

# **Education and Home Affairs - Policing of Events - User Pays Sub-Panel**

**MONDAY, 12th NOVEMBER 2007**

**Panel:**

Deputy D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence (Chairman)

Deputy J. Gallichan of St. Mary

**Witnesses:**

Mr. W. Holt (Co-director of Jersey Live Music Festival)

Mr. W. Cunningham (Co-director of Jersey Live Music Festival)

Mr. M. Corbin (Non-executive Director of Jersey Live Music Festival)

*(Please note: All witnesses and Panel Members were given the opportunity to comment upon the accuracy of the transcript. Whilst the transcript remains a verbatim account of proceedings, suggested points of clarification may have been included as footnotes to the main text.)*

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian of St. Lawrence (Chairman):**

I would like to welcome you all to this hearing this afternoon with the Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel on the proposed Policing of Events User Pays. The format of the hearing is that we would welcome you speaking to us and giving us your views on the proposals and we do have some pre-prepared questions which you may well cover in what you say to us, but I am sure we will pick up on some questions anyway. What I would like to do first of all is thank you for what must have been a considerable amount of work in these submissions that you have made to us. We are very grateful for all of the background you have given us. It has really helped us to get an idea of how events were organised over here and we can tell that you have taken a lot of time and effort in those submissions. So we are very pleased to have received those. I have to give apologies on behalf of Deputy Pitman who is ill today. I have to also tell you that you are covered by privilege at this hearing and there is information to that effect on the desk in front of you. The hearing is being recorded and will eventually be uploaded on to the Scrutiny website, so it will be public. You will receive a copy of the transcript for you to decide whether you have been accurately reported and I understand that we may touch on some confidential matters, in which case please feel free immediately to draw that to our attention and we can

discuss those in camera a little later. We will try to not make comment to the second report that you submitted to us which is called *Schedules and Appendices* but shout at us if we stray into that area. For the record we will need to introduce ourselves, so I am Deputy Mezbourian, Chairman of the Panel, and to my right is ...

**Deputy J. Gallichan of St. Mary:**

Deputy of St. Mary, Juliette Gallichan, Vice Chairman.

**Mr. W. Holt (Co-director of Jersey Live Music Festival):**

Warren Holt, Co-director of Jersey Live music festival.

**Mr. M. Corbin (Non-executive Director of Jersey Live Music Festival):**

Matthew Corbin, Non-executive Director of Jersey Live music festival.

**Mr. W. Cunningham (Co-director of Jersey Live Music Festival):**

Warren Cunningham, Co-director of Jersey Live music festival.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Thank you very much. So I would like to ask you to kick off and give us your views on the proposition of the Home Affairs Minister to charge for policing of certain events.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

If I could start by noting to the Panel page 5 of part one of our submission where we try to summarise our view on the current proposition and I think the view of Jersey Live music festival is that it does not oppose the introduction of user pays charges per se however we suggest that there are a number of points that need to be considered before any such legislation is put in place. We draw attention to 4 specific points and if it is helpful I can read those points.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Yes, please do.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

“Firstly, that user pays should not be perceived to be a stealth tax and neither should it be created as a mechanism by which either inefficiency nor unnecessary spending within the States of Jersey departments is recompensed. Secondly, user pays should be fairly and consistently applied without differentiating or prejudicing commercial events such as Jersey Live where these events are in the best interests of the Island. The policy should be consistent with the Island’s focus on achieving sustainable economic growth generally and tourism growth specifically, and in seeking to create an environment within which entrepreneurship is encouraged. Thirdly, user pays need to be applied transparently and for the avoidance of actual or potential conflict should be divorced from the process of securing an event licence, such that the 2 elements, firstly being the event licence application and secondly being the user pays charge negotiation can be independently assessed and fourthly, user pays charges need to be capable of being mitigated as far as possible, which may mean that a wider review of existing policing and Honorary Policing responsibilities in particular is undertaken which in turn may result in a resourcing model being jointly developed between the police forces and event organisers similar in approach to the larger U.K. events.”

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Thank you. Do either of the Warrens want to say anything? I am sure when you start you will not be able to stop.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We will follow on with exactly what Matthew has said there. That has set out the 4 main points.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

It seems that you do not really want to say very much to us. Do you want us to start questioning you, then? Because as I say we have some that we have prepared earlier.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think what we have tried to do with the written submission is to set out as clearly as possible up front what ... if you like the 4 key principles that we feel are important to any user pays discussion and then behind that within the report really flesh things out

a little bit more, and as you picked up the second part of the report really is just our business sensitive evidence which supports the assertions and the proposals that we are putting forward.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Okay. Well, as I say what you have given us has been comprehensive and thought provoking, so I think we will just start by discussing with you the current arrangements of organising an event and for the record just ask you what kind of event Jersey Live is.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Jersey Live is a festival of music and performing arts which we believe is a large community event for Jersey. We believe there is a long term future for Jersey Live. We have to work hard for it, which is why we are here today, obviously, and it is something that we believe we can deliver year in, year out with the support obviously of the States of Jersey and with the hard work of ourselves as well and the support of the public of Jersey.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Do you organise any other events at the moment, and if so, can you tell us about those?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We do organise smaller events, some smaller club events and we organise some of the concerts, a large scale concert at Fort Regent. Some of the band events are at Elizabeth Castle and we are hoping to act as consultants in the future to other event organisers as well.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Has the suggestion of user pays for the policing of events only ever been applied to Jersey Live as far as you are aware?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

As far as we are aware, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So there has been no discussion at all or suggestion that perhaps any raves may need to be charged for if extra resources are used by the police?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We do not know anybody who organises raves.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Oh, is that not you?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

A dirty word.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Oh, right. Well, you can tell my age. Sorry about that.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Raves are illegally organised parties and that is something that we do not do.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So what do you organise at the Castle, then?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Legally organised parties.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Legally organised parties?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Dance parties, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Right. Okay, then. Interesting. We have had the word rave used ...

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

That is something we try and distance ourselves from, because it comes up with the wrong perception.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Oh, you mean like a witness? Thank you. So we know that you had issues for the 2007 organisation of Jersey Live, but can you give us a history of what planning and organisation you need to undertake in order to deliver a good, safe event regarding Jersey Live?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Yes, there is lots of red tape obviously in Jersey, which at first we thought was difficult to overcome, and we saw it as an obstacle, but now we just see it as it is only going to make our event safer and safer. So we just overcome it now all the time. We are making our event so safe and we look to be the slickest event that there is, basically, but it is very difficult when some of these points come in and we are unable to mitigate and things like that, so we feel a bit frustrated then.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

What sort of help have you been given over the years to get this off the ground? Have you received any advice from any States department?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

On a one-to-one basis, it works really well, but then as soon it comes to the Panel, as such, it is quite difficult, if one ...

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You are talking about the Bailiff's Panel?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

The Bailiff's Advisory Panel, yes. If one faction there is against something that we have proposed, it seems like everybody is and we cannot discuss it kind of thing. We

have to go and discuss it on a single basis. We have to go and see them independently from the panel. It seems to stretch it out a little bit then, so the process.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think, coming back to your point, there are 2 ways in which we get advice for our event. Firstly, we pay a U.K. (United Kingdom) event management team to provide us with advice and to run the event on the day. Ultimately, the responsibility sits here, but our operation of the event is undertaken by a U.K. event management team who have experience of major events in the U.K., so that is obviously a huge cost for the business, but they provide input into that planning process throughout the year. So as well as having a paid event manager, you also have a paid security director and a paid health and safety director, among others. There are other operational positions, such as artist liaison who are also paid, but they are the relevant ones. So we take advice and soundings from them throughout the year, and they will have input into our event plan, which basically sets out how we will safely manage an event for up to 10,000 people, as it was this year. The other place where we get help and guidance from is from the individual members of the Bailiff's Advisory Panel. We have said in our report, and we have put it on record that the individual members of the Bailiff's Advisory Panel do provide time to us and do sit down with us and engage in constructive dialogue around their particular concerns with particular matters, that they are engaged to consider with regard to the wider licence application. We then meet with the Bailiff's Panel as a collective of representatives of these various agencies and their role is to - based on the facts presented and based on the event safety plan that has been presented to them - decide whether or not the event gets a licence. What that forum will not necessarily do is provide any guidance to us as organisers, so we are expected to take our soundings from our team and from individual members of the panel, go to the panel and present a plan, which will either be accepted or rejected. I think when you look through the event application timeline, which is part 2 of the report, you will see how that process unfolded with regard to Jersey Live 2007. So we did take a lot of advice internally and externally. I think one of the points that comes through in the submission is that we would like that whole process to become more structured and a little bit more transparent, such that when we talk to the panel, we are getting very, very clear guidance from them as to what we

have to do to make sure the plan works for them, rather than playing any sort of second-guessing game.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Thank you. That just brings me on to a question that we had already identified, because in your submission, you suggested that there should be 2 panels. One would be the Bailiff's Advisory Panel and the other you mentioned was the Economic Development Panel, who would consider whether a user-pays charge should be levied. Now, you made that suggestion, but had you given any consideration as to how you thought such a system would work?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

The suggestion - if I can start on this one - came about because we have had 4 years of operating this event and applying for licences, and each year, as you will have seen from this submission, we have had different issues to deal with and overcome. But operationally, the event has become stronger and stronger and I think the type of issues being talked about with the panel in the debrief meetings has become less and less significant. So going into the licence application process for 2007, we were very comfortable that we were in a very good position, and we thought that the granting of the licence would be much more of a formality. However, the process became, really from our perspective, incredibly entwined with the user-pays discussion that was going on at around the same time, and that is a highly emotive and political matter. We thought that there was a need to divorce those 2 issues, so we could go and talk to the Bailiff's Panel about operational and logistical matters which would have enabled us to get a licence in a timely fashion, and separately have a discussion around paying for a reasonable level of policing. Unfortunately, the way that the licence application process transpired in 2007 was that there were a number of steps that the panel asked us to go through, which we did, and then when we thought we had overcome the last hurdle, the whole issue of user-pays came up, and the issue that on Island resources, police resources would be struggling to deal with our event as well as maintaining their other duties on that weekend, and therefore, the only way that this event would get a licence is through us volunteering to pay for mutual aid policing. So we thought that the 2 issues should have been separately analysed, so the Minister who is responsible for economic development could assess whether our event was in the best

interests of the Island, and because clearly, we share a lot of information with him and with economic development about the event and the profile of our visitors et cetera, whereas we could focus the Bailiff's Advisory Panel on making sure that we were planning to run the event in a way that would give them comfort that our patrons would be properly looked after. That was the point we were trying to make. I think what the user-pays brought to this year's application process was it started to lead to some more strained relationships between us, and particularly the States of Jersey Police in the Parish of Trinity, both of whom we had worked with very hard over 4 years to establish a good and robust working relationship, and I think it did at times put our relationship under severe strain.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I know you have made that comment in the submission you gave us. Can you remember when user-pays was first mooted during your planning for 2007?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think if we look back - and I cannot quote on this - following 2006, it had transpired that the States of Jersey Police had drafted 9 specialist police officers; I think they were specialist in dealing with major crowd disturbances et cetera. Those officers we understand were in the Island but were never deployed to the event, but some questions were asked in the States following the event about the cost of that deployment and I think a figure of around £30,000 was being discussed. So I think at that point in time, we felt that user-pays was on the agenda, but we also felt that while we were not going to say we did not agree with user-pays, we wanted to ensure that any police deployment was proportionate, and that our own risk assessment, which we spend a huge amount of time developing - and as I say, we pay a big management team to help us to compile - was being reviewed by the police and was being considered by them in determining their level of deployment and thus the amount of cost that would ultimately be passed to organisers. So I think it goes right back to 2006, and it had sort of been in the background ever since then, but it was not until May 2007 that basically it was intimated, I guess, that we would need to be paying for policing for this event to happen.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You mentioned that relations were strained between you as organisers with the States of Jersey Police since you had become aware of user-pays. Why do you think they were strained? Was it because you had said you did not want to pay, or was it because you think the police were under pressure to arrange mutual aid from outside? Can you pinpoint the reason?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

I am not really sure it is any of those 2 factors. I think it was more we could not understand the way it was being assessed, our event, because there was no previous evidence that we needed such a heavy police presence there, and obviously from the report you have seen from Brian Schofield, the figures are just miles apart. So that is what we could not understand, so we were trying to question that, but we were unable to get the right answers.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

When you say it was strained, were you getting dialogue from the police? Were they being helpful to you? How was it different to previous years?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

When we have asked for certain answers to do with the subject, we have never been told how the police would assess risk about our event, which has been very frustrating for us, because we are, as an event organisation, very transparent; we have to be, obviously with the licence process. But for us to go and ask the police how they are going to deploy to our event, we would never get the answer. They will never give us any numbers, breakdowns of anything. So again, that causes frustration, because as a business, we need to know what we are supposedly going to be paying for if we are going to paying for anything. So that is where the frustration has lead to, just basically not being given the information that we required, really. We felt it was almost being forced upon us, the mutual aid costings. We were led to believe that if we had done a Friday and Saturday event, as opposed to the Saturday/Sunday which we proposed, then there would not be the need for mutual aid from off-Island, but because we were hoping to go for the Saturday/Sunday, we were then told that it could only happen if we were to ...

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Have the mutual aid.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Well, mutual aid would be needed if it was the Saturday/Sunday operation.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

What was the reason for the difference?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Again, we do not know.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Would it have made a big difference to you had it been on the Friday and Saturday? I understand that you feel that you would not have had such a good attendance.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

It is the natural progression to go Saturday/Sunday, and that is the natural weekend anyway, so it is the obvious to go for and then you would build out from there.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

We did pilots of a Friday night show in 2006, and it was our first foray into 2-night events. Fridays do not work in Jersey, because people work on a Friday. It was an evening show, it started at 5.00 p.m. - or the gates opened at 5.00 p.m. - and I think the main stage act finished at 11.00 p.m., so most people, by the time they had gone home from work and they have changed and they have taken a bus up to the site or something, it is 8.00 p.m. or 8.30 p.m. and people just do not see the value in that. When we were talking to the panel about the Saturday/Sunday, they proposed Friday/Saturday at the same numbers, so on the Friday 10,000 and on the Saturday, we knew that firstly, it would be impossible to sell 10,000 tickets for a Friday show based on our experience of the prior year, when we had sold about 2,500 tickets; and the second issue was that to get 10,000 people on to site takes about a 4 to 5-hour ingress. We can only process about 2,000 people through the gates in each hour, which is why on the Saturday it works, because our gates open at 11.00 a.m. and we

have entertainment then from 12.00 p.m., so there are some people who want to be there when the gates open; there are some people who will not want to get there much before the headline band is on. But the fact is, we have about an 8 or 9-hour period in which to get all of those people on to site. We could not do that with a Friday, unless again we opened the gates at 11.00 a.m. or 12.00 p.m., so the benefits of doing it on a Friday, from a policing perspective, dissipate again, because we are still going to need to have roadblocks manned. We are still going to need to have ordinary police - who also have day jobs to do - out of work on a Friday to do that, and we are going to need States of Jersey Police deployment throughout the entire day. So for many, many reasons, we knew that the Friday night show would not work and it had to be a Saturday/Sunday. The reason it had to go to 2 days and the reason we piloted that in 2006 was that now, the size of the event infrastructure is such that it is just not profitable to run a one-day show. Aside from the staging and aside from the PA system, basically everything else in 2004 had been provided on-Island, because the infrastructure had been much smaller. We now have a fence that circles the entire site; we have 100 security guys from the U.K.; we have the U.K. event management team; we have 2 articulated lorries of tower lights.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

3, yes.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

3, just to light the roadway back to St. Helier. We have a bigger stage. We have all of our lights in the production from the U.K. We have a lot of backstage staff now from the U.K. because the artists are bigger and they need to be looked after in certain ways, so we have also a lot more marquee-type structures. The whole infrastructure, everything about the event has grown, and to run that just on a Saturday would not be financially viable, and so it needed to move to 2 days. But Friday and Saturday would not have worked, for the reasons we have just discussed.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Also, when we were suggesting the Saturday/Sunday, we were told by the panel and obviously the Parish to firstly seek permission from the church within the Parish, which we went personally to see, myself and Mr. Holt, and we had the co-operation of

the church, so that was obviously the first hurdle. Then we were advised to write a letter to residents of the Parish, advised us to write to approximately 80 addresses, but we chose to expand that and write to up to 200. We had feedback from only 15 residents, and only 4 of them had concerns with regards to extending the festival to the Saturday and Sunday. So we believe that to be a majority vote, if you like.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

I think it was less than 3 per cent were in opposition anyway.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

So we were asked by the panel obviously to do things such as that, which we did do in co-operation and we feel we received positivity from doing that.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I know somewhere - and it is in this submission - you used the quote from the Constable of Trinity, Connétable Gallichan, and he spoke in the House about Jersey Live and he did say the event is very well organised. Do you think that you have now resolved any problems with the Parish as regards staging the event?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I do not think relations with the Parish ever broke down, I think they just became strained. I think they became strained because of the panel process we were going through, and representatives of the Parish now attend all of the panel meetings relevant to Jersey Live, which we are very happy about. But it became strained on 2 fronts: firstly because clearly the lead on this issue was with the States of Jersey Police, and I think there is probably a feeling that the police forces need to have a fairly joined-up view on this; and secondly, I think there was a concern by Connétable Gallichan that the event put an unreasonable strain on the police resourcing, expecting officers to come out for 2 days. However, having said that, the officers had supported us in 2006 by coming and policing the Friday and the Saturday event, and showed their support again this year by policing the Saturday and Sunday, and I think they almost had a full complement of honoraries in the end for this year. So I think those issues did dissipate, to a certain extent. But the Parish have always been very supportive of the event, and I think generally are now quite accepting of it. Of course,

the site - the Royal Jersey Cultural Society - itself is a world class site, and for that type of event, it is a very natural site, and the organisation itself are very, very accepting of the event and think it is an extremely important event for their own profile, as well for the profile of the Island.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I would like to follow up on something you just said about there now being a representative from the Parish on the Bailiff's Panel when Jersey Live is discussed. Who is that representative? Is it from the Honorary Police in the Parish, or is it ...

**Mr. W. Holt:**

It will either be John Gallichan, the Constable, or the Chef de Police, Phil Le Sueur.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I understand there is a standing invitation to both.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

To both of them. How did that come about? Was it at your request that they attended, or did it just evolve that they ...

**Mr. W. Holt:**

I think it is because it is so intertwined, that the Honorary Police, they are the jurisdiction in the Parish, so they look after their roadways, and I think they can invite in S.O.J.P. (States of Jersey Police) to help them police those roads. We have suggested that we bring over traffic marshals to lessen the burden on themselves, but they were a bit opposed to that at first, but we will keep trying, I think, and that would further help reduce the burden to the Honorary Police.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I am sure you are aware that as far as the Honorary Police are concerned, they draft in officers from other Parishes.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

That is right, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Is your communication with the Honorary Police only through the Chef within Trinity, or do you liase with the Honorary Police Association, which is the Island-wide?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Solely through the Parish.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Through the Parish.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

The only other communication we have is the likes of Paul Atkinson, but that is more to do with car parks, so it would naturally involve the traffic management.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Thank you.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

You have mentioned several times with regard to transparency and your frustration with not knowing how your plan was reacted to by the police and what influence it had. Do you feel though generally that the experience that you demonstrated and built up in previous years is taken into consideration by the panel? Do you have any evidence of that; I mean, what has gone before?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

It is difficult really, because when we speak individually to the members of the panel, we feel we get great positivity and they feel we are competent to be able to deliver a safe event. It is when the panel become a collective, it is - I do not know, it is difficult to put a word to it - just like people are scared to sort of speak out of turn, that they do not want a show a level of support, because they might get looked down upon by another Panel member. That is the feeling that comes across. I am not sure whether that is the actual case, but that is the feeling that we pick up on.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Interesting.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

But we prefer individual Panel meetings, because we feel it is more productive and less daunting, really.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

In an ideal world, we would have the individual discussions with individual Panel members, consolidate their thoughts into our plan and present the plan once and that would be it. It has not yet transpired that way, but in an ideal world, that is what would happen. I think the problem is that when the panel as a collective basically turn down the licence application, I think the problem we have is getting from that Panel as a body clarity on the reasons for that, and there is some correspondence, but I think it is difficult in the face-to-face environment to get that out, and often then it is a matter of having the meetings with the individual members to really understand their issues and their concerns.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Can I come back to this: you mentioned the correspondence, because we have spoken to an event organiser, and from my understanding of that witness, when they have appeared before the Bailiff's Panel, they then have never had a written confirmation that the licence is going to be granted, it is just accepted at the meeting. So do you get the written confirmation?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

This is the same Panel we are talking about here?

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Yes.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

No, all we get is basically a communication from Heather, which is David's secretary, via email to come in with the licence fee and to basically pay for that, then we will be issued the licence. We do not get any formal sort of written letter in terms of ...

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think what I was referring to is the fact that this year - because on at least 2 occasions, the original licence application was turned down - we received some correspondence explaining reasons, which we have then gone back, so there was quite an extensive chain of correspondence this year between the Bailiff's chambers and Jersey Live.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

But that was in the case of being refused an application?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

But it is not as extensive when it is being approved?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

None of the event licences that we have gone for have ever been accepted at an actual Panel meeting. It is always a fortnight after, something like that, that it is either accepted or rejected, is it not?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

I think we have had, in the most speedy case, an email back after 3 or 4 days just to say to come in and obviously pay for the licence itself. That is the kind of communication that we get, but we do not get a formal written letter of acceptance, so to say, do we?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

No.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

I know we have had an evolution from a one-day now to a 2-day, but do you see that is the format you are going to follow? I am just trying to get at whether you have established all the parameters that could change and whether in future, it might be easier to have a speedy approval or otherwise.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

The event is organic, so we cannot really put any boundaries to it, really. You know, all we can do is supply for the demand, and as safely and as efficiently as we possibly can, bearing in mind restrictions of being on an island. You know, it is a cost burden in itself, just being able to produce the event, but again, as long as the demand is there from the general public, then we will just keep going as much as we can, really.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I would like to come back to something that one of you mentioned quite a lot earlier, and you were talking about the attitude of the States of Jersey Police. I understand that you offered to pay for the mutual aid provision that may be necessary. Did the attitude of the police change after you had made that offer?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think it generated forward momentum, again. I think the process had stalled. I think if we had not made that offer, I think we would have had a really very serious issue. I think we made the offer around the middle of May, so we were talking about 12 or 14 weeks away from the event date. It was absolutely pushing it to the wire at that point, because we had to confirm all of the infrastructure arrangements. There is so much to do in putting this event on, and it takes the 2 Warrens the year. You know, the work starts sort of the day after the festival finishes for next year, and so we really did feel that the event, by mid-May, was in jeopardy.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Were you ever told that if you refused to pay or chose to not pay, the event would definitely not go ahead?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Not in this format.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

No. I think we were probably quite clearly told that basically, the event would not be supported on a Saturday/Sunday unless we were going to help the police to deal with their resourcing issue. Now, the only way that that was going to be possible was through enabling them to bring in outside officers, and it was clear that we were going to have to pay the bill for that.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So did you have an option to reduce the profile of the event and not pay a charge for additional policing?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Yes.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

To do it on a Friday and Saturday.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Well, there is the Saturday/Sunday, but we were told that it would have to finish at about 7.00 p.m., which was basically a tea party.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So it was a commercial decision to go ahead on your part?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

I was away for 2 weeks on holiday, so I missed some of the crucial meetings.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

It was commercial, yes.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes, it was a commercial decision.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

It was to grow the event into a professional event. It is a real festival now.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

But I think at the same time, we were making that commercial decision, and we were also making commercial decisions around our security arrangements, for example, and confirming that we were growing our U.K. security team from 50 people to 100 people. We were doing everything we possibly could, we felt, to relieve the police burden as far as possible, and we also felt that our event plan and risk assessment was such that we were not expecting the level of police deployment that ultimately transpired.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

But you never knew, you never were told how much comfort your assessment had given the police authority?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

No. When the offer was made to pay reasonable costs of policing, the original response from the police was that the cost would be somewhere within a range, the lower end of the range assuming that a full complement of honorary officers could be found; the high end of the range being, if you like, doomsday scenario, no honorary officers and so an awful lot more mutual aid officers. But that was it. This is the point I think that Warren was making earlier, we did not see a risk assessment that supported that level of deployment at that point in time and thus their cost.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I believe that you have seen the risk assessment that the States of Jersey Police ...

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Yes, we received that just recently.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Yes. Have you seen it in previous years?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

No.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You received it only at your request?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Under the Code of Practice, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Because it seems to me that it was relatively recently that you saw it and I just wondered why it had taken so long, but it is obviously because you requested it. Did you receive it soon after your request?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

21 days, to the max. We requested it last year, but we were told that due to obviously operational intelligence that we were unable to see it.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Was there a reason given then for you being able to see it this year?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Just because we requested it on the correct terms.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So these documents are available if you go about it in the right way?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Using the Code of Practice, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Presumably that will be something that you will continue to do then?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Well, I think looking at the risk assessment in hindsight is useful, to a point. I think what we want as organisers is to be much more engaged in proactive dialogue with the States of Jersey Police at the outset and involving our Director of Security, who brings a whole wealth of experience to this, and sitting down and talking to the police and saying: “Look, what do we need to do, if anything, or what do we need to demonstrate to you that will help you to reassess your deployment levels?” because in our mind, the risk assessment is not supporting the level of the deployment necessarily being talked about. So we want to talk in advance and have some input maybe into a risk assessment and utilise the professionals that we are engaging and paying a lot of money to have on a team to have that dialogue with the police; as much as anything to try to give them comfort, because I think this year, they have come from the event praising the security team and praising the organisation of the event. You know, if we can provide to that comfort to them in advance in future, it might mean that they will assess the event very, very differently.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So when you looked at their risk assessment, were you able to understand their concerns at the level of policing that they required?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

There is nothing in there that reflects that.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

There is content, but we could not see specific risks that were significant, and more importantly maybe, we were looking at it from a perspective of: “Are there any risks here that our security operation would not be able to handle?” and there was not. Our security team cannot make arrests, so for that, you do need to have police, without a doubt, and there may be certain other functions that private security contractors cannot undertake, and the police would therefore have to take the lead on that, but we think they can be minimised, particularly within the confined area of the event site. Sometimes it is forgotten that as organisers, if we do not get our security arrangements right and there was an incident, then it would be incredibly damaging - if not terminal - to the event itself, and so it is not in our interests to take any shortcuts

when it comes to people's safety and the security of the event, which is why we invest so heavily. I think all we are saying is that has to be factored into any risk assessment being undertaken by the police or any other party, because there is an ongoing requirement for us to continue to invest in security, each year to develop it, to enhance it, to take points coming out of debriefs. I think that is the point.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

Can I just go to your second point that you raised, the fairly and consistently applied point: in your written submission, you stated that it was not clear how a commercial event would be defined. I was interested, Mr. Cunningham, I think it was you that said that Jersey Live was, in fact, a community event; in other words, you believe that community and commercial are not mutually exclusive. Can you tell me a bit more about that and also how you would define the difference between what should be charged for as a commercial event or not?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Well, I believe a community event is something that reaches out to all aspects of the community, so that is what I believe a community event is, whether it is a free event or a paid event. In terms of a commercial event, we have to be commercial, because we do not get state funding in any way, shape or form, so being able to deliver the quality of event which we do do year on year out, we have to obviously find revenue from that to be able to fund it. So in terms of what you see as community/free/commercial, we fall into the community/commercial, because we are self-funding, basically.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

So if there was a decision made to bring in a user-pays charge for certain kinds of events, do you have any idea of the criteria that you think should be applied?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

No, that is why we are here today.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

You are another one expecting us to have all the answers. Can I ask you, you must obviously know other people in your sort of field, do you have any idea what the buzz is - says she, trying to lapse into something like jargon - what other people are thinking about this user-pays charge? Do you know, for example, if there are events which people are holding off on organising because there is no certainty?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Obviously this is raising quite a profile. There are people waiting to see the outcome, the results, but it certainly sends shockwaves throughout. We are quite unique, our event, so it is very difficult to be able to comment, really, on behalf of other people. But again, I suppose that is why we are here today, just because we are so unique. We can only compare ourselves against events like the Battle of Flowers or the Battle of Britain, because they are large-scale events. But we draw comparisons about the Flowers in many ways, due the fact that obviously they charge for tickets for entry, so does that make Battle of Flowers commercial? Because we are deemed commercial because we pay an entry fee, but so do the Battle of Flowers, but for some reason, the Battle of Flowers are not classed as a commercial event. They are funded by the State, which we are not. They have corporate investment; we have some corporate investment, so there is many ways where we compare, but we are the ones being classed as a commercial event.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You have had some States' funding though for this event, is that right, in the beginning?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Did you have advice and/or funding?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

We had no funding in 2004, but we had some advice. That was the launch year. We had some funding in 2005 and 2006. There was one tranche of fundings which we

took the benefit of over 2 years and then we have had no funding in 2007. In 2005, the funding was provided, and we can talk to you in a private moment about numbers in more detail, but the quantum of the funding was not hugely significant, but it was important to us at that point in time, because we were building an event from scratch.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I wonder if perhaps we could touch on that just near the end, when we have finished the public part of it.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

But the interesting point there was that the then people responsible for tourism felt that providing some funding to early stage events to enable them to get off the ground, such that they could then be self-funding and not come back asking for handouts year after year, was a far preferable position, and that particularly where those events were - and even back in 2005 - clearly demonstrable that they will bring meaningful numbers of tourists into the Island. We sell most of the tickets online for Jersey Live, we can track where they are being bought from. There has been real take up of tickets from overseas, so I think in that regard, it has been successful. I think moving forward, we have not - and we are not expecting to have - any grants going forward. We have worked incredibly hard to build a business which is able to stand on its 2 feet, notwithstanding the huge cost of doing so. As Warren has alluded to, the user-pays charge, if it comes in, you asked about the impact, I think the user-pays charge has an impact on our visitors, on our patrons who come to the event, because it has been said to us by a couple of people: "It is you, the organisers, that get charged for the policing and you have to decide whether you pass it on to your ticket purchasers." We turn that on its head and say: "Well, no, because this is one-trick pony. Our business operates the Jersey Live event and nothing else, and therefore we have to have the right level of revenue to discharge all of our costs." Therefore, by default, if we know that we are going to have a significant policing bill, that will be built into the ticket prices. There is nowhere else for it to go and so the impact of user-pays is potentially to charge a - and this is where our first point came from - sort of additional tax on people who are buying tickets for the event, many of whom are Island residents who pay tax. Of course, the business itself, being commercial, is a tax-paying business, and therefore it is benefiting the Exchequer by paying its taxes also.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

We have had some evidence - or submissions, should I say - put to us that the user-pays policy is targeted solely at Jersey Live. How do you feel about that?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Our concern was that the definition that was being discussed in some of the papers that we have referred to basically served to, if you like, focus on to Jersey Live and basically to cut all of the other events out of it. It comes back to the point, how do you define tradition? If Jersey Live had been set up 10 years ago, 15 years ago, would it now be traditional? Would we not be the guys sitting here, would it be someone who had set up some other event? I do not know.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You may be interested to know that we have been told that it is considered about 7 years is the length of time for an event to have been established enough to be regarded as traditional over here.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

So we had 2 years to go for that. There would be no discussions.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So bad timing, guys.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

But sorry, coming back to that point, I think the point Warren made is that you have other events that charge a ticket fee and that also have the need for policing, and therefore on a consistently and fairly applied basis, you would expect to see them being charged and them making whatever adjustment they need to make to their ticket prices. I think the problem we have at the moment is the sort of people who come to our event are the sort of people who will not go to Battle of the Flowers; they will not go to an air display; they will not go and watch a marathon; they will not go and watch the Jersey Rally, necessarily. You know, all of these things are being policed for free. They come to Jersey Live and they are being double taxed, because they are

being charged for policing and I think that is our issue. I think you cannot always be providing policing services to a group of events that benefit the same class of the community. There are so many people who talk about the lack of things for the youth of the Island to do, and then what you are in effect then doing is saying: “Well, here is a great event that a lot of the youth in the Island spend all year looking forward to, it is a world-class music event on their doorstep, and they are going to be charged an extra £10 or £15 a ticket to go and watch it because we have to cover policing fees.” That is where we see that there is a problem.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

But you have told us in your submission, and you mentioned it earlier, Mr. Corbin, that you do not oppose the introduction of user charges per se. Do you see this then at the moment we can only refer to P.94, which was the Home Affairs Minister’s proposition; do you see it as being an inequitable proposition?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes, I think that is exactly it, and I think that is exactly why we have listed those 4 principles. The 4 points are all very important, especially it cannot be just a tax or a way for inefficient spend or anything else to be recouped. Secondly, the fair and consistent application, we have just talked about that. I mean, that we see as being vital, because our event is providing content for a different part of the local demographic than, say, the Battle of Flowers or the air display. The third point about transparency, clearly the point comes through around these things; and fourthly, the fact that it is capable of mitigation is almost the most important point, because what we think is that we do not disagree that event organisers should be responsible for maybe the extraordinary police costs associated with policing the event, but that policing deployment has to be proportionate to the event and the police must take account of the significant measures being put in place by event organisers to keep that event safe, and the risk assessment that is being developed by those organisers, particularly where they are engaging outside help and people who are renowned within their industry for creating and hosting big events in the U.K.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

I was going to ask you before that you have mentioned in the submission that the level of police must be able to be scrutinised and appealed against. Who would you consider to be an appropriate arbiter if there was an appeal?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I do not know. It would have to be an independent arbiter. I do not know what the right person would be. I am an accountant, and in our business, if we have any sort of fee dispute with the clients, it would go to the President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, whoever that may be from time to time. Now, you would have to think about who the most appropriate person or body may be to act in that arbiter role. What we would envisage though if the upfront dialogue with S.O.J.P. became very constructive and positive and there was a lot of information shared with regard risk assessment et cetera, then we do not feel that we would ever get to that position, because we would have a position pre-event where we were happy with the deployment levels being proposed, and we were happy therefore with the approximate quantum of cost that might then rest with the organisers.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

I understand. It would be the best position never to get to that kind of scenario.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Exactly, and that would really be there only as a last resort, if something went wrong, but you always need to have that appeal mechanism.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I understand that you paid an upfront sum of money to the Home Affairs for the deployment costs of the mutual aid officers and until recently, I believe you were not sure how much you were going to be charged. It may have been that you needed to pay them some additional funding. Has that been finalised now?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

We had a call on Friday, as it happens - sorry, after the report had been issued to you - and the final quantum of that cost has now been communicated to us, although we have yet to see the final invoice and supporting statements in support .

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So this is what, 2 months after the event itself?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So were you given a timescale by which you would be notified?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

No, we were not.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So what do you consider this timescale to be? Do you think it is satisfactory or do you think it should perhaps have been quicker?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Well, we need to know beforehand, really, so it needs to be planned for.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Sorry, when you say “beforehand” do you mean ...

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Before the event itself we should really be given an idea. We did not know what it was going to be.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Agree the level of deployment and then we should have a better indication of what it is going to truly cost, rather than being left in the dark.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

We had to work on the maximum as such, yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

If you do not mind, I would just like to take some time to go through this and make sure that we have addressed the questions that we think we need to.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

I could think of a quick one to ask you, to keep you entertained. Can I ask you just a general question then: what experience do any of you have in organising events probably of a similar nature elsewhere outside the Island?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We do not have experience of outside of the Island of this scale, but we do have associations with friends of ours now who work with the Glastonbury Festival, the Reading Festival, the Leeds Festival et cetera and we take consultation from their experiences of how they deal with things relevant to our event as well, on scale. So we pick up on that really, yes.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

So that is what makes you really realise that perhaps you are out of proportion here; is that fair comment?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Completely, yes.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think we have done what any business in our position would be expected to do, and that is engage experts and consultants who have international experience; it is not confined just in the U.K., they operate very large festivals in the U.K. and they operate different types of events in the U.K. and so they advise us in terms of risk assessments, our event plans, the way we should go about doing things. Over 4 years, I think as a business, Jersey Live has learnt an awful lot.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

Absolutely.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

But there has always been an awful lot of steering and guidance from these consultants, and that is across all aspects; that is not just operational stuff we are talking about now, but right through artists and ...

**Mr. W. Holt:**

We have basically brought about 20 years' experience to our event, so it is not really 4 years old in that way. There is a lot of experience in our management team.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

You have talked about the consultation that you take. Can I ask you, did anybody at the time the proposals were being mooted - from the Government side, for example - consult with you about what it would mean? Were you ever involved in any discussions before these proposals came out?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

This is the first time.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

This is the first time we have had any.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

The first discussion?

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

So it proves the effectiveness of Scrutiny then.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

Well, I think we have to wait for the outcome.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

We listen to the public.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

We try.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

One thing I would like to touch on is P.94 was withdrawn as a proposition, so although the principle of user-pays as far as State services is concerned, it has been agreed by the States in 2003. As far as the policing of commercial and profit-making events is concerned, it has not been approved and it would need to come to the House for approval. How was it explained to you that you could be charged for this event, as nothing has been agreed by the States?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

The way we understood it, it was just mutual aid as such, not local policing. That is what I understood it as.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes. We were basically advised that our offer to pay mutual aid policing was going to be in effect a private agreement between us and the Minister of Home Affairs, but that there was power for that agreement under - I cannot tell you which piece of legislation but ...

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

That is what we are trying to find out.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

... a police law. Let me try and assist.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Because I think it is important, as it has not been formally approved, we should know how you were able to be charged in this instance.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think it was under the Police Force Jersey Law 1974, but ...

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

But you do not know the clause in there, it was not specified to you?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

The only clause that was referred to us was 8.1 or 8(1).

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Thank you.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

But we will be honest, when we had the draft agreement in the week pre-event, we were not in a position to start researching laws and things. We just had to make a commercial decision and sign the agreement.

**The Deputy of St. Mary:**

Another general one, I think: do you have any information that you could share with us - in open session, anyway - showing the economic benefit that Jersey Live could bring generally to the Island; how do you see it as benefiting?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think on a whole number of factors. I think if we look between sort of local and overseas, I think locally it is an important event. I think it comes back to what we were saying earlier about content for youth in Jersey can be limited, and I think people generally do, and it comes back to: "What is the buzz about this?" I think the buzz in the Island is that Jersey Live is a big event, youngsters love it, they look forward to it every year, they want it to happen, it is the whole - and Warren has often talked about it - feel-good factor in the Island. So it is very important for Islanders. I think in terms of the economic impact, and firstly tourism, in 2006 we calculated that we had 2,000 overseas visitors to the event, so that represents quite a considerable percentage of our crowd. That assessment was made by analysing bookings made on the internet site into the U.K. by tickets that were sold off-Island, either through Condor Ferries, who acted as ticket agents for us in the U.K., and through sales through an outlet in Guernsey, and also then an estimate for people who were here visiting friends and relatives, the V.F.R. (Visiting Friends and Relatives) or something, it is some tourism acronym. So we estimated about 2,000 people came,

and all of those people flew here. All of those people - because certainly historically, we have not been a camping event - would stay in hotels, or a large chunk of them did, visiting friends and family may stay at private addresses, but the hotels were definitely getting a very sizeable benefit. One or 2 campsites have maxed out because of people coming to the Island and the offers being put on. All of these people are on the Island, they are spending money. Within the event site itself, we have there what we call a food and entertainment village, so it is full of local catering stands, little shops selling trinkets and things like that. It has a real buzz, and that is all local businesses, so of course they are benefiting from all of this spend that is coming into the festival as well. I think it served to raise Jersey's profile. We had a lot of visiting journalists. Jersey Tourism have been very keen to invite visiting journalists to the Island and I am not sure offhand what the number have been in each of the last 2 years, but it is very significant and it is co-ordinated in the U.K. through a UK Press Council which is employed by Tourism, and this year, we had various national newspapers, but also music industry publications like *N.M.E (New Musical Express)* here. So it is pushing the Jersey brand into a whole different audience in the U.K., and we hope internationally in due course, because we do have plans to promote this more fully in France in particular, because of the links between France and the Islands. So we think there is a big benefit.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Also for the local bands and musicians. There are opportunities for them to join the main stage alongside some of the more prolific bands. Again, just to add weight to the tourism side, last year we received some public berating about not having enough tickets for locals, because we had sold so much off-Island, which proved the success for the appeal to off-Islanders, which again which gives us confidence to be able to expand the event to supply for the demand. So we believe the profile of the event is very, very strong for the Island.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You just mentioned the local bands, and in fact, we interviewed this morning Deputy Labey, who is the Assistant Minister for Education, Sport and Culture, and she has responsibility for culture, and she mentioned the benefit that the event does give to local bands by allowing them to ... is it Battle of the Bands, is it?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Yes.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We have various competitions leading up to it, but again, just with some of the bands we have had this year, there is one in particular called The Author who have gone away now to play some showcases in the U.K. They have themselves a record deal and are going to be engaging in a tour in the spring, so again, who knows what the future might bring?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

They are being nationally recognised, are they not, on radio?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Yes, but again ...

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

As a result of Jersey Live?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Well, part of it, you know?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Hopefully, we are a stepping-stone.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

But also the fact that they do get to enjoy their further success, and that is a showcase for all of them, and they will fly the Jersey brand. It is all part of the cogs really, is it not?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

When you think of it, everything helps, does it not? If you are an upcoming band and you get an opportunity to play on the same stage as Snow Patrol or Kasabian or

something, I think it gives you a real lift, and I think, as the guys are saying, while we cannot take credit for the bands that have gone off and sought their fame and fortune by moving to the U.K. and embarking on trying to get a record contract, it has to be a step in that. Certainly, 3 of the other bands who played on the big stage since 2005, and that is Velofax, the Valentines and the Author, they have all - Merge as well - gone to the U.K.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

To ply their trade, yes.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Now, that is not all thanks to Jersey Live, but Jersey Live has given them a taste of playing on a big stage in a festival, and I think it is important. Every year now, we advertise and pick 4 local bands to play on the stage. I think the number and quality of the people, the bands that apply to go into the Battle of the Band competition just increases and increases, and I think if you talk to any of those bands who have gone through that Battle of the Bands and who have had an opportunity to play on the stage, I think they would say it is a very important step in their musical careers. Of course, they come on the stage and it is not just turn up and plug in, you are having some of the best lighting and sound technicians in the country producing your show for that 20 minutes that you are on stage. So I think it is quite a special experience for them.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

I would like to come back to the commercial aspect of the event, and I am sure you must have St. John Ambulance representatives at the festival, and I believe that they submit an account for their services. Is that correct?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We offer a donation.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You offer a donation to them. Has it ever been put to you that perhaps you should consider - in fact, indeed, you may consider - making such a donation perhaps to the Honorary Police?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We do offer donations to the Honorary Police.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

They are not allowed to take money.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Yes, they are not allowed to take it, so it gets transferred to the charity of their choice.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Oh, right. Is that a regular occurrence for you?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Annual.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

Yes.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

You do do that?

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We were present on Saturday morning, a coffee morning at the Parish hall, about the Chelsea pensioners.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Done a donation.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Oh, yes.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

We offered our donation towards their cause.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

We are doing the Youth Club as well this year, the Trinity Youth Club.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

The Trinity Youth Club?

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Yes.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Last year, we invested in Trinity. We want to invest into the Parish as well, so there was a big investment in the football team in terms of buying all of the squads strips.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

They were going around in threadbare strips and now they have some non-threadbare strips.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Does it say "Jersey Live" on the back?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

Yes, of course.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

No, I think that washed off in the first wash.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Just a few more questions. I have picked up in your submissions that you say: "It cannot remain the case that policing deployment plans take no account of the

organisers own security and marshalling arrangements.” What do you have that they do not?

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

I think it just goes back to the process we had this year whereby we communicated as early as 10th October 2006 that we were growing our U.K. marshalling contingent from 50 to 100, having had praise from the panel as a collective around the quality of the marshals that had come from the U.K. and yet that did not have any apparent impact on the police deployment. Also, we have never really been engaged in a discussion with the police about our security team. In the sort of environment where our security director can come to the Island and he would sit there with the operational people from, say, Jersey Police and they have talked between them about how we as organisers can ensure the police take as much comfort as possible from the arrangements that were put in place. I think that really drives to the heart of what our submission is all about. It is the fact that we have to be able to mitigate these costs. They cannot just be allowed to go unchallenged.

**Mr. W. Cunningham:**

There is a lot of communication from S.O.J.P. to us as the event organisers on what they intend to do with our event. They do not give us access to their risk profiling pre-event which is why we are here now, suggesting that more communication is there so we can trust S.O.J.P. and they can trust us, that we both agree to the right deployment of officers that are needed for the event which is proportionate. We just feel very frustrated that this has never been the case and obviously now we are facing the single biggest cost ever for Jersey Live.

**Mr. W. Holt:**

Brian Schofield, who is an independent advisor ... it is kind of summarised in that comparative chart that he does. It is so far up those figures; that is basically what our concern is. They are not considering our security.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

We believe that we would never be given a licence if ... what we propose within our plans. We believe we have got a robust event plan that details every particular aspect.

If they were not trusting within that plan then we would not have the licence for them to be told that there is going to be an extra deployment of police officers over and above what there has been in the past. It is frustrating, I think, is the word.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Sorry to be taking so long but I think it is important that we cover the issues that your submission has raised. In it you stated that you, as organisers, were concerned that potentially the States of Jersey Police were utilising the event for the purpose of potentially developing intelligence and/or targeting known criminals. I wondered whether you had any evidence of that or whether it was just a summation that you made.

**Mr. M. Corbin:**

That really comes from ... in fact, we will talk about that off line if we can.

**Deputy D.W. Mezbourian:**

Okay, that is fine. I think we are finished. I think in that case I would like to thank the public for attending for an hour and a quarter. It has been quite a long hearing but I would like to ask you to leave now please as we go in camera for the final part of the hearing. Please come to any future Scrutiny hearings that we have; you are always welcome.