

THE STATES OF DELIBERATION
of the
ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

19 February, 2025

Proposition No. P.2025/5

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

INDEPENDENT STATES' MEMBERS' PAY REVIEW PANEL – FINAL REPORT 2024

AMENDMENT

Proposed by: Deputy Y Burford

Seconded by: Deputy V Oliver

To delete propositions 2, 3 and 4 and to substitute therefor:

"2. To agree that States members' pay commencing 1 July, 2025 shall be as follows:

Position	Deputy		Alderney Representative	
	PROPOSED By this amendment from 1.7.25	EXISTING PAY	PROPOSED by this amendment from 1.7.25	EXISTING PAY
President: Policy & Resources Committee	82,229	84,772	53,927	55,595
Members: Policy & Resources Committee Presidents: Committee for Economic Development Committee for Education, Sport & Culture Committee for Employment & Social Security Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure Committee for Home Affairs Committee for Housing Committee for Health & Social Care States' Trading Supervisory Board	63,181	65,135	34,879	35,958

Presidents: States Assembly & Constitution Committee Scrutiny Management Committee	56,166	65,135	30,346	35,958
Development & Planning Authority		48,213		
All other deputies	49,151	48,213	-	-
Alderney Representatives with a seat on a principal committee	-	-	25,813	26,611
All other Alderney Representatives	-	-	15,273	15,745
Maximum total remuneration: £2,141,851 (same as existing pay envelope)				

Rule 4(1) Information

- a) The proposition contributes to the States' objectives and policy plans by reducing expenditure.
- b) In preparing the proposition, extensive consultation has been undertaken with the Policy & Resources Committee.
- c) The proposition has been submitted to His Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications.
- d) The financial implications of this proposal represent a saving of £195,488 compared with Pay Review Panel proposals and no extra cost when compared with P&R proposals.
- e) Drafting advice was sought from the States' Greffier and the Officers of the Policy & Resources Committee.

Explanatory Note

A supporting report is attached in accordance with Rule 24 (1).

Amendment to Independent States' Members' Pay Review Panel policy letter - Supporting Report

Introduction:

The proposer and seconder of this amendment fully understand that the Policy & Resources Committee did not wish to interfere with the recommendations of the Pay Review Panel. However, the Pay Review Panel proposed a 9.1% increase in the total overall maximum remuneration for States Members. We fully agree with P&R that States' Members' pay should be maintained within the current cost envelope as any increase in the aggregate at a time when many in our community are struggling would be unacceptable. This amendment achieves that. However we consider that there are two issues with P&R's proposal, and this amendment seeks to rectify that. We have set out what we believe those anomalies are, with reasons and with examples illustrating the unintended consequences. This amendment also incorporates the uplift for the new President of Housing within the existing envelope.

Where we agree with P&R's proposals:

- Keeping within the current cost envelope inc. the new Housing President position;
- The proposed rates for the President of P&R and the members of P&R;
- The proposed rates for the seven Principal Committee Presidents and the President of the STSB.
- The proposed rates for Alderney Representatives.

Where we disagree with P&R's proposals:

- The proposed rates for Presidents of the Development and Planning Authority (DPA) and the two Parliamentary Committees (SMC and SACC).
- The proposed rates for ordinary members which give an uplift in pay for a member sitting on a Principal Committee when compared with a member sitting on a smaller Committee or a member without a seat.

We will deal with each of these two matters in turn.

1. Rates for Presidents of the Development & Planning Authority (DPA) and the two Parliamentary Committees (SMC and SACC)

Currently, the SACC and SMC Presidents receive the same pay as Principal Committee Presidents, whilst the DPA President receives the same as an ordinary member. We do not think any of these are currently set at the correct level. We believe that the Parliamentary Committees are set too high and the DPA is set too low. However, P&R are proposing that these three presidents are in future paid the same as an ordinary deputy who sits on a Principal Committee. We disagree with this for three reasons:

a. **Workload and Responsibility**

By way of example, we have set out the typical workload and level of responsibility for the DPA, SMC and SACC Presidents and have compared it to that of an ordinary member on a Principal Committee.

The DPA President will

- chair the DPA twice-monthly meetings;
- meet frequently with DPA officers to discuss and progress matters relevant to the mandate;
- attend President-to-President meetings;
- lead on public consultations;
- chair Open Planning Meetings;
- undertake media interviews, and
- deliver updates to the Assembly and be questioned for 20 minutes on the work of the Committee in the Assembly.

The SMC President will

- chair the SMC monthly meetings;
- chair the monthly Public Accounts panel and up to three other review panels which each meet as frequently as fortnightly;
- help draft and refine questions for public hearings and chair those public hearings which are livestreamed;
- deliver updates to the Assembly and be questioned for 20 minutes on the work of the Committee in the Assembly;
- meet at least twice weekly with the Principal Officer each week to as well as having numerous phone calls and emails with staff, and
- undertake media interviews.

The SACC President will

- chair the SACC three-weekly meetings;
- meet with officers to discuss and progress matters relevant to the mandate;
- undertake media interviews, and
- deliver updates to the Assembly and be questioned for 20 minutes on the work of the Committee in the Assembly.

An ordinary member on a Principal Committee:

- attend between two and four Committee meetings a month.

They do not generally chair meetings, they do not do media interviews, they do not liaise with senior staff on a regular basis, and they do not present updates to the Assembly or answer questions on their mandates in the Assembly.

We therefore contend that on a workload *and* responsibility basis, the role of a DPA, SMC or SACC President cannot in any way be considered comparable to that of an ordinary member on a Principal Committee, and the additional workload and responsibility of a President should be reflected in the remuneration.

b. The status of the Parliamentary Committees

The second reason is the status of the Parliamentary Committees. By banding the Presidents of the Parliamentary Committees with an ordinary Committee member, the message is sent out that the Parliamentary Committees are of no real importance within our system of government. This point also stands for ordinary members of the Parliamentary Committees, for whom P&R is proposing a reduced rate compared with other ordinary deputies.

c. The role of the DPA

With reference to the position of DPA president, the holder of that post currently only receives the same as an ordinary deputy. This is anomalous for all the reasons described above and has long been a source of perceived unfairness. However, under P&R's proposal, this position remains at the same level as that of an ordinary deputy on a Principal Committee.

2. The difference in pay for a member sitting on a Principal Committee, compared with a deputy on smaller Committees or a deputy without a seat

P&R are proposing a higher rate for deputies who take a seat on a Principal Committee as opposed to being a member on other Committees or not having a Committee seat at all. We are opposed to the principle of paying a deputy extra for sitting on a Committee as an ordinary member, whatever Committee that is (P&R excepted of course). This was done in the past and it was stopped as it engendered perverse behaviour, with members standing for Committees simply for the extra money. It should be a given that a person standing for the role of deputy, should expect to do Committee work. Although, theoretically, P&R's approach might speak to workload, in practice it often will not. Imagine a situation where a deputy takes a seat on all three of SACC, Scrutiny and the DPA. Under P&R's proposals that person would receive approximately £3,500 less than a member who only takes a seat on Employment & Social Security for example. Can it really be argued that the latter is doing a significantly more than the former? There is also no way of measuring how much a Committee member engages.

We also believe it is a mistake to penalise those who are not on any Committee. Although there should be, rightly, a basic assumption that becoming a deputy will involve committee work, backbenchers, and those on the minor Committees (SACC, SMC and DPA) have more time to participate in other States work such as Scrutiny panels, Scrutiny reviews, various ad-hoc sub-committees, and constituency work, as well as undertaking general scrutiny which are all vital parts of the role of a deputy. There is no way of measuring any of this workload with any degree of accuracy whatsoever, and to suggest membership of a Principal Committee means a person is working harder than a member of minor Committees or even a person with no Committee role at all but who may have a much greater participation in other aspects of the job is not based on any evidence at all. The biggest factor in determining achieved workload is the work ethic of the individual, not which Committee they sit on. Furthermore, a deputy may be without a Principal Committee position not for want of trying but because, for whatever reason, the States won't elect them to a such a position. They should not be penalised for this, as P&R proposes to do.

Finally, for many candidates considering standing in June, the pay will be a consideration. They will need to ensure that they will be able to afford to meet their financial obligations. Under P&R's proposals there may be some for whom, provided they get a seat on a Principal Committee, the pay would be adequate, but if they only get seats on minor committees, or no committee seat at all, it would be too tight. However, until they are elected they will not know for certain, so will have to base their decision on the lower rate which could

well influence their decision on whether or not to stand. A single rate for all deputies (who are not on P&R or not Presidents) also removes this uncertainty.

Summary

In summary, we are proposing:

- that the rates for the P&R President and P&R members, and for Presidents of Principal Committees and STSB, and the Alderney Representatives are as set out in the P&R proposals.
- that the rate for Presidents of the DPA, SMC and SACC are set exactly midway between those for Presidents of Principal Committees and for ordinary members
- that there is a single rate as set out in the table for all other deputies, as there is at present.