

CORPORATE SERVICES SCRUTINY
SUB-PANEL
Overseas Aid Review

WEDNESDAY, 7th FEBRUARY 2007

Panel:

Senator J.L. Perchard (Chairman)
Connétable D.J. Murphy of Grouville
Connétable S.A. Yates of St. Martin

Witnesses:

Mrs. A. Bailhache
Mr. M. Dubras Revisions tracked as requested.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Welcome, Mrs. Bailhache and Mr. Dubras, to our Corporate Services Panel hearing. As you know we are looking at the Jersey Overseas Aid's contribution, the Commission, the effectiveness of it all, and we made a call for evidence which you kindly submitted written evidence and we thought because of your vast experience in Jersey's overseas aid situation we would invite you to meet with us this afternoon. Can I introduce who we all are? This is Sam Power, who I think you may have corresponded with.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Spoken to on the phone, yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Constable Murphy, Jimmy Perchard, you know. This is Anne Thomson who is from the Office of Policy Management helping the Panel to come to terms with the complexities of this issue and has worked extensively, well, all your life really, in overseas aid and is currently advising the Irish Government. Constable Yates from St. Martin, Mike Haden in the corner.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

And you have got a Constable missing? John?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes. Constable Gallichan, thank you for reminding me, had something unavoidable crop up. It is not his health but just he could not ...

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

That is okay. We will forgive him.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Thank you for your submission. I wonder if we could start ... are you quite happy that we should share the platform with regards to --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, well, we worked together for -- you know, he came on to my committee and I do have things I want to say to you about the review we did.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

There may be some differences but please feel free to disagree. Perhaps we could, in order to structure things, we could start with the sort of general funding of overseas aid, how it is measured, and where Jersey should be.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I do not think we have any problem - I cannot speak for -- Maurice is quite capable of speaking for himself. I do not think we have any problem. We want to see it go to 0.7 per cent, who does not really? But I prefer to see it sooner than later. But we are not doing too badly but I would like to see us do much better. But I think in looking in the overall pattern of what goes on in overseas aid there are other issues that we need to look at as well. Well, first of all, I was quite surprised to see that you did not have any submissions from the main aid agencies. I mean you have them from people connected with them here but when I looked at the submissions you did not have anything, and I have to say that during my presidency of 9 years I found what we got from the main agencies was brilliant. I cannot remember, I am sorry, whether somebody said it to me or I read it because they said: "Oh, there is no way the aid agencies would be open and honest with you." Well, when we did the review I have to say to you, they were extremely honest with us and I have to pay credit to Maurice because with all his abilities and attitude to setting up the reviews, we set up the review and that was chaired by Brian Coutanche and we had people like Gerard Le Claire on it from United Nations. So it was 5 people and it was a success because they wrote and spoke to the agencies, and one of the things that came up from that, which I am very pleased is still being carried on, is the 3 year programme, because up to then we had always been told by Treasury that you had to stop after a year because you may not get any money next year. We had to argue the toss with them, did we not, for a while and say: "Look, this is not the way to handle things" and we won in the end so that was one good thing. I mean one of the things that came up I always remember that Gerard very much wanted us to put all our agency money through United Nations but no United Nations have often last on the ground in aid, we decided against that one because our disaster giving is excellent and having attended only one during my 9 years emergency disasters general

meeting I was rather embarrassed to be pointed out by bankers from the UK how brilliant Jersey was. I felt a bit embarrassed because I felt uncomfortable but very proud as well that Jersey was so good at it. I think that is one of my main concerns that you seem to be missing out on that expertise. You have had some excellent submissions and it was lovely to read David Steiner's because that has been another great person who has done a vast amount of work over the years for overseas aid and he still has a working relationship. But there was one local agency who thought that they should be putting the money through -- Red Cross money could be put through them. Now we had this once before and when you look at it, it is having a third party put in and I would say to you be very careful about encouraging the Commission to go down that road because you do not need an agent. The Commission do not need money to go to an agent to go to the Red Cross. They are quite capable of doing it themselves and this is how it looks at the moment. One of the other things, I think they are still doing a lot of pump priming, especially on small businesses and things like that, and that is brilliant. If we have more money you could do more of it and then people would become self-sufficient. I have seen it in my travels. I did go to -- well, Uganda I did a big tour there. Never been forgiven by my husband because we never had the holiday I promised him at the end because people kept on ringing up and saying: "Can you come and see us? Can we show you what we have done?" And they are brilliant these people. Do you realise, when you go there, they give you a wad of accounts they want you to go through so they can say where the money went, and you get that all the time. So I went to Uganda, went to Malawi, I went --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You say these people ...

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

The people we had donated money to, sorry.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

For example?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Well, think of the school at Goli, which was Bishop Henry Orombi, who is now the Archbishop of Uganda. We built the secondary school there.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Through an NGO?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

No, through Overseas Aid and then doing the rest of the work to get it finished. From the moment that -

-

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Community work project?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

It was a community work project but it had to go further than that because it was a secondary school we built up there. It took 2 and a half years to get it done. But Norman De la Haye got it all started and made sure everything was all in place to finish it. So I was shown all the accounts for it. You know, these sort of things are invaluable to show their honesty and their integrity. So I have been to those countries and I think the most scary country I went to though was Albania after Hoxha was deposed. But that was a real eye-opener. So I had a feeling of these -- and now, of course, you know, I go to South America.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Let us try and focus -- thanks for that introduction because I think it is useful. Try and focus initially on our overseas aid funding, how we measure it, the level it should be and the target timescale to get there, perhaps.

Mr. M. Dubras:

I have prepared some notes by the way and I will leave a copy with your Panel Clerk, but I will draw from them as we tackle them, and maybe fill in some blanks at the end. Having been party to the review and coming up with the formula that was agreed in 1998/1999, it was a good way of breaking through what had become a stagnant situation. In fact when I came into the States I made -- my first effort was to make a slight amendment to the budget to show an increase because it had gone static and therefore losing value. It was as if people felt they had got to the end of the line when, in fact, it was critical that we change the attitude in the States to overseas aid contributions. I think it was helpful having some new people in the States to make that breakthrough. The issue I think was let us get the formula introduced, much as we wanted to make it more and quicker, to get the notion through, the pattern through, in at a time which was very difficult and the negotiation between the former Deputy of St. Ouen, Ken Syvret and Derek Maltwood, made that breakthrough. But I think it was made quite clear at the time that that was just the beginning.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Can I just ask you if it was 24th September 2002 we are talking or was it the 1998?

Mr. M. Dubras:

The 1998. And it was introduced, I think, for 5 years. And at that time it was made clear that if tax revenues did have a downturn then the formula would allow for that and that money would be given but

there would be a trading. But I mean I do not think it was -- it was probably 5 years before that situation occurred. Now I think everybody is telling you, and I do not need to go on *ad nauseam* on this point, we have got to aim for that target. But it is not, in my book, something we should just creep up towards. It should not be a drip drip approach. I think we have got to take much bigger steps commensurate with the wealth in the Island, and I make reference in my notes to I think we should be increasing those steps using 3 league boots. We should have that sort of target. Yes, people are saying: "Well, look, we should do it at a prudent rate" but if you look at the people who write those words their strength has been their approach to our economy and our finances. So you have to accept those words for them as being normal. Others talk about a realistic timetable. Well, of course, but in my view the Island, and through the Scrutiny Panel, which as you know I think has been an excellent idea, I think we have to be brave, courageous even, and go for a challenging target within the foreseeable future and not just creep towards this target. Now I think the other aspect, and we might not agree on this, and might not agree with others, but I think for the benefit of the community we have got to look at the total picture of Island contributions to overseas aid. Yes, there is, through the Commission, the States as the steward of taxpayers' money to come up with a piece of the revenue budget. There is also the value, some of it intangible, of the work groups which have been alluded to before. There is the time that people contribute. I did a quick calculation that if you got a group of 10 people for 3 to 4 weeks and we use, say, £36,000 earning power as an average, one-twelfth of that is 3K, that comes up to £30,000, add 10 for what the people - the group - raises by way of contributions, 3 times a year, that is 150K. Now that is quite a significant amount of money on top of the amount that comes out in the OAC (Overseas Aid Commission) grant. Now add on to that - and people have referred to it in the other submissions and I know Anne Bailhache can talk to the issue - there is a lot of benevolence, a lot of generosity, private generosity through organisations and through individuals. Now if that were tapped into it, if that was recorded in some way, and you will never get it all but you would get an estimate, it would -- the picture would look dramatically different and would demonstrate that it is multi-faceted wave of giving. I think that would encourage people to give more. It would not say: "Well, there is so much being given we do not need to put anymore from taxpayers." I think it is -- but for every pound you have got to be able to demonstrate that it is having a benefit. it is not just putting the money into a deep drain. Now I will refer back to the experience that I had in going to the CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) conference in Fiji in 2005, the Bailiff, Philip Ozouf and myself formed the team and we all participated in the Small Countries Conference as well as the larger sessions, but there was a very specific session on overseas aid and the impact^[1]. There were 2 aspects to it which were most humbling in a way. First of all, there were those countries present as recipient countries who are saying: "Look, we are the poor people. You are the wealthy people" and we counted ourselves in that latter group: "Please continue what you are doing." And I know I am talking on the side to some of the countries, Fijians themselves and others. They value what Jersey does. We are known for our very good way of approaching this issue and who we do it with and through. So that was the first part of the message. The second part of the message was: "Please make sure that you do not do it through local government." Even some of the

government representatives themselves were saying: “Keep on going through the third party, not the extended party, not the ‘go between’.” But we know it is not appropriate to give it to some governments and in fact there was a whole discussion about corruption in government, corruption in various jurisdictions and there is a move in the CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) which you may have already been aware of, and the Commonwealth and the United Nations, to eliminate corruption in government. So you see the double thrust is critical to our giving.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You are both of the opinion that Jersey should be targeting 0.7 per cent of GNI (Gross National Income) by - we did not put a date on it, did we? Is it reasonable for Jersey to have a target date and, if so, what?

Mr. M. Dubras:

Well, I said foreseeable future and for me that is a 10 year sort of time frame.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Foreseeable future or 10 years.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Well, I said foreseeable future and, for me, that is 10 years. I am 68 now so I would expect to see it by my 80th birthday.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Other people would define foreseeable future differently.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I think you can put down 10 years for both of us but I do have a slight deviation with Maurice on looking at what else is given, I mean the Island is generous and people are very generous and I head up Mission Support at St. Paul’s and we spend -- I have a budget of £40,000 a year which for one church is not too bad really, is it? But though it is Aid Agencies -- funnily enough I just picked up my mail from church today and there was a reply from TEAR Fund and you see what marvellous things can happen with a small amount. But what I want to say to you about looking at what other Islands do, every time we debate overseas aid Pierre Horsfall used to come up with what I used to call his old chestnut. “Please look at what everybody else is giving.” I personally do not think that should let the Government off the hook. Maybe we would only get to 6 per cent, I prefer to see 7 per cent but people still encouraged to give in the fantastic way they give now.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

What do you mean “should not let the Government off the hook”, what does that mean?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I mean, let the Government off the hook and say: "Oh, that is fine" because Islanders are giving sort of millions the Government will not have to go to 0.7 per cent. That is what Pierre used to say and I wondered --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry, I do not quite follow your mindset.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I am sorry. It is because it has been inbred in me for so long. Because I did aid work before I went into the States, I am accustomed to it from London level. So, we are saying that we want to see the Government get to 0.7 per cent. If we looked at the millions that people give from this Island I would not want to see that taken away from the 0.7 per cent. Does that explain it? People say: "Right, people are giving, say, £24 million, so we only need to give 0.6 per cent" and I am not --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It is not a cumulative figure that we are talking about?

Mr. M. Dubras:

I think there is a difference of --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Maurice has given us some very creative accounting, he has even talked about loss of earnings by -- a lot of people going on overseas aid --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

But they do.

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is the equivalent -- they take it out of their holidays. So they are taking it away from the community, they are taking it away from their families, so it is a real contribution people are making.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Especially when you are desperately wanting builders and you were not even able to give them anything. They lose money --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You think that Jersey should be targeting 0.7 from central reserves?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Maurice says perhaps it would be --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

It could be cushioned.

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is a way of getting there. I think you want to look at the total contribution.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

But anyway we deviate, I think.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

How are we going to pay for these 2, albeit Maurice's --

Mr. M. Dubras:

I have got this fresh idea - I think a fresh idea - which is the one I alluded to in my paper.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

His DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) plan.

Mr. M. Dubras:

If someone could distribute these. Now, the thought occurred to me 2 or 3 weeks ago, and it is particularly pertinent given the publicity of climate change in the last few days, and I took the trouble to read the summary for policy makers just to get a better understanding of what is going on, that was published out of Paris last week. But if you look at this it describes what carbon offsetting is. This is just the short form and there is reference attached to this to a consultation process going on in the UK for establishing standards which is going to be finished sometime during the summer so that people know who they are giving to. Now, it occurred to me, purely because I responded to something called rental carbon neutral when I booked through Avis and they accepted my pound and sent me information about it which I passed on to the Environment Department to see if they could tell me a bit more, it was contributing towards growing saplings and things like that. But how do you know that it is (a) a *bona fide* organisation and (b) is it really going to make a difference? There is a whole lot of these, as you

know. So it seemed to me as an extra way of contributing -- so there is taxpayers' money on the one hand but here we have an opportunity to do something in terms of our own pollution emission to contribute to an overseas aid project that is going to offset and, in fact, will not add to the burden^[2]. This does not, in any way, replace the Island reducing its contribution to emissions but that which is necessary we could, as an Island, have a single fund. I mention in my notes, I suggest we might even join forces with the other bailiwick and establish a Channel Islands offsetting fund or trust which everybody voluntarily could contribute to. Now it could also be used as a device instead of an environmental tax that went into the central coffers, government would encourage people to divert money in this way so that rather than just using tax payers money you would tap off -- with projects that were approved in a similar way to the way overseas aid goes about it now -- the carbon offsetting fund could provide money for those projects in third world developing countries.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Are you suggesting that those projects are linked to climate change?

Mr. M. Dubras:

Absolutely.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that not going to be too restrictive?

Mr. M. Dubras:

I do not think so because, in fact, if you read the submission by Mark Stanley Price that is one of the things he is encouraging the Overseas Aid Commission to add to its agenda. You remember that there have always been 3 basic elements - not in any particular order that I can remember - water, education and health, and what was the fourth one?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Agriculture.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Agriculture. So I think we could -- those have been long established. What I am suggesting now is we build on that and we say: "Well, we are interested in enabling small communities to reduce the likelihood of them burning fossil fuels or adding contamination, et cetera, et cetera, through this device. Now, this short extract that I have copied you in on is one website, which is the (UK) Government's website, which gives us the principles. I think it might well be within your opportunity to consult with the Environment Department, talk to Chris Newton and others, to get a handle on how practical it would be to do this in Jersey through the vehicle of the Overseas Aid Commission. I offer that as a new way of

contributing.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It is certainly a different one, Maurice.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Well, it just made sense to me given the general attitude. I think this would help to stimulate - and this is the point that was being made - if people have their awareness raised in a really practical, close to home way, then it is more likely to be successful. The other thing I want to come back to is one of the arguments against increasing the level of overseas aid that some members of the public and some of the contributors came up with, is we are already doing enough and look at all the problems we have got at home with our own relative poverty, which I do not want to take away from having been chairman of the Eradication of Poverty Co-ordinating Group for a number of years. I know the issue is real here. However, if you look at all of the money that is being in fact used out of the taxpayer contributions to those who are less well off in the Island or who are disadvantaged in various ways, and it is not all financial by any means - and I think Anne would agree with me on this - there is a complete range of ways in which people experience poverty and hardship. If you add up all the money that the Island is already giving in a domestic way to restore the balance between the haves and the have nots, the wealthy in the Island and those who are truly impoverished and financially poor, you will see that we are talking one order of magnitude, at least, more that is routed very specifically and with the new income support operation I believe it is going to be even better targeted, hopefully with better results. So I think it would be well served if your Scrutiny Panel had someone on the side just look at the budgets and total them up and say: "Well, this is what is diverted domestically. In comparison this is all that is being sent overseas." The relationship, I think, is extremely important to put things in perspective.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

It is relevant poverty, is it not? That is what I always use, because the media used to say: "Why are you giving so much away when there is this, this and this?" I always used to say: "Well, it is relevant poverty and you have to look at it." I apologise for going back but it is -- I mean, they are not lined up to say thank you. People come out of their way to say thank you when they know you are in these countries and that is what absolutely amazed me. One of the other things I would like to say, a lot of the practices have been put in -- some of the letters sort of intimated that we did not have reporting back systems but, of course, there has always been reporting back systems and at one time people were told that if they had not used the money by the end of the year it had to come back. You had to start making a bit leeway and saying you cannot always get the parts. Overseas Aid paid for a driver for my daughter's clinic, morphine driver, and it took us 6 months to get it out there. Those sort of things have to be taken into consideration. So there must be some leeway. But reporting back is a high priority and I am sure it has always been a high priority and I think it still is. I just hope that comes out so people

realise that they have not been ...

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I have been listening to you first, Mrs. Bailhache, about the view that you had in your days and you were very happy with the result.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

We did not do everything.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Sorry?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

We did not do everything they asked us to do because it was not feasible, but it was very, very helpful. It made us look at ourselves, were we going down the right path, that was the idea, was it not, Maurice? It was local people who did it. There was Brian Coutanche, Gerard Le Claire, Tony Roberts - I am sorry I should have looked up the names before I came, I have forgotten the other 2.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

How long ago did that happen?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

1997, 1998, just after you came in.

Mr. M. Dubras:

You have got the paper in your reference pack.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I was interested in a couple of things I picked up on in your talk. You have been supporting charities for a long time and you mentioned that you were actively supporting the TEAR Fund, did I hear right?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, but that is mainly from the church. We have to support the TEAR Fund, yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

You mentioned £40,000.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

We do not give the whole £40,000 to one thing. What I am saying is -- when I was talking to Maurice on Monday he thought these sort of things were relevant. What happens is that they give me a budget every year, the church does, and I and other people look at it and decide how it is going to be spent.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

The thing I want to ask about is that particular charity. That is a UK based charity, is it?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

TEAR Fund, yes. We do TEAR Fund, MAF (Mission Aviation Fellowship), Leprosy, those general ones. We have also got 3 of our own church members who are out on the mission field and we give them a sum of money perhaps to help them come home or to pay for some necessities.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

So you supply cash or money to a UK based charity or several UK based charities?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

With specific projects in mind or you ...?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Sometimes, MAF is always general because we feel --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

What is MAF, please?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Mission Aviation Fellowship. They are long established and do fantastic work. But sometimes it is for specific -- quite often the aid agencies will write to you and say: "This year we are concentrating on this, this or this" if that interests you.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

I am getting around to a situation which has developed over the last 2-3 days. We have spoken to Oxfam, we have spoken to Christian Aid and a couple of others, Side-by-Side, and the sort of aspects that cropped up which are new to me, because I am not an aid expert - I have learnt a lot in the last 2 or 3 days - Oxfam, for instance, they raise a lot of money, earn a lot of money, and they are also supported very well from the Overseas Aid Commission. If forget how much they raise, it is in order of £120,000

locally --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

£200,000 because they more than that in the shop.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

£200,000, yes. The Christian Aid was also a substantial amount; Side-by-Side, I cannot remember what they said, but Side-by-Side is slightly different because they have projects, you know, they know where their money is going to go. Oxfam did not really know where their money was going nor did Christian Aid. They supply UK Christian Aid and I gather that Oxfam supply Oxfam, but one of the comments made was that we never seem to hear feedback, we never seem to have cause for celebration that we have achieved something. We do it again next year quite happily and we do it again, and we do it again. Other comments that came up were about the capping on the pound for pound system, pound for pound grant, which I think was £3,500, is that correct?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, that is correct. That started in this present president/chairman, we did not do that.

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Right. We have had sort tea break chats among ourselves here saying if the present Overseas Aid Commission - who seem to manage their money very well, they have got good contacts with the major agencies in the UK, Oxfam and Christian Aid - would it not be nice if there was partnership, in fact local fundraisers made a partnership with Jersey Overseas Aid Commission and said: "Look, we have got £50,000 or £100,000, if we attach it on to a similar amount that you were to provide, £100,000, we would like you to put it through your channels but we would like to know where the money is going to go or we have got an idea of where the money might go." I put this to the commission this morning and it was not kicked out of the field, it was sort of: "That is interesting." What would your reaction be to that sort of idea as ex-members of the Overseas Aid Committee?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Off the top of my head I think it is very much worth investigating. I cannot -- I will have to think about it and it will come to me in the middle of the night, I like to sort of chew these things over. At first thought I cannot see any reason why you could not do that. I mean, Overseas Aid have always had reports back -- you always get reports back from the aid agencies. In fact I brought one back by hand from Nepal once, the Save the Children chappie gave it to me because he had just finished it. You always get reports back and I think somehow the annual report that Overseas Aid does is not enough to be able to feed in some of the excellent things you hear about, you know? The reports that the commission get, they could be pages long, could they not? Do you remember the reports back? But

also where you gain from being on the committee or the commission is when you met the large aid agencies in the UK that autumn, or whenever they met, January - I do not know when they meet now, it is totally different from my day - you gain so much from seeing the officers face-to-face because quite often they would bring in somebody who had just come back from the field. So, I think one of the things that we perhaps miss out on is that we do not get enough of that feedback. You get an occasional article in the paper --

The Connétable of St. Martin:

Are you talking about your TEAR Fund and MAF and stuff?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, or anybody, whether it was Leprosy, whether it was Oxfam or Christian Aid, all those people have to report back the money they have spent. What I am saying is I do not think that is put over in a big enough way and it is very difficult, you know, the *Evening Post* are not going to write up all those good annual reports.

Mr. M. Dubras:

I tried to get hold of the most recent Overseas Aid report which was lodged as RC8 --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes, then withdrawn --

Mr. M. Dubras:

I could not find it --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

A numerical error.

Mr. M. Dubras:

But my recollection is that the *JEP (Jersey Evening Post)* used to run articles quite frequently when the groups came back or when there was some celebration being made because of a building or a vehicle or something like that. You see far less of that today. Now, maybe the Overseas Aid Commission website could in fact carry a lot of these individual reports. The mechanics of that is not difficult. In my notes I said there were 3 highlights in the time that I was on Overseas Aid. One of them was in fact that process of selecting, analysing, interviewing, receiving feedback and I remember one of them was the Christian Aid gentleman with the beard who I found knocking on my door one year and the next year I met him in London reporting on the value of the contributions that have been made through Overseas Aid, quite separate from the individual donations that go through to the main operations. Now, to pick up your

idea I think it is quite feasible -- some of the charities would be quite happy to do that. Others might say: "No, we would rather the money come to us so we can divvy up a much larger pot." My belief is that, and your own experience must tell you this, if people can associate with something close to their level of interest or their particular experience, if they have been somewhere and they come away and they want to contribute to something. It has much more meaning and I think that it is quite possible that you could combine some of the local contributions from one of the charities with something that was being done. But we should not rule out some of the fresh ideas and different ways of doing what we have been doing so long, as the overall principles that have been tried and tested are maintained.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I think from that also, just thinking, quite often the Overseas Aid would just be doing the building while the local collectors would not have the same restraints on their money and they could be providing all the equipment you need because quite often - it does not happen so much now - the building would go up and there would not be any desks, they would be sitting on stones and you need to do the full picture.

The Connétable of Grouville:

We have had both sides of this. The argument about people going and the first argument is that yes it is very good because it brings it home to Jersey people, they come back, spread the word, blah, blah, blah. The other side of it is: "Well, we feel we could do a lot more just send 2 people out to oversee a construction job with local labour and get local people working as opposed to having 10 or 12 labourers from Jersey. We have heard both sides of that argument and I find I am just up in the air about --

Mr. M. Dubras:

I think it is 'both and'. You can -- I have got a particular story that I have been given permission to talk about when there is a suitable moment.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is it part of the Overseas Aid Commission's brief or responsibility to promote awareness in Jersey?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, I think it is but it is not always easy. You know, I have known the *Evening Post* sort of say: "Can we do an interview with somebody?" and you have had somebody very interesting over and brought photographs and then you ring up and they say: "Oh, they said we decided we did not like it in the end so they would not print it." They have done the interviewing, that has happened on quite a few occasions.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Really?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Or they did not have space, something more important came up and they thought it was old hat now.

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is a spin off. It is just a natural part of the responsibility if there is a belief that there should be reporting out from the projects that are contributed to from taxpayers' money in order to do an effective job, then the taxpayers deserve the reporting out from the Overseas Aid Commission, not in a marketing way, not in a "look at us we have done a great job." But this is -- you know, the advent of the 3-year project I think was a very important change of focus because it gave the continuity, and this is what listening to the Overseas Aid agencies themselves were telling us. They were frustrated at that meeting that I attended because they could not rely on the money being there for 2 or 3 years in order to achieve something. If you think in terms of some of the small co-operatives and groups, women's groups, being given authority and money management that was part of the role of some of these agencies, they - just like those of us who are involved in Jersey charities, we are ^[3] looking to the States for some sense of certainty that the money is going to be there for 2 or 3 years in a row, not just for one year at a time, otherwise you cannot do certain things. So the pattern is established and it has worked so, I think, as with all good business processes, in order to plan ahead and to contribute more you have got to get the feedback and you have got to see what changes you have to make. That is why your process here is extraordinarily important. Overseas Aid Commission is inside the forest and only sees the trees but you are providing that extra pair of eyes that our review provided in 1998.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

This is an excellent document, by the way.

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is an amazing document.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

That was mainly produced by Brian Coutanche.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Yes.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Brian and Gerard with the help of others.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Help of others but, yes.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Brian has been a driver of this process.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I just want to add on to that, and it is a bit of gloss, but it was really exciting during those 3-year projects because when we started doing them we started doing some really exciting things with the aid agencies and doing bigger things and seeing the result of those was really fantastic.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You would expect to see a move into more sustainable aid and to manage more sustainable aid and more block support. Would you expect that trend to continue? I understand at the moment there is only 3 projects for 3 years. I am not sure if it is 3 every year or 3 every --

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is 3 for every 3 years. By now they may have a rolling arrangement --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Is that enough?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

No.

Mr. M. Dubras:

But it depends how much money you have got.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Precisely.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Does it demand more money or less --

Mr. M. Dubras:

There was always a big pool of projects and we could only fill 2 or 3 at a time and that was at the time when that was started so we were feeling our way a little bit.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

But does it depend on how much money you have got? If it is the right way to give aid, it is the right way to give aid, regardless of how much money you have got. It either is or it is not, there are not --

Mr. M. Dubras:

It is not the only way to give aid. It is one of a portfolio of ways, as I see it. I do not know about Anne's view.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I absolutely agree, it is part of the package because there is some of those other aid agencies where their work is just as important but in a different sphere.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Some of it is more finite.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes.

Mr. M. Dubras:

The one thing I remember being drilled into us as a new committee was we do not give money for buying cars or land rovers or whatever. Somebody has got to look after the maintenance aspects of it and, you know, that could be an indefinite drain -- on the other hand you know how Jersey has not been very good at maintaining its assets and this is where this partnership gets established, some of it is purely psychological, I think, but some of it can be very real, and this is where the 3 year project is real, where you establish a link with that group -- one of the examples I would like to give you by way of sort of closing off, perhaps, is the experience that Clare Morvan had. She has been on 2 groups now - she is a local dentist - and she went out as a builder but because it was on the list of who is coming and what they bring to the scene CV, it was known by the African group that she was a dentist and so she was asked to take some of her professional tools because they wanted some help. As a side issue, nothing to do with the building, she spent quite a lot of her time looking at and treating youngsters for their dental problems and she identified a student and trained that person up to give injections and take teeth out. Subsequently that person is going on to do something locally. Now she has been back a second time and has continued that process. There have been others that have gone out quite independently of Overseas Aid and carried on an initiative, possibly taking some of their friends with them, I gather. But Clare's - and she is open, I think, if you wanted to talk to her and hear the story first hand - belief is that there is far more spin off from the Overseas Aid work and the work projects than ever gets publicised, where because they are there 24 hours they contribute in other ways than just the project that they are on. Of course people bring back, I think you referred to that earlier -- so there are so many intangibles you cannot put a value on it. You might say it was creative accounting but I think we should not ignore

trying to place some sort of value which is far more than just the pounds, the --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It is incidentally only 3 per cent, as you probably know, of the total Overseas Aid budget so it is not a massive amount. Anne, you said something earlier that I noted and it made me think of a previous witness who had a difficulty. It was a Jersey based charity, raising money in the Island, looking to take that money into Africa in this case and do good work. They were not - albeit they were trying to be professional and account for everything they do probably - being recognised formally by the commission, they had one or 2 small grants but they were small grants. The complaint of this small group was how can they ever get on your big important list so you can recognise them for aid and as a reputable charity. The reply they had was: "Work with a recognised Oxfam or Christian Aid as a third party and once you have established your credentials then perhaps we will consider you as a worthwhile beneficiary of the aid that we decide to give." What you told us about 10 minutes was exactly that you do not like these intermediaries working in between the commission and one of the bigger agencies. How does anybody get off the starting blocks in Jersey, get on to the bigger list if the crux here is they have to link up with one of the big agencies?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I think it is quite difficult for a small -- first of all I have to say, are their accounts up to date? You always ask for accounts and I had the same problem when I was president, people would say: "We want money for this and that." We say: "Can we see your last year's accounts?" Now, Leslie Crapp was the honorary executive officer and he sees money when it is wrong. I always remember in London he saw - - somebody wanted to come on to our books and he said: "Your accounts are incorrect" and the man got up and walked out because they were incorrect and they should not have brought them. This is a very important issue because you have to show if you are capable of doing it and accounts is an important issue. So, I think, first of all you need to have your accounts right. Secondly, some of these people over here have done some fantastic work, there is no doubt about it. But some of them have been very sort of blasé and want to -- well, they try and tell me, and I am sure they would do the same with the present commission, of how you should run things and they have to see that it has to fit into a big picture. I still see the need for a path to be made so perhaps they can get more than the £3,500 but there has to be a strong criteria. I am not certain that marrying up with, say, Oxfam would work. Perhaps if you were going to a leprosy mission you could marry up with Leprosy Mission and it is all according to what sort of work you would be doing.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

So perhaps the level from £3,500 could be raised? Was it £3,500 in your time?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

No, we did not do it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You did not do it.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

We did not do it, no. This is a new thing that has come in since Deputy Huet took over. People were saying to her -- occasionally we would give a grant to a local -- a small grant to a local agency. There were occasions when it was quite feasible. Quite often it would be one of those groups that when they went out on Overseas Aid they were so moved by it they would form a group and want to go back themselves so you like to be able to help them and assist them. Some of them have been going for a long time now and I suppose they want to do bigger and better things. Quite often they just work in a particular area. I think that has got another advantage because they are known well there and they will be respected. I think there is a movement to raise it. You were saying thousands or something they were wanting?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I was trying to get you to say a number.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I think that is a little bit unkind because you cannot say a number out of the blue because you have to know what it is for, how they are going to spend it --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

There would have to be a maximum. There is a maximum of £3,500 and you have got to have a tidy ship. I am saying that given the same tidy ship should the maximum be raised and, if so, what would be a reasonable number?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I would say at the present time, without knowing the ins and outs, I would not want to go above £10,000.

Mr. M. Dubras:

That is the number that was sitting in here my head.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Was sitting with you? I think £10,000 would be -- do you know, if you are in Africa and even if you are like in South America where --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That is £20,000, that is £10,000 each. £10,000 raised in house and £10,000 matched?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

That is a lot.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Look at the groups that are raising the money to go out there, they are just giving the money to the organisation paying for the materials and now the teams, like the church team last year, they raised all their own finance to go out, plus their insurance, which I understand the insurance is getting quite large. I do not know whether your Panel advisor knows about Overseas Aid insurance but it is getting --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

For working groups?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Working groups, yes. It is getting quite --

Mr. M. Dubras:

Based presumably on the target country.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

The vaccinations are getting larger then, are they not?

Mr. M. Dubras:

Can I respond to your comment, or your question, because it is the same way, we started with 3 year rolling projects, 3 3-year rolling projects, it may be that they have got more now, I am not up to date. They started with £3,500 as a cap so maybe once you had the experience of that you are ready to raise it and that £10,000 just rolled off the tongue as far as I am concerned. Your tongue and my mind. And you take a stab at that and see how that is developing and there will be another new way of doing it and you inch forward by testing it, trialling it, and then saying: "Yes, it works" and the key is not the way it is given, it is how well it serves the organisation and the project that they are trying to do. It may be that some years they want less, some years they want more but you either average it or you allow for the averaging over a 3 year project.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You would have no problem in principle - putting words into your mouth, but perhaps a yes will do - if the annual request for this type of arrangement was made in the same area or do you think it, as it is now, necessary to spend these £3,500 lots on different areas?

Mr. M. Dubras:

What do you mean by area?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Village.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Geographical.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I think I am right in saying that you cannot keep going back year after year in the same village, that is right, is it not?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, I did read that.

Mr. M. Dubras:

I do not have a view on that. But I know -- I had an experience of going back to India and visiting a very poor area of Delhi, to a school that was being privately funded and relied very much on charity contribution and the people running it said -- I talked about Overseas Aid and so on -- and they said: "Well, can you give us some money? Can you arrange for some money?" What I did was I came back to the committee and I said: "Look, I have been approached, what is the method of dealing with this?" To avoid any individual acting as a 'go between', to maintain integrity, the recommendation was: "Well, we cannot do it for this year because of the process that we are already in but encourage them to contact either this organisation or that organisation in India so they are part of a bigger organisation that has a reputation with whom we have dealt, because you just do not know who you are dealing with when you are dealing with a small organisation at that end." Similarly, we do not always know who we are dealing with at this end and I think from best practice in terms of probity and know your customer and all of these good things that are right through our community right now, I think anybody is going to expect the Overseas Aid to be cautious so you might encourage them to work for a year or 2 through somebody else or under their umbrella to demonstrate their *bona fide* status and then, at some point, you might allow them to strike out on their own. I think it is experience that is going to determine it.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

The good thing about that is that some of these people who get themselves abroad into a community, when they get attached - say they get attached to Christian Aid or Oxfam or something like that - they put in the expertise to help them so they get a structure so they are able to -- that is all learning. That is another one of the good things that comes out of Overseas Aid as well. There is a vast amount of good that comes from it.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Are there any other questions you wanted -- or points that we have not really covered?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Just something about the make up of the commission really. We have moved, as you well know, to an Overseas Aid Commission and they felt that was important to do to have some independence from political pressures, too much political involvement. The commission, as you know, has 2 politicians and 3 --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

It is 3 politicians, is it not?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Who is the other one?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Paul Routier.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Paul, yes. Sorry, 3 politicians and 3 invited States nominated persons, in this case I think we have got a lawyer, an accountant and a banker. Do you think the commission, as it is constituted is really capable of making the right judgments on where it targets aid or should there be special expertise brought on?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Well, in some of the people that are there you have got good expertise at the present time. The banker is someone who has travelled extensively, who has done work projects. Leslie Crapp, he did a one man project.

Mr. M. Dubras:

He is retired now.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It might be better, Ann, if we did not talk about the individuals, albeit I did introduce the banker, the accountant and the lawyer. The thing is, should we be looking for expertise on the commission, special expertise?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

You have still got your expertise. I think you will find, and I cannot remember because I did not -- I just looked at what you had when you had the projet, that there has to be a banker and a lawyer and an accountant, is it written down like that or was it agreed --

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Not that I am aware of.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes, I think it was just agreed.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I think Jacqui thought that would be ideal, a nice mix of skills.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes. You do need expertise to a certain degree but you also need fresh minds and some of the expertise -- I do not know how I to phrase this.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Be brave.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Well, they do not want to let go, that is what I will say to you and they want to carry on and carry on and carry on. Now, if you notice, I was still in the States and I only did 9 years as president and several after me said: "Oh no, you have not got a presidency" and I said: "So what? I have done 9 years, that is it. I think you need fresh ideas and fresh people" because I do not think anybody should stay in a position too long.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Right. Would you be perhaps bold enough to say how long a commissioner of the Overseas Aid Commission's office should be as a maximum?

Mr. M. Dubras:

(To former Senator Ann Bailhache) Remember you are talking to a Senator. **[Laughter]**

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

And I am not one anymore. You have put me on the spot slightly.

Mr. M. Dubras:

I will take over and you can go back.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

I must reply to it now. I am thinking 6 years but I think there always has to be the opportunity if it was right to allow a person to stay 9 years. I think 6 years because you can give a lot in 6 years. Your first year could be -- you could be on a learning curve because it is all right saying: "Oh, let us have these people who have got a proven knowledge" but are they going to be looking forward or are they going to be going back and who are you going to use in deciding because they have all got their own agendas. I mean, I have been very good, I have not spoken about my own agenda today.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I can feel a question coming on. Tell me, I will not take that little worm that you dangled out there but 6 years for the politicians and 6 years for the non politicians?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Yes.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

Special skills. Should we be looking for people who have skills in international aid development rather than just our best Jersey people?

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

Well, you can use some of our own -- look at Renee De la Haye(?) who did some fantastic work in different parts of Africa and has worked with aid agencies. Look at Caroline Nursey, you know, we have our own people who are well known, well respected with a terrific amount of -- those are the only 2 that I can think of off the top of my head at the moment. I am sure there are others.

Mr. M. Dubras:

I would support the 6 years. If you have got 6 members then one can rotate every year. I think the continuity is important and I think a fresh mind is too. The pleasure of coming on to a committee as a new member and being part of the challenging process, which is like an internal scrutiny process, in the

old days that is what committees -- that is how they were meant to operate, I think.

The Connétable of Grouville:

A bit like a rolling election, bringing in new ideas all the time.

Mr. M. Dubras:

That is right, and it should -- quite honestly, I am not sure about it always having to come to the States [4] -- but certainly using the Appointments Commission is good but I would certainly see that sort of rotation. Whether 6 is enough people or not, that is probably about right. I do not know how useful you found your panel advisor. I spare her blushes but I suggest to you that the commission could well benefit from someone like Caroline Nursey who is tapped into from time to time to bring that external view, and someone who has got the ability to sort of set aside the fact they are an Oxfam person. Yes, we have got some locally but I think it is important to tap into some of the bigger organisations and provide that external expertise advice to the commission. I would see that as -- you know, if you have to pay for travel expenses and so on it is a very small cost for what is a very important aspect.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

When Jean brought in Sir Robin Vanderfelt to look at the small countries, and that came from CPA, we paid all his expenses, we did not have to pay any salary we paid for him -- mainly he was put up in different people's homes. I think we all took a turn, he is such a wonderful man. We carried on with that. But then we found that small countries really came -- you know, Oxfam and all the others were dealing with them and Robin was really getting very tired and his wife was very ill so ... But one of the things he did for us was kept a record -- he was always watching and looking at the accounts in a different aspect of seeing the percentage that these aid agencies spent on admin. People tell you they spend this, that and the other and when you look at it -- were you there when he brought a paper once --

Mr. M. Dubras:

No, it was before my time.

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

It was before your time. I am sorry I did not mention it before but those are other things that the commission need to be looking at, are you paying for a huge admin cost? We found that there was one agency whose admin was very high so we told them and avoided them for a couple of years. They started to improve.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

It has been very useful. Is there anything else to add?

Mr. M. Dubras:

(To Scrutiny Officer) No, you can copy my notes to the members of the Panel so they can see what I might have said but I think we have covered most of it.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

There will be a transcript produced --

Mrs. A. Bailhache:

We will see a copy?

Senator J.L. Perchard:

You will have an advanced copy to ensure that it is factually correct. We will let you change it if you -- we allow you to change facts.

Mr. M. Dubras:

My hope is that the commission has welcomed your Scrutiny Panel and they see it as making a contribution to their efforts.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I think there are mixed feelings there, Maurice.

Mr. M. Dubras:

Well, that is possible.

Senator J.L. Perchard:

I declare the session closed and am going to turn the tape off.

[1] of natural disasters on small islands

[2] on the other hand.

[3] Wanted certainty.

[4] to approve each appointment