creating action plans for making improvements. Quarterly reporting to the ELT will advise on common themes, best practices and progress being made. Experience from organisations showing high engagement scores is that successful engagement strategies, deployed with care, lead to accelerating improvement and this is our intention.

- b. Are you worried by the 10% of respondents that stated they would leave the organisation if they had another job opportunity?

The percentage number of respondents who have indicated that they would leave the organisation is higher than ideal and is indicative of the strength of feeling that people have expressed.

It is important that we understand more about why people feel this way. For example, we know that some employees are frustrated about the lack of career progression opportunities available. This can be acute where they work in small teams delivering particularly specialist work, and where that specialist work is being available in other organisations in the island. We need to explore what more we can do to engage with those respondents and enable them to have greater satisfaction in their roles, within the inherent constraints. This could include considering lateral moves and or career changes as part of a future talent development programmes. Equally, improving performance management should positively influence this score.

- c. What were the largest areas of improvement since the 2018 survey?

Whilst it is not possible to directly compare with the survey of 2018 (as that was provided by a different supplier and the methodology and statement / questions are not exactly the same) the 3 percentage point increase in overall engagement to 53% is a positive given that the organisation is part way through a transformation and was just emerging from the first wave of the Covid 19 pandemic.

Areas where there was clear positive strength of feeling for scores relate to:

- 86% feel they can make a valuable contribution to the organisations (no comparative data),
- 73% have a positive view about their team (+6%),
- 60% are proud to work in the public service (+2%),
- My Company (Score 5.04 / 7.0) – how people feel about working for the organisation and their affiliation to it,
- My Manager (Score 4.45 / 7.0) – how people feel they are supported and managed,
- Personal Growth (Score 4.45 / 7.0) – how people feel about their role including interest in the work they do, development and their skills,
- My Team (Score 4.84 / 7.0) – how people feel about the support they receive and given in the team environment.

d. Were there any results that cause concern?

Yes, and these are key themes that will be the priority focus for organisation-wide attention:

- The numbers of employees who would leave the organisation if they had another job,
- Leadership scores across all questions are below the expectations,
- Wellbeing scores demonstrate the impact of the COVID19 response and large organisational change programmes.

SEB have commissioned work to identify ways to improve areas where we are weak, and to continue building on areas where we are strong.

10. In your letter to the Panel of the 9th February 2021 you indicate that the States Employment board aims to ensure there is equal pay for work of equal value but also highlight the boards mindfulness for the lower receipts into Government. Can you please elaborate on this?

a. Are pay freezes for the Public sector being considered?

The pay review of salaries is currently underway, covering the whole of government.

The States Employment Board is concerned about increasing costs at a time when government receipts are under pressure, and alongside previously unforeseen expenditure to support the protection of public health alongside measures to support the economy as a result of the Pandemic.

Nevertheless, SEB determined at their December 2020 meeting that this is not a time for total pay restraint and instructed officers to open pay negotiations with all unions on the basis that cost of living would be protected.

The review is not concluded but most unions have accepted a 0.9% consolidated increase from 1 January 2021.

b. Is the commitment of frontline employees, including nurses and frontline care givers, during COVID-19 being considered in the pay reviews.

Over the past 10 years pay agreements in respect of nurses and midwives have been the highest of any pay group.

The 2020 settlement with nurses' and midwives' unions included an additional 1.97% above the base settlement of 4% to achieve equal pay for work of equal value compared to civil servants including those civil servants who work in healthcare settings.

SEB recognise and appreciate the significant efforts made by public servants across government from nurses and midwives to police, manual workers, the new track and trace teams, and those in a range of other functions who have kept services to islanders going.

SEB's pay offer for 2021, protecting standards of living even during a time of job uncertainty and economic strain in many other sectors, is tangible proof of SEB's commitment to all government employees.

11. An Employment and Discrimination Tribunal has recently declared that the States Employment Board failed to follow procedures relating to suspension and exclusion of a member of staff. Why were reviews of the situation delayed in the view of the Board?

a. What actions were taken to resolve the issue by the Board?

The argument before the Tribunal was to determine whether the Tribunal had the jurisdiction to hear the dispute. The Chairman concluded that the Tribunal did have such jurisdiction and then determined the matter based on the facts before him at that hearing, without the need for a further substantive hearing where fuller arguments and witness evidence could have been put.

The decision was not appealed because it was not considered to be a good use of public funds in all the circumstances of this particular case.

All matters pertaining to this case, including the exclusion process were overseen by an Interim HR Director who no longer works for the organisation. Unfortunately, despite best efforts, the procedural defects that had occurred in the initial 6 months made it exceptionally difficult to put the case back into process.

That said, in the later handling of the case, there have been two 4-week reviews held and a further 6-month review was held on 3rd March 2021, to consider the grounds of exclusion. A decision was made to lift the exclusion and return the practitioner to restricted non-clinical work. All recent decisions have been communicated to the employee in line with the policy and in a timely manner.

b. Are there other ongoing cases involving these procedures?

Yes, there is one.

c. What actions are the board taking to ensure that failure to follow these procedures does not happen again?

The Government of Jersey has a policy in place for the management of conduct and performance issues within the regulated group of medical professions. This is called the Policy for the Handling of Concerns and Disciplinary Procedures relating to the Conduct and Performance of Doctors and Dentists. It has been agreed with the representatives of all doctors across Government of Jersey and lays out the duties and timelines to be followed.

A toolkit is in development which will outline the responsibilities of the Case Manager and Case Investigator (which are the two main roles in ensuring the process proceeds in accordance with the policy).

This toolkit will also include flow charts to highlight the steps to be taken in an exclusion process, which was the issue that caused problems with this case, alongside template letters, this will be supplemented by training for Case Managers when dealing with exclusion / restriction of practice.

In addition, all cases are reviewed on a regular basis by senior management within HCS and PCS to ensure adherence to policy. We are in the process of reviewing all our policies in relation to disciplinary and suspension to ensure we are adhering to best practice. Training sessions are also being developed for all line managers on these matters.

- d. How much has been spent on tribunals over the last three years by the States Employment Board?

Eleven cases have been submitted to the Jersey Employment and Discrimination Tribunal against the States Employment Board in the last three years. No awards have been made against the States Employment Board.

Costs associated with supporting and progressing tribunal cases are not identified separately. We use internal resources, including legal advice from the Law Officers Department to support Tribunal cases, which are a part of business as usual activities for a large complex organisation

12. What objectives will be set for the Interim Chief Executive Officer?

The key priorities have been outlined in the interim Chief Executive Officer Job Description; a copy is attached. The interim Chief Executive Officer will be publishing his objectives shortly.

- a. How will the interim look to improve results of the “be Heard Survey”?

The interim Chief Executive Officer will lead and direct the Director Generals and Office of the Chief Executive to ensure action plans specific to departmental responses are put in place and delivered across the Government of Jersey to develop and improve the organisation.

- b. Will he be tasked with reconsidering the effectiveness of One Gov, particularly in light of the staff feedback of the Be Heard survey?

This position with respect to One-Gov is that he is expected to maintain the current direction of travel, whilst identifying opportunities for improvement. The interim Chief Executive Officer will be required to prepare the organisation for the arrival of a new chief executive once appointed.

- c. Has a timeline for recruitment for the substantive post been proposed?

Yes, a timeline is in place, the proposed timeline has been agreed by the panel and the process is designed for the appointment to start by the end of Q1 2022.

- d. Why was an additional 3-month contract required for the exiting CEO?

The exiting Chief Executive Officer’s contract ended in December 2020. In light of the interim Chief Executive Officer starting in March 2021, the Government of Jersey required an accountable officer to be in place, therefore, the existing Chief Executive Officer was asked to take up a temporary 3-month contract to cover the role and to provide a handover period between the exiting Chief Executive Officer and the interim Chief Executive Officer.

Consultants

13. How could the information supplied in the consultant report be improved?

As noted in the letter from the Chief Minister 14 September 2020;

"The Government of Jersey's accounting and procurement systems do not hold much of the information required by P59/2019 in the format requested. As such, producing the report requires data to be extracted in varying formats from a few systems together with manual collation and manipulation. This process is both time consuming (estimated officer hours to produce the recently published report were in excess of 300 hours) and prone to error, although every effort is made to establish the accuracy of the information and a rigorous quality assurance process is in place."

Members of the team have previously met with the panel to explain the challenges in reporting and at the suggestion of the panel recently met with Deputy Morel, who filed the original proposition, to discuss any improvements and explained the process in detail and no additional requirements have been raised by the Deputy.

14. When will any improvements to the consultant report be implemented?

Until the Integrated Technology Solution is implemented (2023), we will not be able to make any significant improvement in this reporting.

In the interim, we will continue to:

- hone the process of data extraction from the accounting system,
- take time to reflect on each report identifying any improvements we could make,
- document findings and the data collected.

However, as the vast majority of the report is manual, we cannot make any material improvements before ITS is implemented.

15. Does the consultant report highlight any areas of concern?

The specific cause for concern would be around the number of interim appointments in place. Interims largely fall into two categories, those brought in to fill permanent roles because of difficulties/delays in recruiting permanent employees and those brought in to undertake temporary time limited roles, often in project teams. Covid-19 has had a significant impact on the former e.g. Treasury and Exchequer needed interim resources to support the department whilst they experienced challenges recruiting to permanent roles and this is not sustainable in the long term.

There have been a significant number of specific projects requiring additional specialist and technical expertise, which have caused consultancy costs to increase, such as Our Hospital, Integrated Technology Solution, Efficiencies and Covid response, which is less of a concern as the Government is unlikely to require these specific skills in the long term.

a. Is the reliance on consultants, as highlighted in the increase of spend during 2020, cause concern?

No, there will always be a place for interim appointments and the use of in any organisation. In 2020, the Government of Jersey were consistent in their requirement for specialist interim resource which fell into the following three categories:

- To provide short-term cover to fill vacancies or sudden capacity gaps, where speed of appointment is important to avoid the failure of services or care, for instance in teaching, nursing, and social care.
- To fill longer-term capacity gaps, where permanent recruitment will take time and the need to fill a role is urgent, but it is likely to take months to make permanent recruitments. This can again involve teachers, nurses, and social workers, but also some more senior roles.
- To fill capability gaps, where skills are needed that the organisation does not currently have. This could be for a time-limited project, and/or where the project's aim is to build sustainable internal skills and it needs support to do this.

The Government of Jersey mitigates the risk of reliance for categories 1 and 2 by ensuring that an appropriate recruitment process is in place for the recruitment of the permanent role and that this process is completed in a timely manner wherever possible. The requirement for interims in category 3 is time limited without the need to appoint to on a permanent basis.

The recently developed and approved People Strategy enables us to develop our existing colleagues and to reduce the need for off island specialist resource, this will be done by developing and introducing the following:

- Workforce plans
- Succession plans
- On-island recruitment campaigns
- Secondments both across Government and from outside Government

Statistics Jersey

16. What actions are being taken to ensure the continued independence of Statistics Jersey?

a. How will the Chief Statistician remain independent to the Government of Jersey?

The Statistics and Census (Jersey) Law 2018 already contains measures protecting the independence of Statistics Jersey and the Chief Statistician. These include:

Part 2, paragraph 2 (4)

“In exercising any of its functions, Statistics Jersey has the right to act independently.”

Part 2, paragraph 3 includes:

“(1) The Chief Statistician is responsible for –

(d) the statistical methodology and statistical standards used by Statistics Jersey and ensuring that the requirements of Article 11 and the Code are met;

(e) the manner in which data are collected, processed, documented and stored;

(f) the content of statistical releases and publications issued by Statistics Jersey;

(g) the form, timing and methods of dissemination of statistics compiled by Statistics Jersey;

(h) commenting on the quality and interpretation of any statistics produced by public authorities, other undertakings and individuals;”

However, to ensure that the public can continue to have a high level of trust and confidence in official statistics, the Chief Minister announced on 1 February that he has asked Assistant Minister, Deputy Kirsten Morel, to chair a steering group which will develop improvements to Jersey’s statistics legislation. In addition to Deputy Morel the Steering group includes Senator Tracey Vallois; the chair of the Statistics User Group; the interim Chief Statistician; and the Deputy Chief Statistician.

The steering group will review the structure around Statistics Jersey and develop proposed amendments to the Statistics and Census (Jersey) Law 2018, with the aim of lodging them with the States Assembly by the end of the year.

Deputy Morel has said “We want to ensure the public can have a high level of trust and confidence in official statistics, which are vital for policy making as they provide the government, organisations and indeed all islanders, with key data about our community, upon which we base major decisions about our future.”

Deputy Morel and Senator Vallois have said that “we both look forward to helping ensure that Jersey’s statistical system is underpinned by a strong legal and institutional framework, which guarantees professional independence and conforms to international best practice.”

The steering group has met three times and is developing its Terms of Reference, which include a focus on professional independence for Statistics Jersey and the Chief Statistician; the structure and status of Statistics Jersey; and the role of the Statistics Users Group etc. To support transparency and trust, Deputy Morel has committed to publish the finalised Terms of Reference of the steering group.

17. Why is there a necessity to be accountable to the Government of Jersey?

The Jersey Comptroller & Auditor General has said, in her 2017 report on Arm’s Length Organisations (ALOs) has said:

"Jersey is no different from other governments in having a number of ALOs. But the establishment or funding of an ALO does not relieve government from a responsibility for ensuring that good governance is being demonstrated, effective internal control is in place and value for money is being secured. Where funding flows from government to an ALO, the relevant Accounting Officer has a personal responsibility for the application of public funds and, ultimately, the relevant Minister has a political responsibility. It is essential that the organisations funded by the States are not regarded as out of sight and out of mind."

Statistics Jersey is not an Arm's Length Organisation but, as a body funded by government, it is necessary for Statistics Jersey to be accountable to government for its use of public funds.

No decisions have been made by the steering group on the organisational structure and status of Statistics Jersey, but this will be a priority matter considered by the steering group. The steering group will: take account of the UN guidance on modernising statistical legislation; review existing international practice amongst National Statistics Offices; consider options; and propose solutions for legislation that are relevant to the circumstances of Jersey.

An initial review of reporting arrangements for National Statistical Offices (NSOs) in other countries has identified that almost all report to a government minister. For instance Statistics Canada reports to the Minister for Industry; Statistics Norway reports to the Finance Minister; Statistics New Zealand reports to the Statistics Minister - who is also the Minister of Commerce and Consumer Affairs; the Minister for the Digital Economy and Communications; and the Minister for State Owned Enterprises.

However, Statistics Iceland is professionally independent 'under the aegis of the Prime Minister'; Statistics Netherlands is described as an 'Autonomous agency, with the Minister of Economic Affairs responsible for legislation and budget etc. The Portuguese NSO is described as 'Reports to Minister of the Presidency'. The UK appears to be the only country where the National Statistics Office reports to a Statistics Authority, which then reports directly to Parliament.

- a. When is it expected that census information will start to be returned to Statistics Jersey?

Census questionnaires were delivered to households starting on Monday 8 March. The first online response was received that same day.

- b. When can initial data publication be anticipated?

Assuming the same high response rates as in 2011, Statistics Jersey are planning on releasing the first, high level, census results from Q1 2022. There will then be a phased programme to release more detailed statistics.

2020 Underspends

18. How are you as Chief Minister ensuring underspends during 2020 are used effectively?

The end of year report lodged by the Minister for Treasury and Resources moved some of the unspent budgets from 2020 in 2021. Other than capital sums, the majority of those underspend budgets are now held in reserves. In order for any allocations to be made from reserves to fund expenditure, in accordance with the Treasury Minister's reserves policy, a Business Case will be required and recommendations made to the Treasury Minister prior to any Ministerial Decision being drafted for Council of Ministers to have sight of before any allocations are made.

Yours sincerely,



Senator John Le Fondré

Chief Minister