



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF GUERNSEY

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT

COMMITTEE

The Committee *for* Home Affairs
Public Hearing

HANSARD

Guernsey, Thursday, 13th September 2018

No. 3/2018

*All published Official Reports can be found on the
official States of Guernsey website www.gov.gg/scrutiny*

Members Present:

Panel Chair: Deputy Chris Green – President
Deputy Laurie Queripel – Vice President
Advocate Peter Harwood – Non-States’ Member
Mrs Gill Morris – Non-States’ Member
Mr Mark Huntington – Principal Scrutiny Officer
Mr Alistair Doherty - Advisor

Ms Lisa Wonnacott - Scrutiny Officer

Business transacted

Procedural – Remit of the Committee3
EVIDENCE OF Deputy Mary Lowe, President; Mr Adrian Lewis, Chief Secretary3
The Committee adjourned at 11:00 a.m. and resumed at 11:10 a.m..... 29
The Committee adjourned at 12:10 p.m. 44

Scrutiny Management Committee

The Committee *for* Home Affairs Public Hearing

*The Committee met at 10 a.m.
in the Moulin Huet and Petit Port Rooms, St Martins Community Centre*

[DEPUTY GREEN *in the Chair*]

Procedural – Remit of the Committee

The Chairman (Deputy Green): Good morning. I would like to welcome everybody here today – elected representatives, our witnesses, senior public servants and members of the public.

Our session today is one of our regular public hearings looking at major issues of public and political concern, and our focus today is the implementation of transformation processes within the Committee *for* Home Affairs. This is the second in a series of SMC public hearings focussing on public sector transformation.

Our Panel today comprises myself, Deputy Chris Green, Vice-President Deputy Laurie Queripel and our two non-States' members, Mrs Gill Morris and Advocate Peter Harwood. Following this event the Committee will decide whether any further review activity will be commissioned on this area.

Turning to the arrangements for today, I can confirm that the *Hansard* transcript from these proceedings will be published in due course. Please can I ask anybody who has mobile phone devices to put them on silent. It is essential during our session that the Committee is able to hear from our witnesses without any interruption from the Public Gallery.

EVIDENCE OF Deputy Mary Lowe, President; Mr Adrian Lewis, Chief Secretary

The Chairman: Can I turn to our two witnesses? Deputy Lowe firstly, could you just introduce yourself?

The President (Deputy Lowe): Yes, I am Deputy Mary Lowe, President for Home Affairs.

The Chairman: Thank you very much.

Mr Lewis: Adrian Lewis, Chief Secretary to the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

The Chairman: Good morning.

25 Okay, before we start I should declare an interest, in that most people know I am a practising
advocate; some of the issues this morning will touch on criminal justice processes and justice
policy. But without further ado I think we will start in relation to the transformation of public
services within the Committee for Home Affairs.

30 In actual fact, before we do that we will turn to some budget matters which will then lead in
seamlessly to transformation issues.

Deputy Lowe, in July of 2018 the indication was that there was a forecast overspend for the
Committee for Home Affairs at over £400,000; is that still the position today?

35 **The President:** There still maybe an overspend. Certainly we cannot actually say how much
exactly yet that it will be. We are hoping to be able to make a return on as close as we can to the
actual budget amount, but that may not include the 1%. P&R are fully aware of that as part of the
oversight board. We met with them before the oversight board to make them aware of that staff
level at both Home Affairs and P&R ... are aware of what is going on. Equally, so are our service
chiefs and those that are under the actual Committee...we really need to see if we can make some
40 more. They are fully aware of that. There is quite a lot of pressure on that.

The Chairman: The figure for the forecast overspend in July was £400,000; are you able to
pinpoint what that figure is today in terms of what is the forecast overspend at today's date?

45 **The President:** I cannot give you an exact figure. I mean Adrian may be able to but –

The Chairman: Mr Lewis?

50 **The President:** I just wanted to finish. But there are items that we have approached P&R that
they may be able to assist under delegated authority, because the very nature of Home Affairs,
the way they operate and because of the Prison, there may be items where there is unforeseen
expenditure which these days you cannot have a contingency on a budget for unintended
circumstances. So as an example, if you have got youngsters in the wing – what they call the
juvenile wing, the children's wing, and remember 17 is classed as a child under the Law – it means
55 the resources have to be moved across and it means overtime. So that type of thing you cannot
account for that and of course we have had people in that wing –

The Chairman: Mr Lewis, are you able to update us on what the forecast overspend is today?
It was £400,000 in July.

60 **Mr Lewis:** Our current predictions are it has come down. We are currently looking at closer to
£200,000, but again that still has not included the 1% saving that we would like to be making.

65 I do add a caveat though, as a civil servant for a number of years, that when we are talking
about £200,000 or £400,000 in the context of a £30-plus million budget, you are talking about
fractions of 1% and it is very difficult to give solid assurances to say you will hit whatever figure.
Clearly, we need to be as close as we can to the budget; ideally we would be below it, but our
situation is marginally improving on when we last reported.

70 **The Chairman:** It is a very simple question. Why are you going to be overspent for 2018?
Deputy Lowe.

75 **The President:** I can answer that. Part of that as well is that we have had two very large Police
investigations that are still ongoing. Again, as I said before, with the nature of Home Affairs and
the Police, we cannot turn around and say, 'We are not going to investigate that.' There are
certain areas of the Police, when something comes to their attention that they have no choice,

they have to do that. That costs an awful lot of money with some of these investigations. So there is an element of that. That is why P&R are aware of that.

80 **The Chairman:** Is that an element of the £200,000?

The President: Yes.

The Chairman: What kind of percentage of that would that be?

85 **The President:** Probably approaching half?

Mr Lewis: Yes.

90 **The Chairman:** What about the other half?

The President: Some of that would be the Prison and also the HMIC report as well, there is the unaccounted money for that because we could not put it in for the budget because of the timing issue on that one. So that is probably where we are on those two areas.

95 **The Chairman:** Obviously it is agreement of budget time, in terms of budget for 2019. Have you reached a full agreement with Policy & Resources on your budget for next year?

100 **The President:** We met with Policy & Resources last week and I have to say I am quite pleased to actually inform Policy & Resources that we have not looked for extra money because we have made it very clear to all the services that we want to be corporate, we want to make sure that we can try and stay within a reasonable amount. There are lots more we could do and of course we are aware that other politicians or the public are saying, 'Well, Home Affairs should be doing this, they should be doing that.' That is all about prioritisation and for us it is important that we try and put forward a budget that is fair and reasonable, as I would hope all the other committees would do. We have not got lots of money.

The Chairman: Have you reached agreement with P&R on the budget allocation for next year?

110 **The President:** They have not come back to us yet, but we met them and they were very receptive to us. They were very pleased at the budget that we put forward and they will let us know in due course once they have met with the other committees on how they are going to deal with it.

115 **The Chairman:** There is no indication at this time how far apart you are? You believe you put your bid in, you believe it has been received relatively well, but technically you are still waiting to hear from them?

120 **The President:** Sure, I mean there are three or four areas that they actually mentioned and they questioned us on that and they were satisfied with the answers that we gave them for the reasons of our budget.

125 **The Chairman:** Okay, just before I turn to transformation as such, I think the last time you spoke to us was June 2017 – doesn't time fly! – I think at that stage you indicated that you were spending something around £600,000 on overtime payments for law enforcement officers. I think you told us at that stage that as a political board you very much got the message and you had told that message to the Law Enforcement and they had to sort that out. Can I ask you have you been able to tackle that issue with overtime payments in Law Enforcement?

130 **The President:** Yes and no. The message has gone very clear to Law Enforcement and indeed across the services, but Law Enforcement is the highest one for overtime, and again it goes back to the nature of the business. Some of these large –

The Chairman: Can I ask what the figure is now?

135 **The President:** The current figure for across, for all of law enforcement overtime... Have you got it there?

Mr Lewis: I think it is of the same scale as it was last time.

140 **The President:** It is not far off what –

The Chairman: Six hundred thousand pounds?

145 **The President:** Yes. I was looking to see if I had the exact figure for you, which I may have. I can look on the spreadsheet but if not what I can do is I can actually let you have it at a later date, (**The Chairman:** Later on.) if that is okay with you?

The Chairman: That would be great.

150 **The President:** But no, the message is very clear, and of course if you have got a situation where – it is in the public domain but I am not going to mention names or particular instances here, you cannot turn round and say you are not going to look for somebody because they are missing. It is a requirement, it is human nature, it is our responsibility to make this Island safe and secure, and our community safe and secure. If it means that there is overtime to go and look for somebody or if there is a serious investigation we have a duty and we are duty bound to do that, and that is where a lot of the overtime comes in.

The Chairman: Advocate Harwood.

160 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I follow up on that? Last time I think we identified that one of the reasons for the overtime was actually you had a lot of vacancies. Is that still the situation? Is it your vacancy factor really that is driving the matter of overtime and other law enforcement officers are having to fill?

165 **The President:** There are some vacancies. I am not sure of the numbers for what we are talking about for the gap between the two, but I think, as with all the services, they try to make sure that they are operating within the amount of staff that they have actually got. It is so wide, as you would know, if you are talking about Law Enforcement, the Fraud Department, if you are talking about the court section; you are talking about the domestic abuse section, the area there. It is vast. Talking about the criminal side of it. It is huge, so it is not a case of it is just one area in Home Affairs.

The Chairman: I think Advocate Harwood's question was basically, if I can put it –

175 **The President:** I understood his question.

The Chairman: Yes, I am just not quite sure what the answer is. Is the amount of overtime actually linked to the lack of police officers?

180 **The President:** There would be an element of that, there is bound to be. If you have got staff vacancies there is bound to be an element. Equally, if you have got people on holiday, which that is always catered in, but if you have got people on holiday and you have got an incident that has happened on this Island you have to pay overtime; it is not something you cannot do.

185 **The Chairman:** Are there particular patterns with overtime payments? Are there particular times of the year when it might spike higher or is it fairly consistent?

The President: Not really. When you look at it – and again I can let you have that because we have got all of that and we have the breakdown –

190 **The Chairman:** I think that would be useful actually.

The President: Yes, we have that monthly and it will show all the services; it will show Fire and Rescue, there is hardly anything; it will show the Prison –

195 **The Chairman:** I think that would be useful.

The President: It will show Law Enforcement. So you are welcome to have that, certainly.

200 **The Chairman:** Thank you.
Advocate Harwood.

Advocate Harwood: Can I just make one final point on this?

It has often been said, I think particularly with blue light service delivery, that there is a lot of illness relating around stress and that can contribute to overtime pressures. (**The President:** Yes.)
205 Is that particularly prevalent within your Law Enforcement organisation?

The President: Yes, very much so. Yes, it is a stressful job and sometimes can be quite an unpleasant job with some of the things that they have to deal with. Obviously the support services are in there for them to be able to cope with that and to be able to obtain that support, but
210 equally we do get staff that are stressed and will go off sick, as with a lot of the other States' departments. It is not just Home Affairs, but certainly with the nature of some of the difficulties that they have to deal with it is understandable.

215 **The Chairman:** Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Do you think, Deputy Lowe, the amount of support and counselling available to staff is adequate or could it be improved to help with their resilience in regard to ...?

The President: No, my understanding is it is there if they wish to have that support and obtain
220 it if they wish to do so. There has not been a request for us to actually take on more or that there is a failing on that side. There is an awful lot of support within the States, across the States, anyway so I do not actually see there is a gap there. We would hear about it because, as the Home Affairs Committee we scrutinise the accounts and everything that is going on; we have the business monitoring meetings. So all the service chiefs come in separately, they have a
225 considerable amount of time, so not everybody comes in and they have got a five-minute slot. They have all got a considerable amount of time with the full committee. They are questioned quite in depth about what is going on, if there are resources that are needed, what the problems are, what we can do as a committee if it means changing policy or if it means that there are more resources required. So we work very closely with all of our sources.

230

The Chairman: Do you think the welfare issues and stress levels in the Guernsey Police Force and suffered by officers locally are broadly comparable with other jurisdictions or do you think it is worse or better?

235 **The President:** As I do not live in the UK or other jurisdictions I cannot answer that. I have no idea.

The Chairman: I wondered whether as a board you have looked at the data?

240 **The President:** You see it on the news and you see in newspapers and things, but from our point of view we work very closely with our staff and our staff are important to us and so it is not a case of you just accept that there is a problem, you deal with that problem and put the resources into that.

245 I cannot see that we would be any different. We are probably lower if anything because of the small jurisdiction that we are and because it is more personalised in not having a very large police force that you are able to deal with that. But I have not got those numbers at all. It may be that the Sergeants have, but I personally have not got that information.

The Chairman: Yes, Mr Lewis, do you think those enquiries could be made?

250

Mr Lewis: We can. I can probably give you a short answer now insofar as while it has not been published, we have had sight of the draft of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary Report which clearly was able to compare the UK with Guernsey and in many areas, including things like morale, turnover, etc., Guernsey is fairly comparable with the UK. So it did not flag up anything to say Guernsey is off the scale in terms of stress levels or anything like that.

255

The Chairman: Okay. Alright, thank you.

260 Can we turn to transformation? Deputy Lowe, you have already mentioned the Oversight Group that has been set up, as I understand it, jointly with P&R and your committee to look at longer-term transformational change as well as more short-term tactical savings.

Do you think the setting up of that group was recognition at some level that not enough progress had been made by Home Affairs hitherto on transformational change?

265 **The President:** No, not at all.

What we did at Home Affairs is that, working again with the staff, we had short-term, medium-term and long-term looking at the transformation. Looking at the short-term, it was very much a salami-slicing; there was not really the addressing of main issues of areas that we could address being in the medium-term plan, that we could see there was potential for savings.

270 So what we did as a committee is we wrote to P&R and we said, 'We would like to come and discuss this with you because it is important that you are aware of it and also important that the resources we require to do that ... so could we come and talk to you about it? We met with the committee; they were very welcoming. They were pleased to hear that we were so active as a committee, looking at it right across the board and we asked if they would be prepared to have an oversight board with us so that we could spend more time going into that in depth.

275

The Chairman: It was P&R's idea?

The President: No, it was ours.

280 **The Chairman:** It was your idea. Okay, sorry, I misunderstood.

The President: Yes it was ours. We wrote to P&R and asked if we could meet them. (**The Chairman:** Home Affairs?) Home Affairs suggested that we met with P&R and we explained about the short-term, medium-term and long-term and how the salami-slicing was not going to achieve as much as what we wanted for the medium term and really we should be looking at that as well – but it is bigger than that. So we asked P&R at that meeting if they would be prepared to work with us, we needed their help. Because it is across other committees as well and because of the resources that would be required, we asked P&R if they would be prepared to have an oversight board with us at Home Affairs and they said, 'Absolutely,' they would be delighted to do so. We have met as an oversight board now four times and it has been extremely helpful. Really helpful.

The Chairman: When did it start? When was the first meeting?

The President: Was it in June, possibly?

Mr Lewis: Yes, 13th June.

The President: They were very quick, at our request again, 'Could we meet as soon as we could?', which we did and they have got the message as well because they are keen to help us, that it is not a case of just a meeting and then off you go; there are action points in there, they have put in the resources in there, they are helping us. Certainly from the meetings that we have attended, they are quite enthused at what we are trying to do and are supportive of that. Because again we have looked at it with the staff, we have looked at it as a committee. The staff have come up with ideas, we have come up with ideas, discussed it with staff; all of that has been relayed across to P&R. They have had all the documentation as well. Then again just before the last meeting with P&R, which was this week, we had a meeting at Home Affairs and it was dedicated to going through the whole sheet again of the short-term, medium-term and the long-term, so we could revisit all of that, prioritise it again: 'That is not achievable, that would take too much resources, let's see what we can do here and take that forward to P&R.' They have been involved with all of that. They know everything that is involved with that.

The Chairman: There is joint working going on.

Can I ask the \$64,000 question, which is when can we expect to hear news of progress of actual transformational change? That is what we need to see, isn't it. When can we expect to see some progress?

The President: There will be information passed out at the Budget Report when the Budget comes out and that is what P&R are aiming for, as are we as well. We are trying to get some of this work through so that Members will be aware what we are trying to do between the two of us. But, certainly across the other committees as well, we need their help with some of those things.

The Chairman: Yes, we will come on to that.

The President: P&R have been helpful. They have agreed as well we have got a resource that somebody started last week working with us, solely working on all these different projects which are the short term and the medium term to gather –

The Chairman: As civil servants seconded from P&R?

The President: A well-qualified senior civil servant who is able to come and work with us, bringing all of these projects together, getting it together, what resources are going to be required to do that, because we have not got that spare resource. So they are very keen to help us on that so we have got this person who is going to be with us for a couple of months.

The Chairman: Deputy Queripel.

335

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Yes, you mentioned that salami slicing is not the way to go, so you have got to be focusing on transformational savings. We know we are going to get a progress report in due course, but can you give us an example then of the sort of initiative that you are thinking of in regard to transformational savings – perhaps that have been agreed between yourself and P&R?

340

The President: Okay, obviously the property rationalisation is one of the key ones for us because we have got to be out of Les Vardes House by May next year and so we need to be able to deal with that quite soon.

345

The Chairman: Is this the Host project?

The President: No, it is no longer called 'Host', it has a new title.

350

Deputy Laurie Queripel: It has transformed into something else!

The President: Yes, indeed it has. And that is good because –

The Chairman: How States like to change its name!

355

The President: – instead of just looking at Home Affairs and saying, 'Yes, that needs to come out and we will go there,' we are looking at it holistically and we are saying, 'Actually, do you know what, it would make sense, if possible, to have the Population Management Office with the Immigration Office,' so you put the two together. So that is the overview and the area that we are looking at, in consultation explaining it to P&R. It is important that instead of just looking and saying, 'Well, we would like this property because we have got x amount of staff,' actually we want to look at it and say, to make the whole of Home Affairs more efficient and to be able to make it better for our customers, let's see what we can do with amalgamating some; and then you have a building that would be more appropriate to be able to put some of these services in so that it is easier for our customers rather than bouncing them backwards and forwards down to the White Rock up to Frossard House.

360

365

So that is just an example of one of the areas that we are looking at and saying to them that we think that will be more efficient and it would be better for our customers.

370

The Chairman: I will come to that ... I will come to it now. *(Laughter)* **(The President:** Why not!) PwC had touched on a number of areas and one of them was what you have just alluded to – that Law Enforcement use a number of non-States' owned properties and therefore incur rent. Is that part of what you are likely to be announcing fairly soon; that there will be a kind of consolidation of the estate that Home uses and that some of these rented properties will no longer be used? **(The President:** Yes, but that –) Presumably that is something that could be done quite easily?

375

The President: We wish. Certainly you will be well aware that this has been raised in the States a number of times by myself and previously by Deputy Gillson when he was Minister. We were asking to get out of there. It is a large rent that we are paying.

380

The Chairman: Les Vardes?

The President: No, not Les Vardes. Well, Les Vardes, yes, but I am talking about Ozanne Hall, because that one is far more expensive for us. That is where the Law Enforcement comes in

385

because you mentioned Law Enforcement. **(The Chairman:** That is right.) Equally, we are operating from a police station that is really no longer fit for purpose. I mean the way everybody is squashed in there. So medium to long term, we are looking to say, well actually is it right and proper that we are operating from there, because further down the line it may be that we might
390 be able to have the police station somewhere else and look at that one.

But certainly regarding the Ozanne Hall with the Financial Crime Unit up there, that has got another three years; they have extended it because they were not able to find the right sort of premises for us in time, so that has been extended. Nevertheless, that will save us some considerable amount of money which will again be in the medium term and part of the
395 consultation with the P&R, the oversight board are fully aware of that, they tried to help us with that. So the property rationalisation is certainly one that is well on the table on the oversight board, because it has huge ramifications –

The Chairman: But what you are saying is these are not immediate or short-term savings, they
400 may be medium-term savings – three years or so down the line?

The President: The Les Vardes House will be, hopefully, but then you have only got to look at, we looked to make savings by moving Probation out of by the market. They have now moved. We have not been able to get that saving back because the way it operates the States have to let that
405 building and then we do not actually get that saving until they have let out where we move from. So it is sort of a false saving, if you like. We have moved, we have done what we were asked to do, because it was expensive, but they have not been able to rent it out yet.

So those are the type of things that will all be part of the rationalisation –

The Chairman: Yes, okay. My flow has been interrupted. I am just going to briefly go back to something and then I am going to come back to talking about specific examples.

I think what I would quite like to know is what your understanding is of what your committee has to save financially in 2018, in 2019, in 2020. I know that the Medium Term Financial Plan is basically our big picture policy in this area. I would just quite like to know what your
415 understanding is or what P&R expect from the Committee for Home Affairs for 2018-19. Are there specific targets?

The President: The 2018, P&R have asked everybody to get 1% below their budget for their savings, which we started right at the beginning of this, but it does not look like at this stage we
420 are going to be able to do it. That does not mean to say that we have rolled over and said, 'It doesn't matter,' it does matter for us. Even if we were a point of a percent, in the scale of things even though we have got £32 million budget, we would be talking about something like £50,000; it is still an overspend and we still have not been able to do the 1%.

The Chairman: Yes. What about 2019?

The President: Twenty-nineteen? I said to you before, we have put in a budget for which we believe for 2019 is a fair budget. We have not put in asking for a bucket load of money, we have recognised as a corporate player that the States have actually said, 'Isn't that money available?'
430 Again, that is discussing this with P&R and indeed with the oversight board. I believe they have welcomed our approach because lots of other committees are asking for a shedload of money. We have not gone down that route. We have actually said, 'This is our budget and this is what we would hope to be able to achieve with that budget.' However, there may be circumstances where we might not be able to get the 1% again. We hope to; our intention is to do so.

The Chairman: Can we just be very clear? Is it that P&R expect you to save another 1% in
435 2019?

440 **The President:** That was the States, wasn't it, that actually said that at the time. That was the States approval to be able to do that. (**The Chairman:** In 2019?) In 2018, but Deputy St Pier has actually gone out publicly and he has said that it may not be the same percentage across all committees in the future. We do not know the answer to that yet because until they say the Budget and what we can have, we are in the dark.

445 All we can say is that we have been, I believe, fair and very responsible and it is tough and the message – a very tough message – has gone through the staff, and from Adrian and Chelsea through to the other staff, that we have to be a team player, we have to make sure that we can try to operate within that amount.

The Chairman: How much do you think you could save in 2019?

450 **The President:** Well, how long is a piece of string really? I mean the budget we have put in is the budget that we believe we will hopefully be able to maintain. We could have another year, like we have had this year, with large investigations. We never know what is on the horizon with the type of work that we have got.

455 But our aim is definitely to be able to try and get in with the budget that we have put forward, otherwise we would be putting forward false figures and that is not what we want to do. We have put in figures that we believe and hope will be achievable.

The Chairman: Going back to the oversight board, where do you think the inefficiencies are with the Home Affairs mandate?

460 **The President:** I do not know if there are too many inefficiencies as such, where they are all operating efficiently in their own little areas. Where we see that there could be savings, as I mentioned before, was amalgamating some of those. So if we are able to do that we could possibly see where we could make some savings by amalgamating. But savings are obviously
465 important, but equally so is the service that we give and if you have got Law Enforcement you cannot have it to the detriment of the Island, that the Island no longer becomes safe and secure. That is right at the top of P&R's plan: to make sure this Island is safe and secure by having a very scrupulous committee, which I am very proud of. There is not much that gets past them, because we work so closely with the service chiefs and with the staff, with having that monthly meeting of
470 the accounts, or right across the board, and we have our business monitoring, so we know what is going on and we can send that direction of, 'You need to look at that. Is that a need or a want?' I have to say that very rarely happens. The message is very much there across the emergency services, the blue light services, of that is what we are looking for and there is not a lot of slack, if any. I mean Adrian might be able to add more to that but I do not think –

475 **The Chairman:** Mr Lewis.

Mr Lewis: May I clarify the question was what savings we have got to make? So it is £350,000 for this year, which we are saying we will struggle to deliver, and there is another area where,
480 because of the way things work, a few years ago we banked some savings on prison numbers having reduced and that was about £100,000. So because we have not delivered this year, one of our few-years-ago banked savings has not materialised because numbers have gone back up, that has been added. So our target for next year, if we do not deliver on this one, rises to £450,000. (**The Chairman:** I see.)

485 But I would also add in supplement to what the President has said: in terms of inefficiencies, maybe I would agree there are not a great many that are obvious – (**The Chairman:** There are not?) There are *not* – one of the challenges is the Home Department followed by the Home Affairs Committee, between the period 2012-13 to 2017-18 delivered a few tens of thousand pounds under £4 million of savings through the FTP and other things. That largely drove out many of the

490 inefficiencies which clearly led to ... things like the combining of Bailiwick Law Enforcement with
bringing together the Border Agency and Guernsey Police; a number of initiatives drove out
significant savings prior to the current phase of work we have got.

The Chairman: How do you reconcile this figure? I think, Deputy Lowe, when we spoke to you
495 last year you talked about the services and Home Affairs being down to the bone in terms of the
kind of post-FTP environment, but on the other hand we know that the three main spending
committees do have to pursue transformational change, certainly in the longer term, and that is
why we have had the PwC Report and that is why you have got the oversight group.

How exactly are you reconciling that though, because you are saying that there are not
500 particularly any areas of inefficiency? Where and how are those transformation changes really
going to be achieved?

The President: By amalgamating some of those, as I explained before really. You have got
property rationalisation which would make a saving for us and, equally, if we have the right type
505 of property and were able to amalgamate working together by having management structure for,
if you take population management and indeed, as an example, the passport area, there are going
to be efficiencies there, there are bound to be efficiencies.

Equally, if we have got a situation where – I mean this is not going to be short term, but if you
have got a new police station, as an example, and you have got the Fraud Unit who is not a mile
510 away – they are actually all on site, as Jersey ... Jersey have actually recognised that, so everything
now is on-site at their new police station and they are telling me the efficiencies and the savings
have been immense, and equally so much easier, so much quicker; they are all on the same
system for the computer and everything else. So there have been savings and efficiencies.

We would like to see that. We would love to see that at Home Affairs, but we are realistic; that
515 is not going to happen overnight. That is not the sort of saving we can achieve. That is the sort of
thing where we are saying to P&R, 'We can do more. Absolutely, we can do more. This is what we
would need to do. That would be a nice goal. Not a gold service, not silver; that is the bronze
service that we could do and we could have savings and make efficiencies of that.

The Chairman: Has there been an evaluation of what kind of quantum of transformational
520 savings we are talking about? How much money could be opened up? I mean I appreciate a new
police station obviously is going to require capital investment, but in terms of general revenue
savings –

525 **The President:** Yes, that is the bigger one, which is –

The Chairman: If we take it in turn, the property rationalisation, how much do you think that
could save?

530 **The President:** This is where the member of staff who has come across to help us on that ... all
that information to be able to scope some of these things that we have put forward, and they are
very keen for that to happen. The scoping process would take place with the member of staff. So
until we have got that member of staff who is able to get all that together, I am not going to
pluck numbers out of the air because that is too dangerous to do because it is misleading and it is
535 just –

The Chairman: Yes, okay. Alright, no I understand that. The other one you talked about was
540 amalgamation of the Population Management Office with the Passport Office, the Immigration
Service, and again do we know what sort of money we could potentially save, or has that work not
been done?

What I am trying to get at generally is how far along the road you are. Are these still at the ideas phase or are there things that have actually gone further?

545 **The President:** No, these are all in the idea phases, they are all part of the staff member that has actually come to help us. So probably if we were sitting in front of you in three months' time I could give you a lot more information, (**The Chairman:** Okay, it's a date!) (*Laughter*) but we are literally just there with the support that has come across and it would be wrong. I mean I do not think ... (**The Chairman:** Advocate Harwood, Deputy ...) Do you have anything to add on that?

550 **The Chairman:** Mr Lewis, yes, sorry.

Mr Lewis: It will be quite a few hundred thousands of pounds if we are targeting for 2020 and beyond, that potentially –

555 **The Chairman:** Is that the property rationalisation?

Mr Lewis: On the property. So as the President rightly said, at the moment there are 50 or so projects, multiple things, that we could do and it is a matter of prioritising which ones are going to deliver, in what timeframe are they going to deliver?

560 So with property there are savings – many of them are linked to dependencies on other committees and other services, whether it is with joint working, whether it is with support from Property Services, Law Officers and others. So there is a considerable dependency on all parties playing together. So property, there is real money.

565 **The President:** But that was why I was a little bit hesitant to give a number, because we have been there and done that and it does not materialise because of what is happening –

The Chairman: No, that is right.

570 **The President:** So I do not want to put my head on the block and you say in a year's time or the States in a year's time, 'Well, actually, you said you were going to be able to save that in a year's time.'

The Chairman: You cannot win either way. I know that, yes.

575

The President: No, we can't. We do not know until that scoping has been done and what have you, then we will be a bit more confident that may happen.

580 **The Chairman:** Is that same in relation to the amalgamation of the Population Management Office and the Passport Office, Mr Lewis, in terms of the numbers not having been done yet?

585 **Mr Lewis:** Yes, the numbers have not been done. That one is very conceptual, to say, again I pick up this point about transformation, they seem similar. It is about people and their right to do certain things and have a piece of paper that says, 'You are entitled to ...' and the view is actually there must be synergies in those two things and actually the way we manage them, and also in terms of supporting the customer to avoid the customer having to go one place to do something and then go to another part of the States to do something else.

590 So that one is just very early stage but the committee looked at it and said there seems to be an alignment there that we should try and pursue. It will not make a great deal of savings in terms of office space. Staffing-wise, we just look for efficiencies on that front. But I think that one is as much about transformation, a small amount of savings, but primarily can we improve the customer experience and make it easier for customers?

595 **The Chairman:** Just whilst you are on that, obviously trying to make the service better for the customer is a key part of all of our responsibilities, but I mean why does it actually necessarily take the requirement to save money by a transformation to look at some of these kinds of locational amalgamations because that is part of the day job, isn't it?

600 **Mr Lewis:** It is, but I think in the world in which we live money drives many things and money, or lack of it, prompts people to think differently, it forces innovation. So I think, yes, you are right, it is something we would be doing anyway, but when you are short of cash you then have to think differently.

605 **The Chairman:** It is the context.

The President: Yes.

Mr Lewis: Yes.

610 **The Chairman:** Advocate Harwood? Deputy Queripel?

Advocate Harwood: Can I just pick up, Deputy Lowe, you mentioned the potential savings and I think Mr Lewis was also talking about amalgamation; I can understand savings from property amalgamation and consolidation; I question actually whether, and to what extent, you can achieve savings through operational amalgamation.

615 For example, JESCC, is that an upstanding example of how you can actually make a saving? Similarly with putting together the Law Enforcement under one head, have you yet been able to quantify if there has been created any financial saving and/or efficiencies?

620 **The President:** I can come back to JESCC in a minute.

The Chairman: Yes, we will be.

625 **The President:** Alright then.

Mrs Morris: There is lots of JESCC coming up.

The Chairman: I think we might have jumped the gun a bit on that one. *(Laughter)*

630 **Advocate Harwood:** Your conversation on amalgamation of operations instigated my question.

635 **The President:** Yes, that is fine. I appreciate that, thank you. But also, and I was thinking of another one just before as well – we were talking about transformation and where there would be savings and more efficiency. The IT system is a definite one that we have difficulties with because it is a different system to the courts, so where as we would do it electronically, some of it has to be done on paper because the courts have not got that and it is not combined.

640 So there are inefficiencies within the States and indeed St James' Chambers. We need to be able to get all of that linked up. We have actually spent some money so probation now have got a very good system. We are looking to expand that out so that can be linked up to some of the others as well. So that again is another efficiency and saving which we receive the benefit of because it makes a huge difference if you start doing paperwork if you can do it on ... and it is circulated to all the others in the right area.

645 **The Chairman:** Yes, before I come back –
Sorry, Advocate Harwood.

Advocate Harwood: Maybe it is a question for Mr Lewis, but have you been able to identify any positive financial savings from the amalgamation of the Law Enforcement ... or putting Law Enforcement under one ...?

650 **The President:** That is going to be part of the scoping, which this member of staff will be able to do, because that, I believe –

655 **Advocate Harwood:** So you do not know yet whether it has achieved any –?

The President: We have got the property, which obviously makes a difference, but States' property does not come free either; there is a cost for having States' property and that is too often forgotten about. (**The Chairman:** That is true.) People think if you have got States' property it is free. No, it is not free at all and that is lost sight of sometimes. So it is the difference between the two.

660 **Advocate Harwood:** Are you able to turn to or show any positive financial savings that have resulted from the consolidation of Law Enforcement?

665 **Mr Lewis:** Yes. Not in the current year but in the years since bringing the two forces together, we can show that a significant number of savings that we have achieved are aligned to Law Enforcement.

The Chairman: Would you be able to share that information with us perhaps privately or publicly?

670 **Mr Lewis:** I cannot see why not, if we look through our past accounts, year-end financial statements.

675 **The Chairman:** I think that would be helpful.

Advocate Harwood: Yes, it is. In terms of lessons learnt, if you have achieved savings from amalgamation of that type it definitely gives credence possibly to creating further savings.

680 **The President:** Absolutely, we can let you have that.

The Chairman: That would be good.
Okay, I just want to come back to the PwC Report, but before I do that are there any other specific transformational projects that you wanted to talk about today that are being looked at, that are being part of this new member of staff that you have got seconded to you will be looking at? Is there anything else that you wanted to put into the public domain in terms of what you might be looking at?

685 **The President:** No, I think some of it can be a little bit sensitive and it would be inappropriate really.

The Chairman: Absolutely.
Okay, can I turn to the PwC benchmarking report then? We have already touched upon one so I will not talk about the use of property, but I will talk about two of the other suggestions in that report. I just wanted to be very clear in terms of your committee's position on those

recommendations made by PwC. Have you formally said that you are not going to pursue those recommendations? What is the position in terms of the Committee *for Home Affairs*' view on the PwC recommendations?

700 **The President:** Okay, we went through the PwC obviously at the time when it came back. It is all part of the spreadsheet that we have worked with P&R as the oversight board. Before we got there obviously we discussed it as a committee. We went through what is realistic, what is achievable, what have we done? There were many items where we could tick the box and say, 'Yes, we have sorted that.' Don't forget some of those things on PwC came from the staff who said
705 they were doing it anyway which is a little bit ... Fine, they put it in as an idea, PwC, but actually it was our staff that gave that idea and said they were actually doing it. So definitely there are some areas there that have been taken forward. We have got some of the others that they put in there, again, when it comes down to staffing some of that might be a little bit sensitive.

710 So I think what was left has certainly been part of that spreadsheet and part of taking that forward.

The Chairman: One of the suggestions was that Guernsey Fire and Rescue should routinely charge for non-emergency calls. Is that going to be pursued?

715 **The President:** That is being looked at. Certainly we have had a paper from the Fire and Rescue as well to look at future charging. I think they have actually started with some of the charging, if I remember rightly. That is right and proper. They already were charging for some things anyway. Some of the training that they actually have been doing for years, before the PwC report they decided actually that would be the right route to start charging for this training and
720 they have been doing that.

The Chairman: From what you are saying, the option of extending that to very much non-emergency stuff?

725 **The President:** Yes it will be non-emergency.

The Chairman: That is still being looked at in terms of the possibility of extending that?

730 **The President:** Yes, they have carried out some of those.

The Chairman: Yes, some of it has been carried out but –

The President: I do not know how many are left on the –

735 **The Chairman:** But are you saying there are other bits that are still under consideration?

The President: Yes, I will see if I have got it on the spreadsheet here, but certainly some of those they have carried out and they have been successful and we have not had any complaints about it, because at the end of the day if we are offering a service we should be doing that. Yes.
740

The Chairman: Yes. Alright –

The President: Have you got any in there?

745 **Mr Lewis:** I will just add that of the PwC recommendations, probably 40% were accepted and implemented – this is not in monetary value but just in terms of line items – 40% were acted upon and implemented, 40% are still in the bucket of things to explore and are on our long list of items

750 to see where they fit – of which, one of those is can the Guernsey Fire and Rescue Service charge
for things like false alarms, checking bits and pieces and probably down to people's poor
administration sometimes as opposed to a real fire emergency – and then about 20% of the items,
the conclusion is they are not going to work and in effect have been rejected.

755 **The Chairman:** There was one fairly big ticket item which I think was supposed to save
£600,000 per annum. Do you remember what that was?

The President: Oh I remember that one.

760 **The Chairman:** The idea of combining Fire and Rescue with the Ambulance Service. Have you
formally discounted that? Is there any appetite to pursue that? I know it is not just the purview of
Home Affairs, but is there any appetite?

765 **The President:** The States have resolved that actually it is across to HSC; it is no longer for us
to be looking at that. What we have said to HSC is of course we would be happy to work with
them if they thought that was the answer. The blue light services all work together anyway. It is
nothing new that they do not work together; they work together. But of course HSC are looking to
see about whether it would be better use of the Ambulance and Rescue to be operating Accident
& Emergency or from up at the Hospital. Ambulances and hospital go together, but that does not
mean to say that we are completely off the radar. That work is now with HSC, it is not anything to
do with Home Affairs, (**The Chairman:** Well –) as the work itself, but the States resolved that. It
770 was part of the plan, but we have said –

The Chairman: Yes, but bearing in mind that obviously you are politically accountable for the
Fire and Rescue Service, I think you do have some skin in the game, as it were.

775 From your committee's point of view, do you fully evaluate it? Do you have a view on it, I
suppose is what I am saying. I appreciate the fact that Health & Social Care will have the
responsibility but what do you think?

780 **The President:** We have expressed it in the States; it is on *Hansard*. From our point of view,
certainly the looking at it, was it right and proper, can you have a charity; you are not talking
about another States' committee which makes it harder, you are talking about an independent
charity operating for Fire and Rescue. Who is accountable to who if you are amalgamating or
trying to work together with having one senior management structure? They are independent,
they can do what they like and obviously it can make it difficult for us.

785 It was looked at. It was looked at certainly at the time.

The Chairman: By Home Affairs?

790 **The President:** Yes. It has been discussed a few times by Home Affairs and certainly indeed
with Health as well. When we actually met with Health we discussed it with Health. On more than
one occasion Health came and visited us or we went and visited Health.

795 It is left as per the States ... it was in the States' Budget or in our plan? But it is over to HSC and
we have said to HSC we are there if they want to be able to take that further. It is what is making
best use for the charity as which comes first. The ambulance bit comes first before us. You cannot
implement something on a charity if the charity are not willing to go down that route.

The Chairman: When you received the PwC Report were you surprised that that
recommendation was made in the first place?

800 **The President:** No, not at all. I was not totally surprised because our staff, rightly so, were very open, they were very helpful. They just came up with potential ideas or not, things that they had looked at or not. A finger in the air, a sum was put forward, and that finger in the air sum of £600 million – (**The Chairman:** £600 thousand!) £600,000!

805 **The Chairman:** That would be an impressive saving!

The President: I could have my new police station then, yes, it would be fine!
Six hundred thousand. But that did not account for the costs involved to be able to set that up, the alteration costs. When we actually looked at it further afterwards it would be something like between 10 to 15 years before you even had payback on it. So it was not something that would
810 happen overnight and there would be huge savings.

The Chairman: Bearing in mind you said that many of the ideas that came out of PwC came from the officers – (**The President:** Yes they did.) was that particular amalgamation from the consultant or from the officers?
815

The President: I did not sit in the room so I cannot answer that. All I can say is that –

The Chairman: Mr Lewis, do you know that?

820 **Mr Lewis:** I was not in post at the time. I believe that officers will have had some contribution to that debate.

The Chairman: Right, okay.

In terms of your committee, Deputy Lowe, do Members have the political will to actually drive
825 through these transformational changes or is there, as I have heard muted, a lack of will to deliver on some of this big transformational stuff. What is your view on that?

The President: My view is tell them to come and see us then, because that is wrong. We have got a very good committee who definitely want to see transformation take place. I am
830 disappointed to hear that. At a Scrutiny Management meeting that is now in the public domain, I think that is quite disgraceful of our colleagues who are not prepared to come and talk to us about it and find out what we are doing. We have made statements in the States. I can be questioned in the States at Question Time. At no time has anybody stood up and said, 'You have not got the will to do that.' So I dismiss that, Deputy Green.

835 **The Chairman:** Okay, that is very clear. Thank you. I appreciate the candour.

Just before we move on, I am just really keen to make sure that everything that you are happy to put into the public domain about potential items has been said and you have been very open about some of the areas you are looking at.

840 Actually, just before we move on, obviously one of the big ticket matters you raised was the potential of a new police station. Is that very much at the ideas stage as well? How far has that got? That is something that has been around for a while as an idea.

The President: Yes, indeed, but again it is being responsible, isn't it; it is getting the balance of
845 what sort of efficiencies you want and what sort of money we have got in the States. There are lots of other States' committees who would also like to have new buildings or be able to move somewhere and be more efficient. It goes back to privatisation and we as Home Affairs, I have to say, are excited at the moment. We are really pleased at the way things are going. We have got great staff and to be able to have P&R as the oversight board who are with us on this, and they
850 see the enthusiasm and they have seen the ideas that we have put forward, and they are prepared

to help us. It is a good time to be actually around because we can see those changes materialising. So that, for me, is a huge difference to maybe even two years ago or even three years ago. So it is being responsible, being realistic.

855 **The Chairman:** Thank you.

I am going to now try to seamlessly move between transformation and JESCC.

It is fair to say that the Joint Emergency Services Control Centre, the setting up of that, was a transformational piece. It is probably fair to say that there were a number of difficulties encountered with the setting up of JESCC. To any extent have the difficulties that you have
860 encountered with JESCC, has that put the committee off from other major transformational change?

The President: No, not at all.

865 **The Chairman:** Once bitten, twice shy type of thing?

The President: Well, yes, it is the lessons learnt. It was said at the time that we felt we were trying to run before we could walk, had all the training been put in place and everything else. I think it has sort of come to fruition really. So it did go live, in my opinion, and indeed I think the
870 committee's opinion, before we were ready for it. There was not possibly enough training. It is new so equally it was very new to the staff and it was very stressful for them in that area. To be on the end of an emergency phone where you are dealing with some pretty awful, dramatic situations and that is your job day in and day out for a long period of time during your shift, it is not as if you have got something else that is going on. You are there just dealing with all these
875 emergency calls. So it is stressful.

We had changes this year that were in the last seven months, so we have a new structure in there. The manager is no longer there and we have somebody from Law Enforcement because what we were seeing was Law Enforcement were bringing the back-up all the time where there were spaces so they have got that expertise in there. So we have got a senior member of staff
880 from Law Enforcement who is overseeing that and taking forward the project – I believe being more realistic, looking at the staffing and working with the team as well.

The Chairman: I am going to turn to Mrs Morris.

885 **Mrs Morris:** Yes. I have got a list of detailed questions but I expect them to be quite short answers (**The President:** Okay.) and some of this I think is probably already in the public domain, but just so we get the full picture of JESCC. I know we spent quite a lot of time on JESCC last hearing so this is more of a follow up.

890 **The President:** We did but that is okay, it is not a problem.

Mrs Morris: In your statement on 18th July, Deputy Lowe, you said that JESCC still was not fully staffed. Is that still true?

895 **The President:** That is indeed.

Mrs Morris: So how is JESCC maintaining its service levels?

The President: With the support from Law Enforcement.

900

Mrs Morris: Are the recharges now between Law Enforcement and JESCC happening on a regular basis, because I know the last time we spoke that was not the case?

905 **The President:** That is the work that is carrying on at the moment, getting all that data together with the new head who is actually running and looking at JESCC and coming up as the new project team leader to get the costings all right.

910 Because again part of the problem we had right at the very beginning, when JESCC was costed and taking it forward, at the last minute in came the Coastguard. That was not accounted for. So there was a huge amount of training that needed to take place that was not part of the training that had already taken place. So again because of that, that did upset the apple cart, if you like, because of the extra costs that were involved with that.

915 **Mrs Morris:** Because you are still not fully staffed, I know we spoke before about being over budget, is this adding to the cost pressure?

The President: Yes.

920 **Mrs Morris:** Okay. You also said it is quite a stressful job, the operatives have to be well trained; do you have a high churn rate in that service because of what they do?

925 **The President:** Yes. It is a difficult job. It is a stressful job and it is not for everybody. You have got to be pretty special to be answering those phones in those emergency situations all day and all night. So we do have a high turnover of staff on that one, but the reduction in the overspend is coming down, so that is good news. But obviously, as I have said before, those phones have to be answered –

Mrs Morris: Absolutely, and we will come on to that.

930 **The President:** It is not a case of we can say, 'Well, we are not going to pay overtime. We will have to leave it and you will have to catch up tomorrow when you come in with the work.' These phones have to be answered.

935 **Mrs Morris:** When you lose somebody are exit interviews carried out? Are you getting learnings from those exits?

940 **The President:** Yes, with any staff member right across Home Affairs, right across the States, exit interviews are carried out. Of course that happened last year where there was a staff survey across the States and of course it was right across Home Affairs as well. We have all that information and all the feedback. We have all the masses of graphs of whether it was good or whether they were supported. There were an awful lot of questions in that. I do not know if you have had sight of the –?

Mrs Morris: I have not but we do a similar one ourselves.

945 **The President:** Okay. Yes, they have loads of questions and that is right and proper. We look at that and we take it seriously. There is an element of some may be answering because they want to move on, when they are not quite good fans of the job they are doing. There will be others who really take it seriously, and the committee all believe we take it seriously. You have got to strip out some of that where it might be somebody has done it for a particular reason or they have got a grudge. We look at that and we see what we can actually do to improve that situation by discussing it with the Chief Secretary and the Head Of Operations, who are very keen to make sure that they are addressing the issues, whether it be bullying – and I am not saying it is bullying there, but these are the type of questions put in the survey. The political Members around here

955 will have seen the surveys, I would hope, (**The Chairman:** Yes.) that came forward because they should have probably had it in their section as well where their staff were asked.

It is important. Otherwise my view is do not send out a staff survey if you are not going to take it seriously. It is not to be a jobsworth for somebody, it has to be meaningful. Therefore, I think it is important that all the political Members of all the committees ... and I know other committees did not even know it had gone out, they did not even know about the survey. We did and I have encouraged them to ask for theirs across their committees as well.

960 So we did and we have discussed that with the service chiefs as well to make sure that we can address those issues. Most of them had all improved from the survey from two years ago. It was a follow up survey. Most of them have done, but not all.

965 **Mrs Morris:** Okay. Given that there is still quite a lot of churn in that, because these people have to be special and it is not for everybody, how much does it cost to train a new operative and how long does it take? Is this part of the vacancy problem?

970 **The President:** It takes six months to train somebody for that. The cost of that, I will look on my left.

Mrs Morris: I think Mr Lewis might keep his files open for the next few.

975 **Mr Lewis:** I might struggle to give you the definitive answer but you are talking, in addition to the training course you are going to be £10,000-plus.

I would also add that whilst we have got a churn, it would be unwise of me to predict anything but, with any new organisation where you have got some pressure what you will generally find over the course of time is that initially you will get people who will try it and it will not be for them, it will be a stress, but you will find one or two little nuggets in there who actually will find it is the job they want and they will stay. So as time goes by you will get more people who will stay, and I think if you look at any organisation, whether it is Aurigny or anybody else, you will find some characters who came in, some will have come and gone, but some stick there. So over the course of time – and we are probably talking five-10 years – you will build up a very solid rump of people, but in the early years it is my prediction – and I may be proved wrong on this one – is that you will see a higher level of churn in these particular pressure areas.

985 **Mrs Morris:** Okay.

So you mentioned the Coastguard before, Deputy Lowe, this training – either one of you can answer – does it cover all four services including the Coastguard or are the people who look after the Coastguard separate?

990 **Mr Lewis:** The people who look after the Coastguard are given a particular specialist training. What we do is the longer a person remains in JESCC the more their training gets developed. So initially they will come in and they will have an initial period of watching, then they will become able to handle incoming calls, then they will be able to also be a dispatcher. So progressively, and I could see if somebody came in and they were at the stage where they had an interest in nautical matters etc. or they had a particular want, they would simply be briefed up in the Coastguard. The Coastguard is a particular skillset that does not naturally sit automatically with the skillset you get for somebody who wants to handle 999 calls ordinarily.

1000

Mrs Morris: How many calls does the service take in a year?

Mr Lewis: It is a very good question.

1005 **The President:** We had that data at one time and I cannot remember. Well I do not actually know, but I know the emergency calls a few years ago when I was Director of the Ambulance, I know that we had 4,000 a year –

1010 **Mrs Morris:** Just for the ambulance?

The President: – emergency calls. Yes but just emergency calls for the ambulance, not the ordinary day-to-day calls. (**Mrs Morris:** Okay.) So we are talking thousands and thousands of calls.

1015 **Mrs Morris:** Okay and how many operatives are on each shift?

The President: I think he has found the answer...

1020 **Mrs Morris:** Because I am thinking, say for instance, we think about the Bulwer Avenue fire, if anything else had gone off at the same time were there enough operatives who were available to deal with those, given the numbers that you have got on the desk and the number of calls that are coming in?

1025 **The President:** When you have got an emergency like that as well it is inevitable that people will see smoke so the calls are just almost being blocked because somebody is saying, 'There's a fire down there. What's going on?' and that is very difficult and you cannot have a bucket load of staff sitting there for just the odd occasion that you have got a major emergency like that.

Mrs Morris: I understand that.

1030 **The President:** It is getting the balance right and having the right amount of staff to deal with the amount of calls that we have got and that review is taking place anyway as part of the person who has actually taken that over, (**Mrs Morris:** Okay.) to look at the review of the hours that they work, the shifts that they work, should we change the shift pattern so you have more people on at a different time and perhaps fewer at another time. Revaluating the whole lot, which will be a benefit.

1040 **Mrs Morris:** Given that you have got thousands of calls, have you any idea how many of those are real emergencies, how many are well-intentioned but not emergencies? Are there also non-emergency situations? You spoke earlier about some of the things that are now being charged for by some of the services; how does that all split out? Because I am thinking about all these people sitting waiting, so some days nothing much happens on this Island and other days, like the Bulwer Avenue fire, it all kicks off.

1045 **The President:** They are busy all the time. Emergencies just do not happen between a certain period of time, and of course a lot of them are not reported. It is very busy. If somebody has collapsed ... so you get a lot of those types of calls, or if somebody has had a fall ... the elderly population, and because we are encouraging, rightly so, that people will stay in their home and the services will go to their home; and the demographic growth, the increase in falls, which I believe has been replicated up at the Hospital as well at A&E ... that is the type of calls that you get. Well, of course those are not the ones that are in the paper all the time. (**Mrs Morris:** No.) But I have not got a break down of that. I would be able to assist you with that and find out for you, but that is not something I would know, that is operational –

1055 **Mrs Morris:** I was wondering if Mr Lewis might know.

Mr Lewis: I think what we could probably give you is a broken down list, if somebody has got it to hand. But the issue I would say is in terms of staff numbers – and I stand to be corrected on this one but – actually broadly speaking you will get two call handlers and two dispatchers, and then a supervisor who will be overseeing the whole –

1060

Mrs Morris: So about five people most of the time?

Mr Lewis: Then in terms of the breakdown, yes, you asked the question do we deal with non-emergencies, yes. For example, at the weekend if your cesspit is overflowing there is a chance you might phone up the JESCC and say 'I need somebody to sort it out.'

1065

Mrs Morris: That would come through on a 999 call?

Mr Lewis: No, not a 999 call. Potentially JESCC would handle it then, because historically if you wanted to mobilise States' Works, and you did not know the contact numbers. Let's say if you saw a pothole in the road or something, a big pot hole, and you wanted to get States' Works out at the weekend you cannot contact States' Works. So years ago you would have contacted the fire brigade and they would have been the conduit to mobilise States' Works to stop every Tom, Dick and Harry thinking, 'Oh I need States' Works to come and remove a black plastic sack.' So JESCC, one of their services they provide is they also can mobilise States' Works to incidents that need States' Works involved. There's not a lot of that.

1070

1075

Mrs Morris: So we have got these people who take six months to train and they are answering calls about overflowing sewage?

1080

Mr Lewis: Yes, because that is not what they are doing most of the time.

The President: No..... (Laughter)

Mr Lewis: The context was we have a group of people who are there to deal with unforeseen circumstances; many of the calls will be, as we touched on, false alarms, they will be bits and pieces, people saying, 'Oh my alarm is going off.' It does not really need a fire brigade but bells will be ringing. We can try to find the breakdown as you requested. But you did ask the question do they deal with anything that is non-emergency and the answer was yes they deal with some stuff, but it certainly would not be prioritised in the case of an emergency; the caller would be told to go away, effectively, in a non-critical way.

1085

1090

Mrs Morris: So given that when JESCC formed it was very new, but now there are other jurisdictions that also have this kind of joint call centre; would they be dealing with these kinds of non-emergency calls as well?

1095

The President: I do not know. I mean I think it is the Isle of Man, they do it. But this is an island, this is a small community. Are we going to be suggesting then that States Works will work a 24-hour service so that we do not have to take the call at JESCC?

1100

Mrs Morris: That is not what I am suggesting! But who answers the call? Who will take that call if they need to contact somebody? Most of the States is nine to five, Monday to Friday. We are talking about a rare occasion – and a very rare occasion – over a weekend or out of hours where there might be ... I do not know, I do not know if this is a fact or not, all I am saying is if you saw –

1105

Mr Lewis: A fallen tree.

1110 **The President:** Well if it is a tree they will ring up about the tree, but also if you saw sewage coming out from a drain, would we leave that till Monday? No. They would ring up and say, 'Somewhere can somebody help me?' and that is the type of call that they would probably get.

1115 **Mrs Morris:** But you are saying that kind of call is in the minority, (**The President:** Definitely.) not the majority. (**Mr Lewis:** Absolutely.) I do not think that is what the PwC Report says.

1120 **The President:** PwC, I do not know what they actually said on that, but they want to perhaps sit in at JESCC and see the calls that come through. It is an emergency service. It is dealing with emergencies. So some of the areas in the PwC... I am not convinced that they were particularly right on that. You are welcome, as a Scrutiny Committee, I invite any of you to come to JESCC. Contact me and I am happy to let you go down to JESCC and see it operate.

The Chairman: I would like to take you up on that. That would be good.

1125 **Mrs Morris:** I would like to take you up on that. I would also like it if the employee you have seconded into JESCC – sorry, the employee from Law Enforcement – if we could have that to ... how many calls? What percentage are real emergencies? What are the potential emergencies but just well intentional? And how many of these out-of-hours calls are being dealt with by your highly trained staff? Although I have to say it must be a bit of a relief sometimes to pick up the phone and know it is an overflowing cesspit and not a real emergency.

1130 **The President:** It was probably not a good example to give, to be honest.

Mrs Morris: It does happen.

1135 **The President:** That has caused quite a distraction and I can see this is going to get run away with that this is what we do. It is certainly not what we do.

The Chairman: I think Deputy Queripel is trying to –

1140 **The President:** It might be one or two a year. They are not receiving those types of calls in their bucket load.

1145 **Deputy Queripel:** I am sorry to interrupt Mrs Morris's flow but I would just like to take you back to the Coastguard situation for a moment, (**Mrs Morris:** Please do.) because it has been mentioned.

You said they came to, as it were, the amalgamation party quite late in the day. Have they now been successfully integrated and is there adequate cover at all times, bearing in mind, as you said, they need a particular skillset? Are you confident that the Coastguard is always covered at every occasion, night and day?

1150 **The President:** Oh, yes, the Coastguard has to be covered 24 hours a day. It is an important service, so yes, there is a member of staff who sits and only deals with the Coastguard.

Deputy Queripel: Only one member of staff?

1155 **The President:** Yes, sitting there watching the Coastguard screen, which is pretty monotonous really. There is talk that maybe there should be two, (**Deputy Queripel:** Yes.) so they are looking at that. That is part of the review that they are looking at as well. There is also a report looking at whether – and that has been taken out by STSB, I think it is. Is it STSB? (**Mr Lewis:** Yes, it is.) They

1160 are taking out a review to whether the Coastguard is appropriately placed there or not. So they are reviewing that as well, and that is for them to communicate with you. We have been involved with the Coastguard section in JESCC but it is part of the Harbour *per se*. They have taken out a review.

1165 **Deputy Queripel:** Yes, just having one does not seem very resilient. I mean there may be an occasion when that one person is not there, so there does not seem to be a great deal of cover. That must be a concern for you, surely?

The President: There has to be cover at that screen 24 hours a day.

1170

Deputy Queripel: But there is only one person at any one time, you are saying?

The President: Yes, but the others are trained and can take over.

1175 **Deputy Queripel:** I just wanted to make sure that there is adequate cover.

The President: It would not be a case that they disappear and go off for 10 minutes for coffee.

1180 **The Chairman:** I think we will take a break in just a few minutes, Mrs Morris, if you just want to work your way through.

Mrs Morris: I have got a couple of questions.

Deputy Queripel: Only 44 more to go!

1185

Mrs Morris: Thank you.

You were talking about St John being a charity and your taking calls for them, I note from the paperwork we have got that Home Affairs are still recharging costs for St John, the Coastguard and the Housing Department; how long has that been going on?

1190

The President: What, we were charging them?

Mrs Morris: Yes.

1195 **The President:** We charged them from the start but again this is part of this review. Now we can analyse and see what numbers of calls, so we have got more factual information, and that is part of the review that is taking place and will be coming back to the committee to see if we will be charging St John more money for the amount of calls we are taking.

1200 **Mrs Morris:** Okay. Isn't that just 'jam jar' accounting? Wouldn't it be better if your budget was rebased to take account of the fact that you are now doing the work for these three other departments?

1205 **The President:** Well that was in the budget. It is not a case of we redid the budget for it, it was in the budget.

Mrs Morris: No, that is not what I am saying.

1210 **The President:** We took in all good faith the data from St John who told us 'these are the amount of calls' that they receive as an emergency service. Now this is in operation across at JESCC and it is under us it is validating if those are the numbers they are talking about. Are they

1215 right? Have we charged them the right amount? Do we need to charge them more? Are we over charging them? That is the evaluation now that we are taking out to see about that as we are revisiting all of these charging. The same as Housing, that is an out-of-hours ... Again, you will struggle, I think, to find double figures but that is a service that has to be available as part of the States for the Housing and we pick up those calls as out-of-hours. So we charge them for that as well; it is about £3,000 I think.

Mrs Morris: I recall £5,000.

1220 I understand why you would charge St John who are a separate body, but with my accountant hat on I am struggling to understand why we would go to the effort to do that for the Coastguard and Housing when you could just say, 'Do you know what, we won't recharge, won't jam jar. We will just put it in our budget. It will have the same impact on the States' bottom line, but we won't have people who are having to monitor this and raise recharges to other departments.' Would that not be a better idea?

1225

Mr Lewis: I think there are a number of threads there. Some areas like, for example, the Coastguard sits on the responsibility of the States' Trading Supervisory Board which is meant to be a trading entity and therefore it could provide Coastguard or we could. Therefore Coastguard services, they are the trading entity which raises money from airport fees and harbour fees and bits and pieces, should make a contribution. The St John Ambulance we have talked about.

1230

Then if you did explore at some future stage to say, 'Have you got capacity in JESCC to handle possibly people's security alarm calls?' you would want that to be a commercial thing. One of the things I understood in the early days of JESCC was that it is set up as entity, almost like an agency. At present it sits very much under Law Enforcement because the Law Enforcement provides the lead for the support for it, but could you get to a scenario in five-10 years' time when you can actually say, 'Does the States need to run JESCC?' So keeping it as transparent as possible, in terms of the finance, what it has cost to run, what services you are providing for other people, gives you a truer picture of the cost of it.

1235

I do accept the fact that you could say, 'Okay, we are just going to make sure that we do not recharge other people,' and when we do come to a stage of ever looking at whether we outsource this then actually at that point you try and break down the cost and make the change then.

1240

I think there is some logic in the current approach, but yes you are right it could be done a different way.

1245

Mrs Morris: So are you confident that now, in your reporting suite, you have enough information to properly monitor and manage the JESCC budget – we concentrated on that quite a lot the last time – and that there is sufficient clarity and transparency within that reporting risk to help you to keep within budget and to mitigate risks?

1250

Mr Lewis: We are getting close to that point. It is a bit like a number of other areas where you set up a new operation and it takes time to bed in and the fact that we are currently still saying we think that because of cost pressures and staff issues we are still, potentially in that particular area of sub-budget, we are overspent on where we want to be. So we have not cracked it completely yet but as each year passes we are getting closer.

1255

The Chairman: Getting closer to it, yes, but it is still off.

Mrs Morris: And do you believe that there is now sufficient communication between senior management, the project team, the budget holder and the finance to take that forward?

1260

Mr Lewis: Yes, absolutely.

Mrs Morris: Good.

Just – I think it is one last one –

1265

The Chairman: Yes, I want to take a break in a minute.

Mrs Morris: Yes.

1270 Are there any KPIs now in place with respect to JESCC or indeed its relationship with the blue light services that you can point to that and say, 'We have made a difference. This was a transformational project which was a little bit about saving money but also about approaching things in a different way'? Have you got any data that will allow you to prove that?

1275 **Mr Lewis:** We have got data in various sources and we have got a clear set of KPIs that we will be publishing. I need to check with my colleagues – and I might do in the break, if you want – but the answer is there is a steering group which comprises of the various services who – Ambulance, Fire, Police – come together and monitor effectively what it is costing, is the service right? They get various pieces of data. At committee level we have not got many KPIs apart from the financial and the staffing issues.

1280 But I may come back after the break and say actually we have got additional information.

Advocate Harwood: Do you not have KPIs for response times?

Mrs Morris: Yes, that is where I was coming to.

1285

Advocate Harwood: Because I think that is possibly the one critical point.

Mr Lewis: Some services have response times. So for example, Ambulance has response times. The Police do not have response times in the same way. So it is not across every area of activity.

1290

The Chairman: Should the Police have response times? Would that not be a good idea?

1295 **Mr Lewis:** It all depends on prioritisation of the situation because sometimes somebody may call up with what they consider to be a crisis, which the Police may not judge to be quite the same crisis. Some of the other services are easier to say, 'The person has fallen down, they are on the ground, you need to dispatch straightaway,' or 'There are flames shooting out of a chimney.' The Police service is a bit different.

Mrs Morris: Okay, so actually one last subset of questions. (**The Chairman:** Okay.)

1300

You talked about you have got two types of people on the normal desk, do the dispatchers decide on the right level of resource to send to each incident or are they just making sure that they are calling the right services? So for instance, if there was a road traffic accident can I expect say two ambulances with paramedics *and* the Fire and Rescue and the Police to turn up, because they have all decided themselves what they are going to send or would JESCC do that?

1305

1310 **Mr Lewis:** JESCC will endeavour to co-ordinate to say we need this and that, and then it will go to the relevant services and they would, in more detail, decide for example, 'We need a turntable ladder and whatever else.' So it is a cascade thing so the dispatcher alerts the relevant services and says, 'This is big, this is small. This is whatever the case may be,' having gone through the checklist of actually what is the incident, where is it, how many people are involved etc.? But then it does get moved on to ... So the dispatcher does not ring up the ambulance driver, he rings up the station officer at the Ambulance Service or the station officer or relevant person at the Fire and Rescue Service who then makes the judgment as to how to deploy...

1315 **Mrs Morris:** But I guess the question I am asking, trying to get to is, do the services co-ordinate (**Mr Lewis:** Yes.) at that level?

1320 **Mr Lewis:** Yes, they do. For example, if an emergency case is requiring ambulance assistance, say somebody is requiring CPR, the Fire and Rescue Service will equally say, 'Where are we? Are we closer by? Can we get there first?' Or if it is going to require one of these rapid responses where you get multiple people needing CPR, the Fire Service will come along because they have got the trained operatives. If somebody is doing intense CPR you try and switch it quickly to get one person to do it and then somebody else. So Fire and Ambulance work very closely because they are the ones best equipped to do that one. But yes, there is co-ordination to make sure the appropriate response goes out.

1330 **The Chairman:** Shall we take a very quick break at that stage and we will come back with some questions from Advocate Harwood on the HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary). Let's say five minutes to take a break.

*The Committee adjourned at 11:00 a.m.
and resumed at 11:10 a.m.*

The Chairman: Just to round off on JESCC, Deputy Lowe, do you think on balance politically the move to the Joint Emergency Services Control Centre was the right decision?

1335 **The President:** I think, yes, if I am honest. Absolutely, yes, but it has not gone as smoothly as we would have liked, but the potential for them all to be in the same room I think is the right move. I certainly have seen more efficiencies because they can talk to one another and they are not ringing up the phone to ring somewhere else.
So I think, yes.

1340 **The Chairman:** And just so we are very clear, in terms of the response times for, not the Police but for, the Ambulance Service and the Fire Brigade, are those response times now better than what they were before or are they broadly the same or are they worse? Do we know that information?

1345 **The President:** The Ambulance is nothing to do with us; they set their own response times. Our job is to manage the calls. If their ambulances do not arrive on time that is not for us –

1350 **The Chairman:** Fire Service?

The President: They are an independent charity, which I think many people forget. It is nothing to do with us. We are just contracted to answer the phones.

1355 **The Chairman:** Do we know that information?

The President: No, I do not know, you will have to ask the St John for that.

1360 **The Chairman:** No, I mean the response times in terms of JESCC, in terms of their co-ordination. Is that not information you would have for any of the services?

The President: For answering the phone, how long it takes to get in touch with ... to get an ambulance out? (**The Chairman:** Yes.) It is immediate, isn't it. That is why it is an emergency phone operation. It is not somebody answering the phone somewhere else and not sure what to

1365 do; that is why they are trained and they are asking the right questions, to get that ambulance out straightaway, or a paramedic.

1370 It can be frustrating for people that ring in because of the way that now you have got the Pro QA (*software*), that is the way they ask the questions because again that was to make the ambulance more efficient, instead of just sending ... Previously, before it came to JESCC, if they had an emergency call out went a paramedic, out went an ambulance, but actually when they got there it is an emergency to the individual who is really worried because they see somebody in that position, but actually it did not warrant sending an ambulance and a paramedic. So those are the things that the Ambulance side of it were looking for efficiency. Whether they have got that you will have to ask them. But certainly from making sure the right resources go, that is what JESCC is all about.

1375 **The Chairman:** Mr Lewis, are you in possession of the data on response times in terms of JESCC? What could you share with us? What I was trying to get at was whether things are better now than they were before.

1380 **Mr Lewis:** We do not currently monitor, to my knowledge, is the call picked up within three rings or whatever, but actually generally because of the number of calls –

Mrs Morris: Really? You wouldn't monitor something like that? Because my call centre does.

1385 **Mr Lewis:** I may be corrected on that one. But what we do know is that we have no negative feedback in terms of the response of JESCC picking up the calls except occasionally when we have a major incident which has meant lots of calls coming in and we have had to reflect and say, 'How do we ensure that we process calls with sufficient rapidity to get things through?' So there are still lessons to be learned in it and I may find that when I get back that actually we do in fact have that speed, because it is quite a sophisticated system. So I am happy to give that information.

Mrs Morris: Thank you.

1395 **The Chairman:** Okay, I think we need to move along so I am going to turn to Advocate Harwood and he is going to be asking some questions about the HMIC review.

Advocate Harwood: Thank you, Deputy Green.

1400 Can I just focus on the H.M. Inspectorate of Constabulary, because this was referred to I think when we met last year, that you were commissioning this review and the suggestion was, certainly from your then Chief Secretary, that it would probably be over and done with by the end of the year.

1405 There is no update in the statement you gave to the States in July, although by happenstance I think Deputy Prow actually made reference to it in a Question to you, which was very convenient, and you suggested that you still had not yet received the report.

1410 Can you just go over the timeline actually of the commissioning of the report, the setting of the terms of reference – and I would like to come back to that in a moment – and then the delivery. I think Mr Lewis happened to mention that a draft had been received. Can you just go over the whole timeframe, actually commissioning the report for their review and for their completion of the report?

The President: I have not got the date in front of me of when we agreed the terms of reference. I mean that could be a bit frustrating really, because we did ask what sort of questions you wanted to cover and we did not get a response from that, so if I had known you wanted to know details I could have actually made sure I had that in front of me.

1415 But regarding the HMIC report, they first came over in November last year and they came back
in January/February this year, and we have had the draft for corrections, that has gone back and
we still await the main report from HMIC.

Advocate Harwood: When was the draft delivered?

1420

The President: The draft was delivered several weeks ago and we have been chasing for the
main report so it is not a case of ... because we want that report, because again we see that as
part of the transformation as well and –

1425 **The Chairman:** What is the time delay?

The President: – we have found that extremely frustrating.

Advocate Harwood: So they started work on their review in January.

1430

The President: No, November.

Advocate Harwood: November, that was when they first came –

1435 **The President:** Yes, then they came back because they had not had time to cover all that they
wished to cover, so they came back in January or February. Then we had the draft report. They
also then asked for some more information where it was for accuracy, so they asked for more
information. So that was a few weeks ago now. We gave them that and we have been waiting for
it. We were told we would have it, I think it was, September – the first week of September, because
1440 then it was going to be the summer and then it was going to be the end of the summer, and then
it was going to be the first week of September.

Advocate Harwood: Had there been any prior meetings with the review team as to any initial
findings of concern before you actually received the draft report?

1445

The President: Not the draft, but I suppose with all these things it is exactly that, it is a draft.
When you have got a draft report, as well you know, if you are looking for corrections of accuracy
and you send that back will the report be the same as the one that you had in the draft? Until we
have actually got the hard copy we have no idea.

1450

Advocate Harwood: Again, last year you indicated to the committee it would be published.
Has it caused them therefore to have to undergo what is known as the 'Maxwellisation' process
because if you are making a document into the public arena people who are mentioned in the
document have a right to comment before it goes public.

1455

The President: We said all along when we actually met with them right at the very beginning
we wanted them to carry out this inspection, we wanted the report to be public, did they have a
problem with that? They had no problem with that whatsoever.

1460 **Advocate Harwood:** So they have known from day one that it was going to be public?

The President: They have known from day one.

Originally when they came back in February we were going to have the report by May. Here we
are in September.

1465

Advocate Harwood: The cynic in me suggests that the delay in getting a draft report suggests that there are perhaps more problems than they might have anticipated.

1470 **The President:** We are not aware of anything at all, so we do not know. Certainly at staff level there has been much contact chasing for this report and we have not had it.

Advocate Harwood: Mr Lewis, can you add any comment to that?

1475 **Mr Lewis:** No, I can confirm we had the draft in May and it –

Advocate Harwood: It was May, was it?

1480 **Mr Lewis:** End of May for factual accuracy. That was shared clearly with a number of those who had contributed to it and now the committee has not seen what other people have contributed, to say the factual accuracy of the bits where they have contributed.

Advocate Harwood: So you have not seen a revised draft since May?

1485 **The President:** No.

Mr Lewis: No.

What we do know and we have chased at periodic intervals HMIC and the lead officers doing it to say, look, the committee would very much like it, not least of all because we are recruiting a new Head of Law Enforcement, to use the document to share.

1490 The HMIC will have approached it on the basis of publication anyway because their default in the UK is to put the –

Advocate Harwood: Is to publish it.

1495 **Mr Lewis:** But clearly this is not normally in their remit because they are doing a thing out of territory, but the committee have said no, the intention is this report will be published.

Advocate Harwood: Have the terms of reference been made public?

1500 **The President:** Not to my knowledge.

Advocate Harwood: I do not recall having seen them.

1505 **The President:** No, not to our knowledge, but they will. They will be part of the report –

Advocate Harwood: No, but I just wondered whether as an indication to the depth or the extent of the review that you had actually indicated the terms of reference and the areas that you had asked to look at.

1510 **The President:** Before they took it on they saw the terms of reference so they knew how much work we wished them to carry out and they gave us the timeline of when we would be able to have the report. So we are extremely frustrated that we have not got that report yet.

Advocate Harwood: Okay, so they have not met their own timeline –?

1515 **The President:** It was not a timeline that we had to have it back. Obviously we said we needed it and wanted it quite quickly for the transformation, because there was a replacement of Head of

1520 Law Enforcement to look at the whole thing really. So there has been frustration from our point of view and the staff have done their utmost to chase this report. We have no idea why it is being held back. It is certainly not from our point of view and there was not anything in the report that we would look at and think, 'Well ...'

Advocate Harwood: So nothing that has caused you to take immediate action as a result of the draft?

1525 **The President:** Well a draft is a draft.

Advocate Harwood: Yes, I know sorry. I mean sometimes you can use a draft to say, 'Hang on there is a problem here,' and you can actually then start – (**The President:** No.) So that has not ...?

1530 **Mrs Morris:** In support of Advocate Harwood, certainly when we have done reports and circulated them for factual accuracy, quite often by the time we get to the final we discover that the organisations that we have circulated to have already started to make changes. I think that is what Advocate Harwood was getting at.

1535 **Advocate Harwood:** Yes, whether any early lessons had been learnt.

The President: Of course they will be aware of some of the things we were doing because if they are reviewing they would be asking what we were doing, at staff level, what we were looking at and processes might be changing so when –

1540 **Advocate Harwood:** When we spoke last year it was clearly identified that this is an unusual situation because you have the unified Law Enforcement, which is probably the first time that HMIC perhaps have had to look at such a structure. I mean did that feature heavily in your terms of reference? Did you want them to review particularly the effectiveness of that structure?

The President: HMIC now do both; (**Advocate Harwood:** In the UK?) it is part of that now. So it is not new to them, that they were coming across and this was a first for them; they do cover border agencies and things like that so that is covered. So we were comfortable with that.

1550 **Advocate Harwood:** So it was not as novel as we might have been led to believe? (**The President:** No.)

You still intend to publish the full report, (**The President:** Absolutely.) but you do not yet know really when it is going to be available? (**The President:** No.)

1555 Do you know from your review of the draft, has there been any particular comment on the role of the Head of Law Enforcement or in particular has there been any comment about the lack of having an oversight commission or authority above the Law Enforcement?

The President: I think to be absolutely honest here, until we have got the final copy I do not think it is appropriate to talk about a draft. It was sent out for corrections from right across the board of those that have taken part and got involved with that, and I think that would be inappropriate because that might not be in there anymore. It might be in there, it may not be in there. I do not think I personally want to be in that position where I am talking about a report that may be completely different when it is published. I think that is irresponsible, to be honest.

1565 I understand where you are trying to get to but –

Advocate Harwood: I am just trying to understand the terms of reference really – how extensive the reference –

1570 **The President:** It was very extensive – very extensive terms of reference, and I am more than happy to let you have that, even though we have not got the report.

Advocate Harwood: I think it would be useful just to give some indication as to the areas that it would be looking at.

1575

The President: I do not want you to feel that we are not telling you something. All I am saying is that we have not got something to tell you. But you can certainly have the terms of reference. You have not got to wait for the report for the terms of reference. It was comprehensive.

1580

The Chairman: Yes.

Advocate Harwood: That would be helpful.

The President: That will be at your office today or tomorrow.

1585

Advocate Harwood: I think last time we touched on whether or not there should be an oversight body, and I think we had talked about having – the previous States – a Law Enforcement Commission, and that was rescinded. I think you indicated you were in favour of that decision.

1590 Is there anything in light of the report that you have seen that might suggest that perhaps there should be, that you would want to readdress that issue?

The President: It was in the terms of reference for them to look at. (**Advocate Harwood:** It was?) Yes.

1595

Advocate Harwood: Okay.

I appreciate you do not want to share the contents of the draft report with us, but can you give some indication whether they have actually come back to you on that particular issue with any recommendations?

1600

The President: They have come back with everything that we asked them to do on the terms of reference. It is a very comprehensive report because we had so much in the terms of reference. So once we have got it ... It should have been here earlier in September –

Advocate Harwood: No, I understand. Yes.

1605

The President: So from my point of view we are frustrated and I think you probably get that.

The Chairman: Yes.

1610

The President: We are frustrated, the staff are frustrated, because it is holding us up to a certain extent. In certain things when we are looking for replacement –

Advocate Harwood: I think it is very important that is a matter of record, that your committee are frustrated because of the lack of that report.

1615

The President: Very. My thanks to the staff, because the staff hear it from us and the staff have been brilliant in actually trying to chase that. So there is no fault whatsoever from Guernsey, from Home Affairs, or from the political Members. It was supposed to be here again at the beginning of September; as soon as it gets here you will have a copy.

1620

Mrs Morris: Thank you.

The Chairman: We are grateful.

1625 **Advocate Harwood:** Again, just to clarify, the issue about whether or not there should be a commission or an oversight commission is being addressed in that report. It is part of the terms of reference so again we will review that with interest.

Earlier in one of your questions on the transformation and budget I think somebody made the comment that the previous budget for last year did not include the cost of the review. Do you have any idea what the likely cost of the review is going to be?

1630

The President: It is £75,000.

Advocate Harwood: Not bad. It is reasonably good value for money.

1635 **The President:** Yes. When we get it!

The Chairman: When you get it.

1640 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I just also touch on, we spoke previously about the Police Complaints Commission. (**The President:** Yes.) I think you said there have been very few complaints when we spoke in June. Do you have any update as to how the Commission has been performing since then? Have there been any noticeable increase in numbers of complaints?

1645 **The President:** We meet with the Police Complaints Commission and it was a priority for us to have a review of that. It was supposed to happen last term and they were very pleased to hear that this was a priority for the Home Affairs Committee. So we invited them in, literally within the first month of us being appointed, and said, 'We will do this.' We really do believe there is frustration on their side, because it was new to Guernsey and so it was a case of there was enough now to be able to see what worked, what perhaps did not work, what could be improved and how to take this forward.

1650

It has taken a bit longer than we would have liked, but that said, they are involved with it, we are ... of what they believe would be a good way forward. Equally, at political level as well, where we can see that a good Police Complaints Commission will come out of this. We are, I think, almost in the final stages. We have got a meeting coming up with them. It is either in a fortnight's time or in a month's time. They are on the agenda anyway that is coming up to take that report and take that forward of how it is going to be.

1655

Because the Police Complaints Commission, how it works is they can go in any time and look at the complaints register so they can check to see if they are satisfied that the process has been followed; that is all they are able to do. So if they looked at that and thought, 'Well actually if that had come to us ...' because this is senior level, comes to the committee and to the appropriate authority; under senior level is dealt with within the Police themselves.

1660

Advocate Harwood: Does the Police Complaints Commission also review complaints that you as the authority have dealt with?

1665

The President: Yes.

Advocate Harwood: So they are looking at both the ones that you as a committee have dealt with, then also ones that have been dealt with within the Law Enforcement?

1670

The President: They are part of that process. It works with that as well. Whereas they were unsure that the process has been followed they are not able, they do not have the 'power' to say, 'Well, actually we are not sure we would have done that. We think that is not really the

1675 appropriate answer to that.' So this is the area they would like to look at with us to say can they
look at it differently, can they actually see how complaints have been dealt with but be able to
give more feedback on it or even have that responsibility. That is what is all in the melting pot at
the moment of taking that forward.

1680 **Advocate Harwood:** You mentioned the Head of Law Enforcement is retiring, the present
head is retiring, and you will be looking to recruit. Have you started that recruitment process?

The President: I think the advert goes out next week or the week after internally.

1685 **Advocate Harwood:** So is that wide enough that you may be recruiting off-Island or on-
Island?

1690 **The President:** It starts off internally. That is the way the States operate and if there is a
suitable candidate that ticks all the right boxes we would not be advertising externally, I suggest.
But equally, unless they tick all the right boxes it will be an external advert. Both timings – we have
got the timings for everything for that, so the job description has been finalised by ourselves and
indeed by P&R, and we have got all the dates for the interviewing process. So it is all there and I
think it is next week it actually goes out internally.

1695 **Advocate Harwood:** Once again, I think you made the point that one of the frustrations of the
delay in your HMIC Report is because that report could well be influential in the recruitment
process.

1700 **The President:** Yes, but you come to a stage where ... because originally we were going to be
looking for July to start this process and you hang on and hang on. Well the Head of Law
Enforcement retires at the end of December so you cannot be put in that position where the
world stops because of the HMIC report. So we have to take that initiative to move forward...

1705 **Mrs Morris:** So, Deputy Lowe, if you had gone back to last November when you were drawing
up the terms of reference would you have put a timeline in to that terms of reference so that it
could have coincided fortuitously and you would not be sitting round here waiting because they
actually knew when they should have delivered it?

The President: It was made very clear we wanted a quick turnaround on that report.

1710 **Mrs Morris:** That is not very specific though, is it?

The President: No, but hear me through.

1715 The way the HMIC operate they have got six, what I would call, the lead directors. Underneath
that they have then got senior staff who actually come and do the HMIC Report. Once they have
done that report and they have carried out the corrections for accuracy that then goes up to one
of the six there. They could not give us guarantee that one of those six would be available
because there is one that is responsible for the Channel Islands and the south-west, so it has to
go in the list and the pecking order of, the right order, that you do not jump the queue because
everybody wants their reports quickly. So it was out of his hands, the one that is doing it here,
1720 because it goes up to the top level before any HMIC report is actually given back, because it is a
public document, it will go in the public domain, so they have to be completely satisfied at HMIC.

It is well minuted, they know fully well we wanted that back quickly and the answers that we
get back is it is in this log waiting for it to be cleared by HMIC.

1725 **Advocate Harwood:** Can I ask –?

The Chairman: Can you make this the last one on this subject?

1730 **Advocate Harwood:** Sorry. The frustration you are experiencing, is this consistent with the time it takes normally for HMIC to publish their report, in the experience they have in the UK for example?

The President: I do not really know. It was us that instigated –

1735 **Advocate Harwood:** So they did not give you a particular definitive time?

The President: No, it was us that instigated that we wanted a report, we wanted a review. This was committee led, because clearly across the services of Home Affairs it has slipped quite considerably for the types of reviews that we think makes good service. It is good to have an independent report.

1740 **Advocate Harwood:** As part of their review did they question members of your committee?

The President: Yes.

1745 **Advocate Harwood:** Okay, Thank you.

The Chairman: Can we move on to a different topic just to spend the last 10 minutes or so?

1750 One of your sections in your submission to Policy & Resource Plan is about justice policy and I understand that there is a working group that has been set up to develop the Justice Policy Framework. I just wondered, Deputy Lowe, whether any progress has actually been made on developing a justice policy framework by the working group?

1755 **The President:** This is all part of the Oversight Board because it is not a quick fix and you would appreciate that being an advocate and so would Advocate Harwood.

1760 Justice is huge, as well you know, and what we actually said was that there are areas that we could look at that would be quick and easier to do, but equally justice is broad and if we are going to do the job properly, which P&R Oversight Board support, is that we do the job properly and we do it more broadly so we cover the whole lot. That does not mean to say we will not cover certain areas, of course we will. Where we see that we are able to do something for justice we will pick out some of those areas.

The Chairman: So the justice policy *per se* has been taken into the Oversight Board, group?

1765 **The President:** Yes, it has because for us to do it properly we need a huge amount of resources. We also need an independent panel as well to be part of that process. So again the person who has been seconded across, that is one of the key sections of work that she is going to be asked to do so that we can take this forward in the right and proper manner.

1770 **The Chairman:** You recently, I think it was when you were updating the States on the work of the Committee for Home Affairs – I think it was July of this year in the States you gave an update statement – you said that – I will try and quote you exactly, sorry, so I do not get it wrong –

The President: Go on, remind me what I said.

1775 **The Chairman:** I think you said you recently told the States that you had seen an increase in the number of longer term prison sentences. (**The President:** Yes.) You also said that if the trend continued, 'other options for holding prisoners will need to be explored.' Does that mean that you

are potentially considering an extension to the existing prison facilities at Les Nicolles? Is that what that was getting at?

1780

The President: Let's cover that one. It was right and proper we put a marker down in the States rather than wait if that was needed. We are seeing an increase in longer-term prison sentences. We are seeing a reduction in shorter-term prison sentences. That is because the courts are obviously using what they think is appropriate, whether it is community service, whether it is probation, whether it is a suspended sentence, you know the options that are all available to the courts, and there are many. So we have certainly seen an increase in community service and we have seen an increase in longer-term prisoners. The projections that we had from the Prison Governor at that time were saying you need to be aware ... because we get all the data, you can all see the data, it is on the website. I have got a copy here, but just to show those. It is on the website fortnightly. So that is a breakdown of exactly what we have got in the Prison – the age bands, the offences, whether they were local or whether they are –

1785

1790

The Chairman: Sorry to interrupt. Just to bring you back to the question, are you considering a project to extend the capacity?

1795

The President: No. That is a possibility but it is certainly not on the radar for that to be happening at this moment in time, but it is important – and again I will let you have that data – but it is very important we have got break down of new receptions year by year and by sentence.

1800

So if you are looking at up to a year, if you go back to 2011 or even 2008, it was 161. That is what you are talking about for under a year. We are down now so far to 50; last year it was 77. It is a huge drop in that. There could be lots of reasons for that as well, but equally some of it is the court's decision, and that is right. We all know that we set the Laws; it is up to the courts to administrate those Laws and give a sentence that they think is appropriate once they have heard all of the evidence that is before them. But when you look at that data what we are seeing – and if you go back many years ago you would have seen a lot more in the Prison for violence and that sort of thing; what we have got now is the longer term are the drug traffickers. Currently, we have got 40 in there for drugs out of the 90 that are convicted.

1805

But what is also important, I think, for scrutiny is the majority that are in prison at the moment are first timers. So whereas we have spent an awful lot of money with the Education Unit and all the training, and it is a working prison now – years ago they were shut up all day and they came out for their hour; now they have to work eight till six, five days a week and the Education Unit is part of that, where they have to go to the Education Unit at certain times during the week for the various training, courses and education units.

1810

So I believe we are seeing now the results of that, because the number that we have got coming in prison, a majority are first timers. So those that have been in there for one year, two years, three years, that have gone through that system and faced the courts who have given that sentence, we are not seeing a lot of repeats coming in. Of course we have repeats coming in –

1815

The Chairman: You have observed this increase in the long-term sentences. Do you think therefore it is important that we as a States debate a justice policy framework within a reasonable period of time before you start considering whether there needs to be an extension of the prison facilities?

1820

The President: Justice policy is not just about the Prison. You know that and I know that. The Prison is an element of that, but as I said right at the beginning here, the justice policy and all that is involved with the justice policy, you are not going to see a whole report finished and done and dusted in a few months, because –

1825

The Chairman: But a framework though? A framework?

1830 **The President:** But the work that will carry on for that –

The Chairman: Could that not be debated?

1835 **The President:** What we have concerns about is that ... Let me see how many we have got in at the moment. This will help you on this one as much as we can.

Mrs Morris: One hundred and five at the end of August.

1840 **The President:** Twenty three – Pardon?

Mrs Morris: Sorry, 105 in total at the end of August.

1845 **The President:** Yes but some of those are on remand. (**Mrs Morris:** Okay.) You have got 16 on remand, you have got 90 convicted. And some of those on remand may not actually be coming back into the Prison so you need those statistics that we have here which are factual.

1850 But the sexual offences we have 23 currently in the Prison. What we are seeing is that because of the way the world has gone, historical sexual abuse is now being taken seriously. So whereas perhaps it was reported or perhaps somebody did not do anything about it, because now that is being taken seriously these cases are coming forward. We know there is a backlog of cases that are due to be coming to the court. So allowing for those that are there, the potential depending on when those come to court and when these come out of Prison – (**The Chairman:** I understand –) the potential might be that we might have to do something different, which does not mean – just let me finish – it does not mean that you need an extension of the Prison. (**The Chairman:** Okay.) Part of that might mean tagging, if we are able to do the tagging which again is part of the justice policy. We are looking at the whole realms of it, so people will be able to come out of Prison.

1860 **The Chairman:** I think what I am driving at is are we going to know any time soon, are we going to have a debate in the States any time soon, about what that justice policy framework – not the detail necessarily but the framework of it – will be? What do you think a justice policy should be?

The President: It is big –

1865 **The Chairman:** It is big but it is –

1870 **The President:** But there are other elements of it that ... we are supposed to come back to the States in December; we have discussed this with P&R, the Oversight Board. The member of staff who will be coming across is going to get all of that together, which is what I mentioned earlier on, without being repetitive –

The Chairman: They are going to be quite busy, aren't they?

1875 **Mrs Morris:** Aren't they!

The President: So the answer I gave you earlier on has not changed here an hour later, it is exactly the same. That member of staff is actually going to collate all of that together and we will be making either a statement or we will be taking information back to the States that will give them an update of where we are on the justice policy.

1880 **The Chairman:** And when will that be?

1885 **The President:** It will certainly be, probably, mentioned during the Budget report, and if not, it will be December. But that will be of where we are, as an update, if we are able to get something forward by then. If Members actually believe that the whole justice policy is going to have everything before the States before December it will not happen.

The Chairman: That is why I was talking about a framework rather than the policy *per se*.

1890 **The President:** Yes, sure.

The Chairman: Deputy Queripel.

1895 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I was going to say justice policy is clearly a matter for you on your mandate, but clearly politicians want to have a say in regard to justice policy as well. (**The President:** Yes.) So I think do you not agree the sooner the framework can come to the States (**The President:** Absolutely.) the sooner you can get the contribution from the whole of the States' Members and the Assembly to contribute towards what we also think justice policy should look like?

1900 **The President:** Absolutely right. It is part of the P&R Plan as a priority. So we are treating it as a priority, but because we do not have enough resources for it, (**The Chairman:** Ah!) and because we are discussing it with P&R, we are in agreement that we want the job done properly and we do not want to just look at the Prison, we want to look at the whole of the justice policy, that it needs to be done properly.

1905 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** But my – (**The President:** So the States –) Sorry, my point is though that you do not need to have it all signed, sealed and delivered to the States.

1910 **The President:** No, I get that. You are not going to have that.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I think we have all got our own ideas about what justice policy should look like and we could all contribute to that.

1915 **The President:** Yes. Indeed, absolutely right. I know that there are some who think that we should not have a prison full stop. (**The Chairman:** No.) Little Johnny can get away with what he likes. What concerns me is that with some of the comments that are made, which is disappointing, that some political Members forget about the victim and the courts have made that decision it will go to court after hearing about the offences that have taken place and that respect the victim as well, and I think you need to –

1920 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I think that is my point though, there might be Members of the States who actually would like to take a harder line, but there will be also other Members that would like to take a different approach, (**The President:** Yes, I know.) so you will get feed in from the Assembly as a whole and I think that would help to –

1925 **The President:** I totally get that, Deputy Queripel, but it is not for us to make a harder line, it is for the courts to make the harder line. We give them the tools in the box to do that, (**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I know.) and it is wrong and that is a slippery slope if politicians get involved with the court process so –

1930 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Yes, but policy is a matter for politicians, isn't it?

1935 **The President:** We set the policies (**The Chairman:** On that –) and we give them all the options for what is available, whether it is community service, whether it is tagging or any of the other things that we have got coming forward which will be part of that justice policy which will go to the courts, and the courts themselves will be involved in this. (**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Yes.) The courts are involved as part of the review, so it is important that we listen to what they have to say as well.

1940 **The Chairman:** Is sentencing purely a matter for the court?

The President: No. Well, the sentence is up to the courts, but –

1945 **The Chairman:** But the sentencing policy?

The President: – the sentencing policies of what is available to them, obviously we set that and it goes to the States to set that. But if they decide that – and you see it often, well not often but you do see it on occasions, where Joe Public will go, ‘That’s not right. They shouldn’t have had that sentence,’ but of course the court have heard everything before them, not what is actually just written in *The Press*. They make a judgment on probation reports that have been before them, whether the individual has got a long history. That is not for us to get involved in that, it is for us to make sure that we give the options under a policy, the justice policy, that is transferred across to the courts for them to be able to utilise that policy and the options.

1955 **The Chairman:** I am just going to ask one more question on this, okay, because we have detained you beyond the allotted time. (**The President:** You have!) (*Laughter*) I will ask you one question; whether you answer it or not is a matter for you, Deputy Lowe. (**The President:** Alright then!)

1960 On the causes of crime to what extent are you working with other committees of the States to address the causes of crime?

The President: Yes, that again is part of this justice policy, because the justice policy has got to be across committees. It has got to start young, it has got to be the education part of it in the schools and even before they even start school. There is a whole wealth of this justice policy, it is not just about the Prison and the courts. It is about trying to educate and filtering that through. (**The Chairman:** How often –?)

1970 Going back to the data which we were talking about just before – and I see Mrs Morris has picked it up which I am pleased about – if you look at the age band that we have got of those in the Prison, because all of that is on that data, we are likely to have potentially the families of that age group still coming through that system and we need to break that.

The Chairman: How often do you meet with those other committees to actually discuss these issues, to talk about how the Government collectively can tackle best the causes of crime? I would expect that you meet with Education, Social Security, Health fairly often to discuss these things. Is that accurate?

The President: No, it is not. That is their mandate. Surely they know that they have got to educate a good ...

1980 **The Chairman:** I mean the joint working –

The President: Yes, I get that, but it is important as well that, whether it is Education or whoever, they are trying their best as well to have a good society. They are teaching children right

1985 from wrong, they are teaching children that you think of other people. That should filter its way through anyway as a norm because that is the way that they are being taught at the school.

Regarding this justice policy – and this is again another area where we have said to ... and they know that, to the Oversight Board, it is big. We have got to make sure that they are involved with it. We cannot just come to the States and say, 'This is what we would like to do.' You would have all the President stand up and say, 'You did not consult us and it crosses our mandate.'

1990

The Chairman: You will be meeting with them?

The President: Absolutely right, yes. This review will be part of that. We will be making sure that they are involved, because they have to be involved and the same, it will be going out to consultation, it will be for States' Members to come and meet us as well or meet the panel that will be setting this up. So it is not just us.

1995

The Chairman: No, it is not just you.

2000

The President: It is a States' justice policy.

The Chairman: I am just wondering whether you met. Do you think it is fair to accept that historically the States has not been doing enough joint working to tackle the causes of crime?

2005

The President: It has improved. You have only got to look at the figures, it has improved. If you look at the numbers that have gone to Prison, so I am only talking about the Prison here for Home Affairs? This is our mandate so this is where we start from. The numbers in the Prison have gone down – gone down quite a lot. But what we are seeing is longer sentences coming in and that is where the balance has swung really.

2010

So yes, that is all part of the States. The States have a responsibility *per se*. It is not just Home Affairs, it is the States collectively.

The Chairman: No, we are not saying that.

2015

The President: And that is why justice policy is part of that.

The Chairman: Shall we have one from Deputy Queripel and then one question from Advocate Harwood?

2020

Deputy Laurie Queripel: With that in mind, bearing in mind you are the lead committee in essence, shouldn't it be up to you to facilitate meetings between Education and Health to ensure that you pass the relevant information on to each other? Because I would have thought would that be up to you to take the lead to make sure those meetings happen and that information was exchanged and that collaborative working took place?

2025

The President: It could equally be the other way round, Deputy Laurie Queripel. It could equally be Education calling us in and saying, 'We are trying to do this in the schools. What are you doing at the Prison? Why have you got x amount in the Prison?' It is working together, it is not saying, 'It has got to be you. It has got to be you.'

2030

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Who will take the lead on that then, because somebody needs to start the process?

2035

The President: We are doing that. We are and this is what I am saying – (**Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Okay, thank you.) we have now got the member of staff and the panel taking place and

it will be public. It is not a case of we are just doing things behind closed doors; it will be public with the agencies, because they are key. It is not just States committees, agencies are key in this. So agencies, States' committees, States' Members themselves, the courts – it is a wealth of an amount of people that are going to have to be involved with this – and they have to be.

2040

The Chairman: Advocate Harwood, should we make this the last question?

Advocate Harwood: Can I just come back to the nasty question of finance? Do you have a separate budget for this justice policy? As you say, it is a huge issue. Have you been granted a separate budget or do you have to assume it within your existing budget?

2045

The President: It is all part of the Oversight Board and the transformation so it will be part –

Advocate Harwood: So it is within the transformation?

2050

The President: Yes.

Advocate Harwood: So you will be accessing hopefully there?

2055

The President: Yes.

The Chairman: Thank you very much. I think we have –

The President: Thank you very much.

2060

The Chairman: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I just wanted to cover court waiting times very briefly, if we could, because –

2065

The Chairman: I will let you ask the question.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: – we said that we would.

2070

The Chairman: Yes, you are right. You are absolutely right.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: In regard to court waiting times, recent media coverage has alluded to a delay in cases coming to court. Is this factually correct? Were those reports accurate and what are the reasons, if there are delays? Is it a combination of things or one particular thing? I have heard about the lack of resource, poor record-keeping, evidence gathering. Are there delays and what are the causes for the delays, if there are delays; and what is going to be done about those issues to address them and to correct them?

2075

Mr Lewis: There are multiple factors at play here, which all the parties involved, which include Law Enforcement, Guernsey Police, the Law Officers, the courts, are aware that things need to change. But in the mix you also have the legal aid service and changes that have taken place there; pre-court, pre-sentencing discussions. There are a number of factors coming together.

2080

What we have not yet got to the bottom of is actually is there a prime cause of the delays? At the moment it is a combination of factors that are leading to cases taking a lot longer to come to court, and possibly changes in pleas of 'not guilty' until a very late stage, which means a case takes a lot longer. There are multiple factors, but you are right, it is not a situation we want to be

2085

in (**The Chairman:** No.) and so all the parties are working together to try and find a solution to this one.

2090 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Have you got the resource that you need, do you think, to do that?

Mr Lewis: I think it needs all the parties to come together. Is it a matter of process? Are we doing things wrongly? Are the policies we are working to correct? In fact, do we need to review – I will not go in to all the detail but – certain things and the way things are happening at the moment that might appear good but actually are just causing things to take a lot longer than they need to?

Deputy Laurie Queripel: But it is a matter of priority for you.

2100 **Mr Lewis:** Clearly, yes, we want to get it sorted. Not only us but also the courts as well.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Okay. Thank you.

The Chairman: Okay, thank you very much. I think we have detained you here long enough.

2105

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Yes, absolutely.

Mrs Morris: Thank you very much.

2110 **The President:** It has been a pleasure.

The Chairman: Thank you very much. Can I just say, firstly, I wish to thank the witnesses for attending our hearing today and increasing public awareness of this area of work.

2115 We as a Committee intend that these hearings will improve the level of public understanding on key areas of Government. There will be a *Hansard* transcript of what has been said today, which you will have sight of before it is published. Obviously you can make factual accuracy checks. Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

The President: Thank you very much for asking us.

The Committee adjourned at 12:10 hours