



## States Greffe

Tom Walker  
Interim-Chief Executive Officer  
Government of Jersey

### **BY EMAIL**

10 June 2024

Dear Tom,

### **Use of Consultants – Follow up – Executive Response**

As you will aware, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) has recently presented the Executive Response to the Comptroller and Auditor General's (C&AG) report 'Use of Consultants – Follow up' alongside its comments in respect of the response.

The PAC has raised a number of points within its comments and would be grateful if you could provide a response to the points as follows:

1. The PAC notes that both Health and Community Services (HCS) and Children, Young People, Education and Skills (CYPES) are not intended to be included in the action point seeking to improve management information in relation to use of consultancy appointments. Given the current financial position of HCS and, whilst noted that the figure has reduced dramatically, the use of locum and agency staff within CYPES, how do you intend to ensure value for money is being achieved in this area without collecting better management data at this time?
2. How do you intend to monitor and assess whether the frameworks and guidance set out by the Corporate Portfolio Management Office (CPMO) are being complied with by Chief Officers, noting a step is due to be built into the reporting on P.59/2019 and publication of Consultants Reports etc.
3. The PAC notes a number of 'bolt-on' modules of the Ariba system are due to be rolled out in due course, specifically the 'Request for Quote' element. Can the PAC be provided with further information and assurance over how this will enhance the process of engaging consultants. Furthermore, can you provide further details of any further additions that are likely to be required and whether these are planned to be budgeted for in future Government Plans.
4. The PAC notes that the actions outlined in the Strategic Workforce Planning – Skills and Succession are intended to deliver improvements in relation to the future use of consultants. However, can the PAC please be provided with further detail in relation to how this will be achieved in practice and what steps are being taken to ensure the actions outlined in the response are achieved. Furthermore, can details of the plan within HCS to reduce the reliance on consultants be shared in confidence with the PAC.



# | States Assembly

5. The PAC has noted a potential discrepancy in the response between the rejection of recommendations nine and ten and the acceptance of recommendation seven. Whilst we understand that a closure document exists as part of existing frameworks, the C&AG has made recommendations for improvements in this area and notes that the current processes could be strengthened. By accepting recommendation seven (which relates to reporting on the actual and planned skills transfer) without accepting recommendation nine and ten (which focus on improving evaluation processes) the PAC's view is that this does not marry up. Taking forward recommendation seven is reliant on the implementation of the improved evaluation processes set out in recommendation nine. The PAC would, therefore, question what is being done to address this potential disparity between responses.

Thank you for taking the time to address the PAC's questions and I would be grateful of a response by 5pm on Monday 17<sup>th</sup> June, so that the Committee may consider your response at its next scheduled meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> June. It is intended for the PAC to publish this letter, and your response on the States Assembly website.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Inna Gardiner'.

Deputy Inna Gardiner  
**Chair**  
**Public Accounts Committee**