

Deputy Inna Gardiner  
Chair of the Public Accounts Committee  
By email

1<sup>st</sup> December 2021

Dear Deputy Gardiner,

### **PAC Review of Citizens' Panels, Assemblies and Juries**

Thank you for your letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021. The Infrastructure, Housing and Environment Department was not responsible for the establishment and operation of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel, however, as I sit on the Our Hospital Senior Officer Steering Group I am able to provide answers for your questions. Information which addresses the majority of these questions has already been published and for ease of reference I have included links to the appropriate documentation and websites.

#### **1. Please can you explain your department's work in establishing and supporting the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel ("the Panel")?**

As noted above, the Infrastructure, Housing and Environment Department was not involved in either setting up or supporting the work of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel. The Chief Minister's report to the States Assembly on 3 May 2019 set out that a Citizens' Panel would be used to contribute to the process and engagement and decision making for Our Hospital. The idea for using a Citizens' Panel to support the site selection process in particular originated with the Our Hospital Project Team and was discussed and progressed with the support of the Our Hospital Senior Officer Steering Group (**SOSG**) and the Our Hospital Political Oversight Group (**POG**). It was felt that a Citizens' Panel would be an additional and valuable opportunity to involve Islanders in the process for selecting the site for the Island's largest capital project of a generation.

The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel's selection and work is summarised on pages 8 and 9 of the Site Shortlisting Report which can be found on the Our Hospital website [here](#).

#### **a. Why was your department responsible for the Panel, instead of Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance?**

Not applicable.

**2. How did you work with the Department for Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance to understand how Citizens' Panels should be established and coordinated?**

A level of knowledge was already held by members of the Our Hospital Project team so liaison was not required.

**a. What lessons learned did you take from the Jersey Citizens' Panel 2018, established following the Independent Care Inquiry?**

The main lessons learned from this panel and others were

- To ensure that the Citizens' Panel was reflective of Jersey's population demographics as advised by Statistics Jersey
- To allow the confidentiality of membership to be decided by members of the panel themselves

**b. How did you transfer corporate learning from the Panel to Strategic Policy, Planning and Performance, in order to help improve the facilitation of the Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change and Citizens' Jury on Assisted Dying?**

This was not within the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**3. Who facilitated the Panel? Was it done in-house?**

An external facilitator was sourced from the UK to support the Citizens' Panel in their work.

**a. If an external facilitator was used, what procurement processes were used to select them? How were contracts awarded?**

An invitation 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.

**b. If an external organisation was used, why was this not been publicly declared?**

It was publicly declared and is set out in the Site Shortlisting Report published on the Our Hospital website which can be found by following the link in the answer to question 1.

**4. Please could you outline the work of the Chair of the Panel and the Chair of the Selection Panel. What were their respective responsibilities?**

Every member of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel was of equal standing and there was no Chair. It was originally envisaged that there would be a selection panel, however, based on the advice of Scrutiny and Statistics Jersey, a randomised selection process was employed instead, overseen by former Social Security Minister Francis Le Gresley.

**a. Did you issue Service-Level Agreements for either the Chair of the Panel or the Chair of the Chair of the Selection Panel?**

As there was no Chair for the Citizens' Panel and no selection panel this was not required.

**5. Please could you provide a breakdown of the recruitment methodology and selection criteria used for the Chair of the Panel, the Chair of the Selection Panel, and the membership of both bodies (including names)?**

As noted in the answer to 4. there was no Chair for the Citizens' Panel and no selection panel so the answers below relate only to the membership of the Citizens' Panel.

The recruitment methodology can be found on gov.je [here](#).

**a. Why did you select these methods?**

As noted on page 2 of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel Selection methodology (Methodology) [here](#).

**b. How did you promote the recruitment processes?**

This is set out in the Methodology.

**c. How did you ensure that all processes were fair and transparent?**

- Publication of the proposed responsibilities of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel, the process to apply for membership, the selection methodology and the proposed Terms of reference at the time of a call for panel members
- A visible recruitment campaign promoted online, in the mainstream media and on social media
- Oversight of the selection process by former Social Security Minister Francis Le Gresley who was not a current States Assembly Member nor involved in any capacity with the Our Hospital Project, other than overseeing the selection process
- By engaging an independent facilitator from the UK to ensure the Citizens' Panel members understood their remit, Terms of Reference, their specific task in relation to establishing site shortlisting criteria
- Processes were tabled for discussion by both SOSG and POG to ensure they were fully informed of proposals

**d. Part of the selection process involved sifting out applicants who could be susceptible to "outside influence". What processes were involved in sifting out applicants susceptible to this?**

Applicants who fulfilled any of the criteria set out in section 4.2 on page 3 of the Methodology were removed from consideration

**e. What did your department consider to be "outside influence"?**

The project team, SOSG and POG considered 'outside influence' to be opinions of stakeholders that might prejudice the Citizens' Panel members reaching their own conclusions based on the evidence that they considered and discussed at their meetings.

**f. What independently developed criteria was used to understand and monitor how participants were selected?**

The participants were selected randomly as set out on page 4 of the Methodology.

**6. Could you please provide a detailed breakdown:**

**a. on the original planned (participant) membership criteria for each of the Assemblies (e.g. age, gender, profession)**

This is set out on pages 2 and 3 of the Methodology

**b. the selection process (including what forms the 'invitation to apply' process took, and how many replied).**

This can be found on page 2 of the Methodology.

**c. the 'final' membership per criteria**

The final membership comprised 17 people.

**7. Please could you provide a comprehensive overview of how the Panel was facilitated, including stakeholder engagement and the work officers undertook to develop reports and other policy resources resulting from the work of these bodies?**

The work of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel is set out on pages 8 and 9 of the Site Shortlisting Report which can be found by following the link in the answer to question 1.

There was a single output from the Citizens' Panel which was the site shortlisting criteria set out in Appendix 4 to the Site Shortlisting Report.

**a. What involvement did your department and the wider Government of Jersey have in the operation of each Citizens' Panel/Assembly/Jury?**

There was no involvement from any Government Department in the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel.

**b. How were participants selected for each Panel/Assembly/Jury? What involvement did the Government of Jersey and its respective departments have in this?**

This is set out on pages 3 and 4 of the Methodology. There was no involvement of Government of Jersey departments in the selection process for the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel.

**c. How were advisors and stakeholders identified and contacted to support each Citizens' Panel/Assembly/Jury?**

The independent UK facilitator supported the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel.

**8. How was the recruitment and selection process for the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel monitored? Was any independent monitoring involved?**

The former Social Security Minister, Francis Le Gresley provided oversight.

**a. What corporate learning was developed regarding the recruitment and selection of participants?**

This was not within the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**9. What departmental resources and officer support were provided to facilitate the Panel? Please can you include in this answer a breakdown of Officer FTE's,**

departmental funds, and include information on the logistics used for the facilitation of these bodies.

- a. How were Officers resourced by the department to facilitate the Panel?
- b. How did you determine the number of FTE's and other resources needed to facilitate the Panel?
- c. What training did Officers with responsibilities for the Panel receive in improving their understanding of how the Panel should operate and influence policy development/decision-making?
- d. What resources were provided to improve the understanding of States Members and the public on how these bodies work?

No further Government of Jersey support was requested or provided.

**10. What decision-making processes were used by Officers to agree upon and establish the Panel and draft business cases for the respective Minister(s) to approve?**

The use of a Citizens' Panel to establish the site shortlisting criteria was agreed by SOSG and POG and is documented in their respective minutes. Given that the total expenditure for the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel came to less than £5,000, a business case was not required.

**11. Please could you provide to the PAC with the budget for the Panel and a full breakdown of the spend by the Government of Jersey, including a clear outline of departmental spend and what spend was provided to external organisations/facilitators).**

The Citizens' Panel was funded from the Our Hospital Project budget. Total spend is set out in the table below.

Item	Cost (£)
Room Hire	1,518.70
Materials	74.67
Facilitator fee	2,800.00
Facilitator travel	231.00
Facilitator subsistence	244.30

- a. How was the Panel's budget developed? Please could you include a table on the original budget/business case for each, the final cost breakdown, and any outstanding costs.

The budget was not of a level that required a business case and funding came from the overall project budget. There are no outstanding costs.

- b. Did the Citizens' Panel exceed its budget? If so, by how much, and how did you work with Ministers to resolve this?**

No.

- c. What, if any, liaison you had with other jurisdictions to improve your understanding of the potential cost and resources required for the facilitation of the Panel?**

None.

- d. What processes have been developed to deliver any future Citizens' Panels within budget?**

This is not within the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**12. Overall, how could the transparency of the recruitment and selection of the Panel's Chair and participants have been improved?**

It is considered that the recruitment and selection process was fair and transparent.

- a. How would this be reflected upon in future?**

The Our Hospital Project does not require another Citizens' Panel as the site selection process concluded in November 2020.

**13. The Independent Advisors' report for the Future Hospital Review Panel's review of the Future Site Recommendation outlined concerns that it was not possible to comment on whether the Panel had "suitable experience and knowledge to develop Critical Success Factors (CSFs), as advised by the HM Treasury Green book" and that "no operational clinical staff or end users" were present to provide "a more detailed understanding of the potential location, particularly regarding the patient population and services to be delivered" (page 17). Considering these concerns, how do you believe the transparency of the Panel could have been improved?**

The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel members did not require previous experience or knowledge of developing Critical Success Factors as they were supported by an independent facilitator with the relevant experience. The Future Hospital Review Panel's Advisors query was actually in relation to the Site Selection Panel who applied the Citizens' Panel's criteria as shown by key finding 13 in S.R.9/2020 which may be viewed [here](#). The Deputy Chief Minister responded to this in his Ministerial Response [here](#).

- a. What advice did you seek from Treasury & Exchequer, Strategic Policy, Planning & Performance, Health & Community Services and other key departmental stakeholders in order to develop the Panel's work programme and resource it appropriately?**

None. The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel had a single, specific task which did not require input from Government Departments.

- b. The PAC notes that it is difficult to locate publicly available information regarding the Panel's work, meetings and who provided expert advice to them.**

**How was the transparency of the Panel's work considered as part of its facilitation?**

- The output of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel's work was the criteria which were published in Appendix 4 to the Site Shortlisting Report on page 34.
- The Methodology and panel's Terms of Reference were published on gov.je.
- The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel generated interest from the general public via the Freedom of Information process. The dates of meetings together with numbers of attendees, the composition of the panel and the costs involved were all published during 2020 in response together with the minutes of meetings.

**c. What lessons were learnt regarding the transparency of Panel meetings?**

It is considered that there has been sufficient transparency around the meetings. As noted on page 29 of S.R.9/2020, which may be found following the link in question 13, four members of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel met with the Future Hospital Review Panel and explained their reasons for choosing anonymity.

**14. How did you facilitate, receive and process feedback from both participants and organisations you partnered with for the Panel?**

The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel members were able to provide feedback via the independent facilitator. There were no partner organisations involved.

**a. What lessons have been learnt regarding stakeholder development and communication between participants, the Chair, and the Government of Jersey?**

The use of the Our Hospital Citizens' Panel to support the site selection process was deemed a positive experience by the participants as evidenced in S.R.9/2020 and a successful method of engaging Islanders by the project team.

**15. What lessons have you learned in the establishment and operation of the Panel?**

The use of the Panel was a success. The following sub-questions are not within the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**a. How have or will these lessons be implemented to improve the operation of future Citizens' Panels?**

**b. How is the implementation of lessons learned being internally logged and tracked? Have any been included in the department's Recommendations Tracker following feedback from stakeholders and is it logged as a cross-departmental exercise in order to spread knowledge and experience of working with Citizens' Panels across the Government of Jersey?**

**c. What work is being undertaken to increase both corporate and community understanding of Citizens' Panels/Assemblies/Juries and their impact on policy development, local democracy, and similar areas of concern?**

**16. How do you establish value for money in determining the utility of the Panel? What processes are followed to demonstrate this?**

The outlay for Our Hospital Citizens' Panel relative to the overall project budget of £804.5 million was minimal and deemed value for money in terms of successful engagement of Islanders.

**a. How have you developed an understanding of good practice for the organisation and operation of the Panel?**

This is not in the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**17. How did you ensure that the conclusions of the Panel were listened to and factored into the final site selection? How was this represented?**

This is set out in the Site Shortlisting Report.

**a. How do you believe the voices of Citizens' Panels can be amplified, based on key learnings from this Panel?**

This is not within the remit of the Our Hospital Project.

**18. Please provide an explanation, with relevant evidence and timelines, of the added value of the Our Hospital Citizens Panel to the site selection process of the new hospital.**

The Our Hospital Citizens' Panel provided Islanders with additional opportunity to be involved in the site selection process, the initial opportunity having been to suggest sites during the call for sites process.

Yours sincerely,

Andy Scate  
Director General  
Infrastructure, Housing and Environment  
+44 (0)1534 448400 [a.scate@gov.ie](mailto:a.scate@gov.ie)