OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 14th December 2022

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

Volume 12, No. 34

ISSN 2049-8284

Published by the States' Greffier, The Royal Court House, St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ.

Present:

R. J. McMahon, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

People's Deputies

S. E. Aldwell
C. P. A Blin
A. H. Brouard
Y. Burford
A. Cameron
D. de G. de Lisle
H. L. de Sausmarez
A. C. Dudley-Owen
J. F. Dyke
S. P. Fairclough
S. J. Falla
P. T. R. Ferbrache
A. Gabriel
J. A. B. Gollop
S. P. Haskins
M. A. J. Helyar
N. R. Inder
A. Kazantseva-Miller
C. J. Le Tissier
J. P. Le Tocq
M. P. Leadbeater
D. J. Mahoney
A. D. S. Matthews
L. J. McKenna
C. P. Meerveld
N. G. Moakes
R. C. Murray
V. S. Oliver
C. N. K. Parkinson
R. G. Prow
L. C. Queripel
P. J. Roffey
H. J. R. Soulsby
G. A. St Pier
A. W. Taylor
L. S. Trott
S. P. J. Vermeulen

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy T. L. Bury (*absent*)

Business transacted

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m. in the presence of
His Excellency Lt Gen Richard Cripwell
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS
The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État XXII of 2022. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Court House on Wednesday, 14th December 2022 at 9.30 a.m., to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État which have been submitted for debate.

Statements

Recent events in Jersey –
Statement by the President of Policy & Resources

The Bailiff: Good morning, Members of the States.
The first thing I am going to do is to invite Deputy Ferbrache to address the Assembly.

Deputy Ferbrache: I really am very grateful for the opportunity to make this Statement.
Sir, whilst we enjoy a healthy and friendly sporting rivalry with Jersey, we stand very much as one Channel Islands community during times of pain and hardship.
The two tragedies in Jersey during last week have been felt across the Islands and, on behalf of the States of Guernsey and all Islanders, I would like to express our deep sorrow for all those in our sister isle who have been affected. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)
Our thoughts go out to the families and friends of the fishermen missing following the collision at sea on Thursday. Such a tragedy in itself would have been enough to rock any community to its core but for it to be followed by Saturday's devastating explosion is almost unthinkable.

The thoughts of all Guernsey people are with the Jersey community at this very sad time. We are thinking particularly of those who have lost loved ones, those who are injured, and the emergency services working so well and so tirelessly to help their community.

We have been in contact with colleagues in Jersey to offer practical support in any way that would help. The offer will stand today, tomorrow and in the coming days and weeks, and for as long as is necessary. I know that the Guernsey Police has already sent officers to help where they can.

I just want to finish by saying to the people of Jersey: We stand with you.

The Bailiff: Well thank you very much, Deputy Ferbrache. I echo all of those comments and I am going to invite you, Members of the States, to join with me in standing for a short time as a mark of respect to those who have lost their lives.

Members stood in silence.

The Bailiff: Thank you all very much.

Development & Planning Authority – Statement by Deputy Taylor withdrawn

The Bailiff: Now, Members of the States, you may have been expecting there to be a Statement from Deputy Taylor at this point, but he is no longer resigning from the Development & Planning Authority, and we will deal with that in due course. Therefore that is not going to happen.

General update – Statement by the President for Home Affairs

The Bailiff: So we will move on seamlessly to the Statement on behalf of the Committee for Home Affairs from its President, under Rule 10(4).

Deputy Prow, please.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, I am grateful for the opportunity to update the Assembly on the progress being made by the Committee *for* Home Affairs and our plans for the coming months.

Preparations to support the Moneyval evaluation remain a priority for the Committee, both operationally and politically. Work continues at pace with stakeholder colleagues, including Policy & Resources, Law Officers' Chambers, GFSC, Law Enforcement, the EFCB, FIU, Revenue Services and Guernsey Registry. This is a true collaborative effort.

As an economy which depends upon a successful finance sector, we must recognise our international obligations to successfully tackle financial and economic crime, which requires open engagement with the private sector and international colleagues. I had the pleasure recently to welcome the Indonesian Minister for Law and Human Rights, with the sole focus of our meeting being to discuss our joint commitment to combating money laundering, transactional financial crime and associated asset recovery. Significant progress has been made in respect of amending and strengthening the supporting financial crime legislation and further work is in train.

The Economic & Financial Crime Bureau and the Financial Intelligence Unit (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2022 was brought into force on 20th October this year. This completes the

Bureau's transition from an administratively established authority to one that fulfils the requirements of FATF Recommendation 30: Responsibilities of law enforcement and investigative authorities.

The FIU Strategic Plan 2022-24, which sets out its objectives and priorities, was approved and published in August 2022. These dovetail into those of the Bureau that was announced in the EFCB Business Plan published at the beginning of this year.

The Committee's recent Scrutiny Management hearing shone a spotlight on the resourcing challenges within the Committee; challenges of recruitment and retention are replicated across the public and private sectors.

Following external and internal advice the target operating model for the Bureau is for an establishment of 55 and we continue to recruit to this expanding model with active recruitment campaigns resulting in appointments.

In May 2021 there was a complement of 27 officers, who subsequently migrated to the Bureau. As of Monday, the Bureau had 38 officers in post. An additional four officers have recently been recruited and are due to take up their roles in January. The competitive employment market has meant that retention has presented a challenge in building towards the target operating model with the current headcount not being reflective of the appointments, which total 26 since May 2021.

Put simply, Government cannot match the opportunities and benefits provided by the private sector in terms of pay, healthcare and travel. However, more important than just to concentrate on the headcount, is ensuring that the Bureau is made up of individuals with the requisite skills and experience, focusing on targeted delivery of statutory responsibilities. By doing so, the challenges presented by existing vacancies are being managed.

As we prepare for the Moneyval inspection, the Committee looks forward to the continued support of the Assembly so that, as a Government, we pull together as we strive to deliver a united Bailiwick response to combating economic and financial crime.

The Population & Immigration Policy Review recognised that some of the immediate challenges we face as a jurisdiction cannot be easily resolved. The Bailiwick is operating in a competitive employment market. Government has to compete with the private sector. It is accepted that across the public services recruitment and retention present a constant challenge, whether we are looking for police officers, financial crime investigators, healthcare workers or teachers. These are specialist skills and are in demand globally. It is therefore vital that we think strategically about how we attract, develop and keep our workforce, who provide the essential and diverse services the Bailiwick needs.

The Committee were pleased with the constructive debate in the Assembly and for the subsequent support for the Population & Immigration Policy Propositions. Successful Resolutions are not the end of the process and I am pleased to report that, since the debate, work has continued at pace.

The Committee was recently briefed around future changes within population and immigration to achieve the policy ambition of expanding the pool of officers that employers can access where there is evidence they are needed. In addition, bringing the Population Management and Immigration Services together will improve and streamline the service and create resilience.

In delivering the changes agreed in the policy letter, the Committee recognised the need for proportionate transitional arrangements and to continue to proactively engage with businesses and the community to provide certainty and clarity on how and when these changes will take place.

A number of the Resolutions provided direction to other Committees. I am reassured that those discussions have already taken place at officer level to ensure the necessary resources.

The Justice Framework was approved by the States on 26th May, 2022 and we committed to develop and publish a Justice Action Plan once the refreshed Government Work Plan had been approved. This remains our intention.

Whilst acknowledging competing responsibilities of the GWP, the Committee were disappointed in how justice policy was represented. The importance and benefits of investing in the justice policy was recognised in the last term with the Justice Review, and in this political term. However, the GWP did not reflect all the transformational opportunities or essential business as usual developments that must support a justice system that will meet the evolving needs and the justifiably high expectations of the community.

The Committee has directed that further work be undertaken to prepare a plan that identifies cross-Committee justice actions and justice actions which are necessary to service business-as-usual operational policy.

This Action Plan will support shaping the next iteration of the Government Work Plan. The objective is to capture the extent of Home Affairs' commitment to transforming justice, acknowledging the need to resource business-as-usual policy progression in addition to strategic priorities.

The Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence Strategy 2022-25, an enhanced and broadened strategy, was approved by the Assembly in September 2022. The Strategy seeks to maintain and enhance existing services and develop new initiatives which will support survivors of domestic abuse and sexual violence.

Establishing a pilot Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC) in partnership with the third sector was a Committee ambition from the start, and I am pleased to advise the Assembly that this will soon be brought to fruition. A SARC manager has been successfully recruited, while details of the appointment are being finalised, the post holder will bring experience, enthusiasm and momentum to the development and delivery of this essential service. In addition, a property has been identified and work commenced on mapping the services is in progress.

The Committee values collaborative working and is supportive of the principle of focusing on agreed priorities and of delivering within a budget. However, at Home Affairs we are equally aware that: essential services that Government are expected to deliver come at a cost. Health, education or safety and security – and in the public sector rarely generate an income; there is a cost of failing to invest in these essential services. They do not stand still or they deteriorate. There is both a social and financial cost in not investing or planning ahead.

Home Affairs recognises the impact of the desire to deliver new services for less. Because of this the Committee intends to develop a revised model that captures its ambition for the remaining term. This will focus on the delivery of strategic policy and operational output, and on the development that will support the continued cost-effective delivery of services that keep the community safe and secure. The Committee will be asking operational leads to think innovatively to ensure that we can prioritise and deliver.

Sir, the Committee is moving to task and finish mode, and intends to progress the model to achieve this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Well, it is now an opportunity for any Member who wishes to do so to ask a question within the mandate of the Committee *for* Home Affairs.

Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

The President mentioned a productive meeting with a senior Indonesian Minister. Then I am aware that the President, Deputy Prow, and other members of the Committee attended a very successful Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Crown Dependency group of people from Alderney, Jersey and the Isle of Man; and Deputy Prow led a workshop. What common ground lessons have come of out of that useful meeting?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir. I thank Deputy Gollop for his question.

Yes, I very much enjoyed the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Crown Dependencies meetings and he is right, there was a workshop which I hosted along with Deputy Aldwell, and the answer is that there are very many subjects, from drug trafficking to domestic abuse, sexual violence and many other items. It was very interesting to see that high on the agendas of Jersey and the Isle of Man were very similar issues, and it was a very good opportunity to learn from each other. Certain commitments were made to exchange further information and continue the dialogue.

I have also very recently had a very productive meeting with the Jersey Minister for Home Affairs, Helen Miles, along with the Committee and again, there are very many areas of common concern where we can work very closely with Jersey to progress initiatives in both islands.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

I would like to say in posing this question that I am very grateful to Deputy Prow for the time he spent with me yesterday talking through certain issues. But I do though feel I have an obligation to pursue a matter because I have repeatedly asked Deputy Prow if he believes that we are adequately and appropriately resourced for our impending Moneyval visit, and he has confirmed that we are.

Now he has gone into some detail this morning explaining the full complement at the Economic and Financial Crime Bureau is 55. We are currently at 38 with four in the pipeline. Now that means we are 30% down on a full complement but if the quality of those people is as high as I believe he thinks it is, and he made reference to a very tight labour market, can he confirm once more that he does believe and his colleagues believe that we are adequately resourced, in the knowledge that that number of 42 is unlikely to rise significantly between now and Easter?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Trott for his question. I also thank him for the conversation we had yesterday.

What I want to assure this Assembly of is that, in preparing for Moneyval and what we need to do and the resources, it was always recognised – and this process started at the end of last term – that we had to recruit more people into financial crime. It is not just a matter of putting in place the legislation and a dedicated Economic and Financial Crime Bureau; it was about working to an optimum model.

We have, since the beginning of last term, done that, and we have increased the number. But there is no denying that there are challenges with recruitment, not just the FCB or the FIU. This is a problem across the States where you are trying to employ specialist people. What I can tell him and we had an update at Committee on Monday is that progress is being made and …

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow, I am afraid that your time for answering is up.

Deputy Prow: Sorry, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

In 2018 there was an HMRC Report which stated that the IT was somewhere where it should be. With all the IT issues that are happening at the moment, do you feel that Home Affairs have improved on that situation from 2018 and are in good stead for going forward?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir. I thank Deputy Oliver for her question.

I think it must be of concern to every Member of this Assembly – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) the state of our IT. I do not think Home Affairs is alone, but I think what I can say with regard to the HMRC review, which Deputy Oliver points out was 2018, is that the transformational aspects of it, some have been resolved and some are work in progress. They might not be at the pace that the Committee of Home Affairs would like, or the services that have to deliver, but progress has been made. But I think this is placed against a background of a very unsatisfactory States' IT platform, but I know that Policy & Resources are on the case on this and I look forward to any good news that comes out of that in the future.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Prow for his update.

Pavement surfing around Island schools has recently been highlighted in a shocking video on social media, where a pedestrian attempting to walk to Capelles school was having to share the pavement with large volumes of moving car traffic.

Would Deputy Prow agree with me that children should not need to risk their lives whilst walking to school; and also tell me how many fixed penalty tickets the Police have issued this year for pavement surfing?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Cameron for his question, and I thank him for his advance notice of it.

With the specific question he asks I am informed that so far this year there have been 166 fixed penalty notices issued for offences relating to driving on a footpath. I share with him, as I am sure everybody in the Assembly does, the dangers of what is referred to as pavement surfing.

There has been a Police social media campaign in the run up to Road Safety Week on the issue of pavement surfing, which includes a video, and I know within the resources available to them that the Police are aware of this problem and are responding to it as best they can.

I think the message I would like to give out in answer to this question is that it is an offence to drive on the footpath unless this is done so in order to pass another vehicle and this is contained in the Road Traffic (Guernsey) Order of 2019. Continuing to drive along a footpath for longer than is necessary is an aggravating factor in this offence. That is the position and the Police will take action –

The Bailiff: I am afraid your time is up once again. (**Deputy Prow:** Thank you.) Could you keep an eye on the clock please.

Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

Continuing on the theme of Deputy Trott's question around the Economic and Financial Crime Bureau's staffing, given that there are 38 in post, 42 expected out of a total of 55 staffing, how is the recruitment and retention of staff ongoing?

I know Deputy Prow ran out of time earlier so perhaps he would like to carry on and elaborate. And with the existing 38 or 42 staff, is there a danger of them being burnt out or being asked to work unnecessary hours and then losing those staff?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Sir, I thank Deputy Gabriel for his question and again I thank him for the advance notice.

Following on from my answer to Deputy Trott, I am satisfied that the recruitment has identified and employed people of the right and sufficient skills and I am, and the Committee is, confident that those staff will meet the assessment criteria of Moneyval.

Deputy Gabriel highlights the issue of recruitment and retention and all I can say is that I am confident that the leadership in the FCB and the FIU are very aware of this and are continuing their recruiting campaign and are continuing to ensure that the work that is in front of them will be completed to the satisfaction of any Moneyval evaluation.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, Deputy Prow referred to a Justice Framework Action Plan being worked on by Home Affairs but I do not recall him announcing a date when that Action Plan will be published. I apologise if he did and I missed it, but could he clarify that for me please – whether or not there is a date set for the publication of the Action Plan?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir and I thank Deputy Queripel for his question.

He is right, I did not specify a date. That is because the work is in progress but I am confident that in the first quarter of next year we will be able to announce what our Action Plan is, bearing in mind that the Government Work Plan objectives and criteria are known to the Committee. This is about dovetailing in the business-as-usual aspects that we need to do.

What we are doing is more work on the Action Plan so that it is much more transparent and meaningful for both Members of this Assembly and the public and those who need to discharge the delivery of it.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you, sir.

In the recent Public Scrutiny hearing with the Committee for Home Affairs we learned that various aspects of Police work were being deprioritised due to a lack of resources, including neighbourhood policing, road policing and road safety.

What reassurances, if any, can the President give the community that the appropriate measures and campaigns in the interests and safety of all road users, including the annual anti-drink-driving campaign, will continue to be delivered?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Fairclough for his question. I also thank him for advance notice of it.

The seasonal anti-drink-driving campaign is well underway with officers conducting random vehicle safety stop checks around the Island as usual. There have been more than 50 such stop checks undertaken so far with arrests being made for drink driving offences, and several vehicle faults being identified.

Road safety is a shared responsibility across Departments. The Police Force concentrates on the enforcement elements, although it does assist in some specific campaigns; for example, in

November this year pedestrian safety awareness of the Law and the dangers of driving on the footpath, as well as the drink-driving campaign already mentioned.

The reduced number of police officers does have an impact on the services that are provided. However, staff are deployed to maintain an emergency response 24/7 on core policing duties such as criminal investigations.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, it is my understanding that Cayman, Jersey and the Isle of Man have undertaken mock Moneyval inspections before experiencing the real thing. I think in previous comments in the Assembly the President has indicated he does not believe there is merit in Guernsey going down that path.

I would be interested to know, sir, whether in reaching that decision there has been any dialogue with those other jurisdictions to understand their experience and the value which they believe they derived from undertaking that kind of exercise?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy St Pier for his question.

I can absolutely assure Deputy St Pier that dialogue has taken place internationally and with the other Crown Dependencies around the Moneyval evaluation. I am entirely satisfied that the preparedness programme that is in place, working with Policy & Resources and the Home Affairs Committee, is absolutely committed to ensuring that we are as prepared as we possibly can be for Moneyval.

Although an overall mock evaluation is not taking place because we did not think that that was the best use of resources, certainly in all the areas – and I listed all the stakeholders involved in my Statement – where necessary, mock evaluations will take place in those individual services. So, I think the answer is, yes, dialogue is taking place as and when it is appropriate, both globally and with our closer partners.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

Can the President tell us when the Committee will publish the results and recommendations of the Non-Punitive Alternative Committee in respect of sentencing for the possession of small amounts of controlled drugs?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Leadbeater for his question.

The answer to that is very soon. The Committee has made a clear direction and in fact we are in the process of corresponding with the Committee he sits on, the Committee of Health & Social Care, on this matter. So this matter is high on our agenda and the process will be completed very soon.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

Can the President of Home Affairs share with us any progress that has been made regarding noisy vehicles?

I am aware that some of this work is taking place with Environment & Infrastructure but I would appreciate any updates from the side of Home Affairs and what is being progressed.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Blin for his question.

The answer to that is that the Committee, at its last meeting, considered a paper which was a joint initiative with the Committee *for* Environment & Infrastructure, which looks across the whole range of road safety issues and what improvements can be made, which includes a provision to investigate what can be done about noisy vehicles. So I think that specific issue is in a better place with regard to looking for solutions than it has ever been, and I look forward to working with the Committee *for* Environment & Infrastructure in bringing proposals back to this Assembly whenever we can.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

In 2007 the Corston Report commissioned by the UK Home Office was published. It looked into vulnerabilities of women in the criminal justice system. Some of the recommendations and beliefs were that there were many women in prison either on remand or serving sentences for minor non-violent offences for whom prison was both disproportionate and inappropriate.

The Report said that it was essential to do more to address issues connected with women's offending before imprisonment became a serious option.

Could the President confirm if the Corston Report findings have been considered or will be considered as part of the Criminal Justice Review?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy Kazantseva-Miller for her question.

I did not hear properly the reference to the Report that she referred to, but I can give her an assurance that the safety of women in our society is absolutely at the top of our agenda and our lead on that, Deputy Aldwell, is very active in doing that research and reporting back to the Committee. Absolutely every aspect and appropriate report in that regard is considered by the Committee, and we are extremely anxious in the remainder of this term to do all we can to progress this.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Prow has highlighted challenges in recruitment and retention, which will be of major concern to the public in terms of the fact that community security is primate … in concerns of the public. Is this shortage affecting officers on the beat, particularly in Town and the Bridge with respect to security of property and individuals?

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir, and I thank Deputy de Lisle for his question.

The Committee has every confidence in the management of the Island's Police Force. They do deploy according to risk and their staff are certainly kept motivated. But I cannot deny that the recruitment and retention issues that occur not only in the Island's Police Force but across a lot of professional services such as health and social care and in the teaching profession are issues and challenges that we as an Assembly need to face.

But to give Deputy de Lisle the assurance he is seeking, despite those constraints, which I am not trying to minimise, I am confident in the management of the Island's Police Force that prioritisation is taking place and they are deploying according to risk.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: And the last question to the President, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

I am just following on from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's question.

The name of the report is the Corston Report. It was completed by Baroness Corston and it is not so much about the safety of women in the community but rather to do with custodial sentences where women are concerned. It is just the question as to whether that Report – it is some years old now but still very valid – was actually included in our consideration of policy, and perhaps if the President, if he cannot answer now, might revert to myself and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller in due course?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Prow, are you able to say anything further?

Deputy Prow: Simply that there are many reports, many factors which are considered. I am sorry, I did not hear the reference to the Corston Report and certainly that is a report that, in the mix, has been looked at. But I am very happy to look into that further and get back to both Deputy Burford and Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. I am sorry I missed the name of the report.

Thank you, sir.

Questions for Oral Answer

COMMITTEE *FOR* ENVIRONMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Bus services – Service cancellations; driver shortages and evening services

The Bailiff: We will now move into Rule 11 Questions, and the first set of questions is from Deputy Gollop to the President of the Committee *for* Environment & Infrastructure.

Deputy Gollop, your first question please.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff, sir, and yet again I thank Deputy de Sausmarez and her Committee for their reply.

My first question is, whilst welcoming an improvement in the reliability of Island bus services, the measures taken to recruit additional younger drivers and the recent careers fair presence, why are there still service cancellations and driver shortages every week?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez to reply, please.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, the scheduled bus operator is actively recruiting drivers and the numbers have been increasing, supported by the measures that were introduced to that end, and that has reduced the number of services that have had to be dropped. However, additional drivers are still required and that is why the normal schedule has not yet been fully restored.

The majority of drivers are recruited from off-Island on employment permits. There is still a shortage of drivers across Europe and indeed further afield but it is hoped that the recent recruitment initiatives including, for example, the Careers Fair, will attract more local drivers.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes. One success, I believe, Environment & Infrastructure have had recently has been the rapid recruitment, with changing rules, of taxi drivers – who could have been bus drivers, maybe.

My question is, clearly most drivers at the moment are from outside the Island, so is E&I able to push for better employment licences so that existing drivers can stay on the Island rather than having to leave … a refinement of work permits, etc.?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

Deputy Gollop's supplementary question is actually very timely because I would like to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to the officers in Deputy Prow's team with respect to population management, who of course look after the employment permits. We have been working with them very closely and in fact I had a meeting with them just a couple of days ago to discuss how we might be able to streamline processes as far as we can within the rules and policy objectives of the population management policy. So, although I do not have anything specific to announce, I cannot announce any measures, I can give Deputy Gollop the assurance that is something we are looking at very closely, working with the relevant officers to that end.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

Would the President agree with me that Deputy Gollop was partially correct about renewing public service vehicle (PSV) licences, in that the newly-relaxed ruling in that a driver of a vehicle in category D class, which is a bus, that that renewal would cascade down into a B class if they hold a relevant B licence, which of course is the taxi … or again, the D1 holder, which is a minibus driver, which they are able to renew and subsequently drive taxis if they hold the B licence?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez. I am not entirely convinced that that arises out of the principal answer given but do you want to comment at all?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, I will just say yes, what he said. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: I think that is probably fair. Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, with respect to all these service cancellations and driver shortages the public feel that the focus of the Department has not taken full responsibility for the service. What improvements can the public expect in the future from the Department?

The Bailiff: Again, I do not think that arises out of the answer that was given about recruiting drivers.

Deputy de Lisle: It certainly does, sir. I mean –

The Bailiff: I am telling you, Deputy –

Deputy de Lisle: Let us face it, we have a problem,, or the public have got a problem –

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle, I am telling you it does not, so there will be no answer to that question from the President.

Any other supplementary questions on this particular answer? Deputy Gollop, your second question then please.

Deputy Gollop: It is possible that my second question would raise other supplementaries. But, no, apart from the last final Town shopping Christmas Thursday on 22nd December, no public bus service leaves St Peter Port after 20.35 hours at present, a scenario true every weekday. When will the schedule-published later evening services around 9 p.m. return?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez to reply, please.

Deputy de Sausmarez: We cannot reinstate evening services until driver numbers increase further and we cannot yet predict with any accuracy when that might be. However, in light of the current recruitment drive we are hoping that these evening services can be reintroduced early in the New Year.

While driver numbers have been too low to support the full schedule, the focus has been on providing a consistent service with wide coverage protecting, in particular, the core morning and afternoon commuter services.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I thank you for the optimism of the New Year seeing more services but the answer mentions prioritising afternoon commuter services, which indeed has been done, and yet there is a 45-minute gap on the Charroterie-St Fermain-St Martin's Forest Road core link. Will it be possible to ensure that all parts of the Island maintain reliability, especially now in the dark and cold months?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, I think as I explained in my answer to the original question, we have been focused on consistency and wide coverage and, given the constraint that is the driver numbers, the current schedule that we are adhering to is achieving that to the greatest practical extent.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Sir, can I ask whether we can expect a late night service into the west, at least to the Airport, in the very near future?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think I can refer Deputy de Lisle to my original answer to the original question, which was, while we cannot predict with any accuracy the time at which we will have sufficient drivers to be able to restore the full coverage, we are hopeful that we will be able to do so early next year.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: The driver shortages, in fact the staff shortages, across the Island are well understood. I am just wondering if the President could confirm whether there is a general acceptance from commuters that there are issues around that? The impression I get is that it is generally accepted and I wonder whether she can confirm that the complaints around the issues arising are not as strong as they might have been in previous terms?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I thank Deputy Inder for his question.

Again, like him, I have just got my own individual perspective, albeit I do probably have greater insights in terms of the feedback that comes from the team, but I do agree with him we have made a really big effort to communicate the reasons behind the disruption to the service. So I do think it is generally fairly well understood and because, as Deputy Inder points out, this is not an issue just affecting the public transportation sector, I think people do, generally speaking, understand.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel, do you have a supplementary question?

Deputy Queripel: Sir, these questions are all about operational issues, as I understand it. We are always told that Committees are not supposed to get involved in operational issues. So, can Deputy de Sausmarez just assure me that the Committee do not get involved in operational issues and that all she is doing is relaying the answers to the questions that were given by the bus company?

The Bailiff: I am not persuaded that that arises out of an answer relating to evening services.

Can I just say, before we move on to … there are quite a lot of questions at this meeting …this is not an opportunity, Members, to have a general debate through the asking of questions on a topic that seems to be touched on by some or other of the questions.

It is very much a case of asking the question, getting the answer and then, if there are supplementary questions that arise out of the answer that is given, you can ask supplementary questions to seek, effectively clarification on the answer that is given, not to have a more wide-ranging debate. If you want a more wide-ranging debate then you either have a Proposition from Committee or alternatively a requête.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

Carer services – Steps to fill vacancies; return to normal service

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, you have some questions to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care that come next, so your first of those questions please.

Deputy Gollop: Thanking you again, sir, and for the answers.

What steps are the Health & Social Care Committee and the States' Human Resources Team doing to fill the very large number of outstanding carer vacancies?

The Bailiff: The President of the Committee, Deputy Brouard, to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

Health & Social Care is taking every possible step and actively recruiting through a variety of channels, including engaging with school leavers, arranging Open Days and advertising across the whole range of media options. We also look to make employment as attractive as possible to applicants. Training opportunities are constantly reviewed and there are pathways for further qualifications if desired. Employment is also flexible, with full-time and part-time work available, and the option to work certain shifts to fit around other commitments. Where possible, agency staff are used to cover gaps in service, however, recruitment remains challenging in health and care sector, as it is for many sectors locally and indeed globally.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Perhaps two.

The first is, does the Health & Social Care Committee, as much as possible, use the excellent facilities of the College of Further Education, the Guernsey Institute, which I know has been regularly used in the past, to bring on the next generation of carers and indeed perhaps mature students as well?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Very much so, sir. In fact, the Institute moved across from HSC to Education, Sport & Culture just fairly recently and also I was very honoured to go to the graduation service of those members of our health team who, through the Institute, just recently graduated at St Pierre Park. So, yes, we very much look forward to , and continue to work with our colleagues on Education.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Hopefully this does not go too far outside the answer or the question.

The answer refers to agency staff used to cover gaps in service. Would the thinking go further and maybe outsource areas of care to agencies on a more long-term basis?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

We have actually discussed that particular aspect but of course a lot of other care agencies on the Island are under pressure as well.

We also have a piece of work outstanding for regulation of care providers and those who provide other, allied health care support for people. We have not got that regulation in place and, of course, we would have to make sure that we are very careful with our due diligence and governance to make sure that anyone whom we refer to the private sector is going to be safe and well looked after. I am sure in the majority of cases they are but we just do not have that legislation in place at the moment. But yes, it is something that we have looked at and have considered.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Your second question to the President, please, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

Can Health & Social Care give an indication of when carer services of domiciliary care can return to normal?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

It is difficult to confirm a timeframe as this is reliant on having the staff and resources in place, which is an ongoing challenge, but that is not unique to Guernsey.

Internationally, the personal cost of working in health and social care through the pandemic, changes relating to Brexit, the rising cost of living including accommodation and travel costs, have all affected the availability and the decisions of health and care staff when choosing either to stay in the sector in Guernsey or to relocate to the Bailiwick for work. We are having to target our resources where they are most needed but we will keep the situation under review whilst we navigate this difficult period.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I appreciate and understand the answer but does the Committee have a goal of perhaps being able to return to a near normal service by, let us say, June 2023? Is there a timeframe of an aspiration at least in vogue?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you for the question.

We have not set a particular date when we are going to achieve it. We would like it done tomorrow. If it has to be Easter or it has to be the summer it will be when it will be. We have not set a target for this because it is so important that we get it done as soon as possible.

But thank you for the question.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, supplementary?

Deputy Inder: Yes, thank you, sir.

If COVID taught us nothing it taught us that there was no such thing as unskilled labour. In response to Deputy Gollop's questions the President has spoken about recruitment efforts. Is one of the problems that we have got, or would he consider that one of the problems we have got, the low-paid nature of caring? And are we in a position now where we have got to really look at the type of value that the carers have for our community and actually really reflect on the type of packages we are giving them to ensure that we recruit more people into the sector?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

I think Deputy Inder makes a very fair point and this has been echoed across the United Kingdom as well following the pandemic.

I think there is a further question from Deputy Gollop that will touch on this particular area but it is what we as a society are prepared to pay for, and who is going to pay. Is it going to be the person who needs the care in their home or is it contributions through the state system. People are at liberty to pay whatever they need to pay privately but of course that is a different offering from what the States is providing. But thank you for the question, very good point.

The Bailiff: And your third question to the President please, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I am informed that public sector carer salaries have not risen by particularly high amounts. Is the Health & Social Care Committee working across the States at arguing a case for some carer pay wage and salary increases?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard to reply.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

Salary negotiations fall within the remit of Policy & Resources Committee and, as they are the employer, Policy & Resources Committee is already aware of the challenges faced by the Committee in staffing its essential services. The Committee itself is not a direct party to pay negotiations but is confident that the situation is well understood by those who are involved.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Yes, my supplementary touches on Deputy Inder's point as well.

Is the Committee putting a case for a structural increase in carer salaries and an evening-up of the perception that carers from outside of Guernsey may have rent or other allowances that locally-based carers would not have, in order to make the jobs more attractive to local people as a pay enhancement?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I think Deputy Gollop will have his answer, or more of his answer, in his next question but we have, as an Assembly, decided that on negotiations for pay, which is a very tricky area to work in – I also have the scars as well as Deputy Le Tocq before me – it is a difficult area and it is very useful to have one single body that is talking with one voice. I am sure that the professionals there and also the politicians are well aware of all the issues that Deputy Gollop raises.

The Bailiff: Your fourth and final question to the President, please, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

A leading care provider has suggested that for key carer workers the availability and cost of housing is almost impossible. Does Health & Social Care wish to support more specialised housing for carers?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

We are assuming that this question refers to key worker housing. Traditionally, care workers have not been able to access such housing as they are largely recruited from the local population. However, we are aware that it may be helpful to our recruitment efforts to expand our accommodation offering to this group, providing we have the stock available, which we do not have at this time.

Of course, HSC recognises the need for key worker housing generally; indeed, we have been very clear in requesting additional key worker accommodation as this continues to be a significant barrier to recruitment. The Committee recognises that there are broader challenges in the housing market which are causing housing to become unaffordable. While this particular aspect is not part of our mandate, we have a strong interest in this area and will continue to work with the relevant Committees to push for the provision of additional accommodation to help ease some of our staffing challenges.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

We all benefit from care and in the short term would the Committee be able to support utilising life-expired properties that they are redeploying, rather than perhaps transferring them to property services for selling? These properties could be used maybe to house carers.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you for that question.

We have got a smorgasbord of properties that either we own or we rent, some of which are not in particularly good condition, some are not particularly attractive to our staff, but that is what we have.

Ideally, and you know this full well, Deputy Gollop, from the debate that we had earlier in the year, we have suggested and we will still require a building, preferably on the PEH campus which could staff 75-150 of our staff – not only for ourselves but for other key workers and we could do with that and we could fill half of it straight away, tomorrow. We are renting hotels, we have had offers of converting houses which give six bedrooms, but they have to have a shared kitchen.

That is not going to be professional in this century. We need to move away to have professional housing which has got proper kitchens, bathrooms, etc. that people can live with, in dignity. They also, a lot of them, like to be very close to the PEH site. I appreciate for some Members that is abhorrent and they do not understand it. But that is the reality of what our staff tell us on a daily and weekly basis.

Thank you.

A Member: Hear, hear.

Deputy Gollop: My second supplementary would be, the Deputy implies, through the answer in a supplementary, that the board would like to see an extension of key worker accommodation being available to carers, as well as nurses and other staff. Is that a goal once the accommodation at Le Vauquiedor and other areas is pushed through?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: I am going to rephrase it, Deputy Gollop. It is not a goal, it is a reality, almost, if we want to have carers available. As Deputy Inder made it so clear, they are very valuable and they are all very much part of the chain. We cannot move people out of our Hospital until we have places for them to go to, either back into their own homes or into residential homes. So we would very much like to be able to have in our quiver of options further accommodation that we could offer that to carers and other people.

Traditionally, as I said in answer to your earlier question, we have been able to recruit locally, in which case they do not need housing. That market is changing. We are looking at a different landscape as we go forward and that is the reality that we face on a daily basis.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

In response to Deputy Gollop's questions, Deputy Brouard alluded to the amount of key worker accommodation, working possibly with the GHA and I assume therefore that his input into the Housing Action Group which will then become, I think, the Action Plan that we are going to see in March. So in short, sir, he mentioned that he could fill 75 units tomorrow. On a 10-year timeline, how many units does HSC believe that the Island is going to have to build new accommodation for

health workers over the next 10 years or so? What is the sum of that, does the Committee think that we are going to need?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

My personal view is that we would need at least 150. But some of that is releasing properties that we are already either renting privately and then re-letting, or properties that we own now which are unsuitable. So it would mean that we could get out of those markets and move into professional accommodation on or near the PEH site. Also, if we cannot use it all for healthcare that still leaves the door open for key workers in Home or in Education. Or even Islanders generally who are part of our community, who are struggling to find homes at this moment.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, supplementary to the last answer.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you, sir.

Does Deputy Brouard accept that key worker accommodation can only really ever be a short-term fix to what would otherwise be a permanent revolving door of requirement for those key workers? Ultimately, supply and demand is such that the reward for those individuals performing those tasks has to be sufficient to enable them to live in our community and participate in property in our own community. That ultimately is the longer-term challenge.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: No, I do not. I mean the short-term fix of John Henry Court should be empty by now. It is not. It is full. It is full every single day. So we built that because we knew back then that we needed accommodation for some of our healthcare workers. The revolving door is really with agency staff. Agency staff come over for a short term because we cannot get anybody else. If we could recruit somebody to come over to the Island and live in purpose-built accommodation there is more likelihood that they will stay as permanent staff and become integrated into our community.

We will never grow enough doctors, surgeons, and healthcare workers in our community. That is the reality. So either we can pretend that we want a short-term fix, but it is not. It will be longer-term. The global positioning on healthcare workers has changed and is changing. John Henry Court is living evidence of it. As I said, it should be empty but it is not. It is full with people who are here, helping and caring for us and our families.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, second supplementary.

Deputy Inder: On that, sir, Deputy Brouard made mention of the Campus Project. It has been a while since the requête. Can he update the Assembly as to where we are in the

, the planning and what the Board's view is and the timelines? Just roughly.

The Bailiff: I do not really think that arises out of the answer that was given to the first question. You have gone too far away from that first answer, Deputy Inder.

Deputy St Pier, do you want to try a second supplementary?

Deputy St Pier: Yes, sir. Is Deputy Brouard saying in response to the substantive question that in essence, pay is not a factor in relation to ensuring that we have sufficient carers?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: I am sure that pay is a factor. It is one of multiple factors. It is to do with family, where people live, where they come from, what they are looing for at that particular time in life. But the reality is that if you bring someone to the Island to help and work with us, unless they have got somewhere to live and stay overnight, whether that is a hotel or a rented hotel that we have taken over, or its staff accommodation, they will not come.

We need to have places for people to be in. But Deputy St Pier is right that the salary is a factor. What figure you would need to overcome that, that is a debate for another day. But no, it is definitely a factor as with everything.

Thank you.

COMMITTEE *FOR* POLICY & RESOURCES

Sir Charles Frossard House equipment room – Responsibility for warning system and air conditioning; loss of data; independent review

The Bailiff: As there are no more supplementary questions arising out of that answer we will move on to the next set of questions. These are coming from Deputy Soulsby to the President of the Policy & Resources Committee. So your first question please, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

In a media release dated 2nd December 2022, it was stated that a warning system is in place to alert the States when the equipment room at Sir Charles Frossard House gets too hot. Is Agilysis responsible for maintaining, testing and responding to the warning system under its contract with the States of Guernsey?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache, the President, to reply, please.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, no, Agilysis is not responsible for maintaining the climate control.

The Bailiff: Is there a supplementary, Deputy Soulsby?

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, sir. Putting aside the fact that at the moment, irrespective of whether it is a contractual term, or not and any IT service provider worth his salt will understand the importance of the environment in which the service sits as being critically important to their proper functioning, who is responsible?

Deputy Ferbrache: I think that was a statement rather than a question.

The Bailiff: Yes and I am not sure that arises out of the answer that was given either, Deputy Soulsby. The answer is no, effectively. It is quite difficult to do that. I mean, these are matters that can be addressed more broadly, there is always a Rule 14 question. But, we will have your second question, please Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: My question was who is responsible?

The Bailiff: I am saying that it does not arise out of the answer that was given to the first question. Deputy St Pier, you want to try a supplementary, do you?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir. Which is that if the failure was not the responsibility of Agilysis then are the consequential losses of the failure the responsibility of the States, rather than Agilysis?

The Bailiff: Again, I do not think that arises out of the answer given.

The whole issue about questions – we will just take a time out briefly here – is you ask the questions under Rule 11 as of right, provided that they are not ruled out of order for not complying with the conditions that are in Rule 11. When the answer is given, you can have supplementaries that arise out of the answer that is given. As I say, the answer in relation to this question that was posed, namely was Agilysis responsible for maintaining this under its contract with the States of Guernsey. The answer was no.

It is always going to be very difficult to get a supplementary out of a one-word answer, effectively, and when Members are thinking about the questions that they are going to pose, that are going to be for answering, remember that the Member who is asking the question gets to see the question in advance and can think through what might be capable of being asked. For the rest of you, this is the first time that you get to hear the answer to the question. There are other means, as I have said, of enquiring of a Committee what their position is in relation to anything, in particular Rule 14.

That is part of the parliamentary process and those answers are published and they can lead to further questions being asked under Rule 11 at a subsequent States' Meeting. So where the answer is 'no', and the explanation 'Agilysis is not responsible for maintaining the climate control' adds absolutely nothing to the 'no', that is why I am saying it is going to be very difficult to get a supplementary out of such an answer.

You have a second question, Deputy Soulsby?

Deputy Soulsby: Can I try another supplementary to the first question?

The Bailiff: You can try.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you.

If not, I will move to Rule 14s. Whilst Agilysis are not responsible under the contract, does the President agree that although they are responsible for maintaining the States' IT systems, that there has to be some duty of care by Agilysis to ensure the environment was working appropriately?

Deputy Ferbrache: I am quite happy to answer it, sir,

The Bailiff: Well, alright. Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: That cannot be answered in one word because nobody is saying what happened a couple of weeks ago now, whatever it was, was satisfactory. That is being looked at and there will be a full and detailed response to all issues. There is no reason to try and hide anything. But to try, in one or two sentences, to answer questions that people may know the answer to is very difficult.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor, are you going to try a supplementary question arising out of the answer that Deputy Ferbrache gave?

Deputy Taylor: Yes.

The Bailiff: Alright.

Deputy Taylor: So given the considerate ramifications of the failure of climate control, will consideration be given to renegotiate the contract to ensure that Agilysis do have some responsibility in maintaining that equipment?

The Bailiff: Again I am going to rule that does not arise out of the answer to the question. I do not know how many more times that I am going to have to say this during the course of this meeting. It has got to arise out of the answer. It has not got to be tangentially related to this, 'Oh, there is reference to a contract and therefore can we have a question about renegotiating it?' That is a separate line of questioning. It does not arise out of that answer and that is why it is out of order.

Your second question to the President please, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: It was stated in the release that the reason the equipment room in Sir Charles Frossard House got too hot was because the air conditioning systems had failed. Is Agilysis responsible for maintaining and testing the air conditioning systems on a periodic basis under its contract with the States of Guernsey?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to reply.

Deputy Ferbrache: As stated in response to Question 1, these are not part of the Agilysis contract.

The Bailiff: Supplementary Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

Would the President agree with me that in instances when servers fail or when infrastructure fails it raises the importance of disaster recovery planning and testing of the disaster recovery procedures that IT suppliers have. Sorry, does the President agree with me that this highlights the importance of enhancing our disaster recovery posture across States' infrastructure?

The Bailiff: Again, it does not arise out of the answer that was given to the question, which was whether it falls within the contract or not and it does not. These are wide issues but they are not in the context of the current line of questioning from Deputy Soulsby. Any other attempt?

Your third question to the President then, please, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: It was stated in the release that all live data held by the States of Guernsey has been safeguarded. Does that mean no data that was stored in servers at Sir Charles Frossard House has been lost?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to reply, please.

Deputy Ferbrache: The answer to this question is equally brief, sir. That is correct, no data was lost.

Deputy Soulsby: I do have a supplementary.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: How can the President be confident that no data has been lost when two and a half weeks after the first incident, not all systems are up and running?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to reply.

Deputy Ferbrache: Because I have been advised by experts who know what they are talking about that that is the answer. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So I am confident. Deputy Soulsby will also recall, as she was Digital Transformation lead until recently, what the position was likely to be in such circumstances.

The Bailiff: Your fourth question to the President please, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Has the Committee been assured that the air conditioning systems, notification systems and back-up generators at Sir Charles Frossard House and Edward T Wheadon House are now working satisfactorily and in accordance with the States' contract with Agilysis?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to reply, please.

Deputy Ferbrache: Here, sir, I would like to add a rider to the written answer because something happened that I was told about at 10 to 10 last night.

The written answer I will read and then I will add verbally other matters:

> As previously stated, these elements are not part of the contract with Agilysis. The necessary remedial work needs careful considered co-ordination to align with the technical aspect and this will be completed by the end of this week.

That was the answer given yesterday lunchtime when these answers were filed.

I was contacted just before 10 o'clock last night by a senior civil servant to say that there had been another major IT outage and everything was being done to resolve it so I will read what I was told just before 10 o'clock last night:

> In summary, as part of the restoration of the systems and to ensure resilience we started to swap out the battery back systems UPS from Edward T Wheadon house at 3.30 today.

That is 3.30 yesterday.

> We have known that we must do this to provide security in case of a power spike or power cut as previously briefed. To test protocols etc. we did this yesterday at Sir Charles Frossard House and it worked. The UPS engineers, external to the States and manufacture had estimated 99.7% success of things working successfully. They have not and switching the UPS back on crashed the ETWH servers which caused the problem. The disruption has not been as widespread as the first outage, but we have lost Government GG Education and some other key services …

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache, I am afraid that your time for answering this question is now up.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you. Well if the supplementary is asked, I will finish the answer.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

The President has effectively confirmed that systems at Sir Charles Frossard House and Edward T Wheadon House are still not working satisfactorily. The Head of the Public Service has said 'the fact that the outage or outages in reality happened at all is unacceptable'. But regardless of the cause of the outages and the reputational damage they will have caused, how can it be the case that the issues have not been resolved two and a half weeks after the initial incident?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: I agree. As I have said in this Assembly in different contexts previously, I have difficulty switching on an electric light, it is modern technology to me. So the fact that two and a half weeks on we are still not satisfactorily resolved does not help anybody. It does not affect us reputationally very well.

But I am aware, from what I have been told, that all hands have been to the pump both externally, internally, Agilysis, etc. to try and get matters right. I will just finish if I may my previous answer because the Bailiff, quite rightly, stopped me in mid-sentence, just to say that everybody is working hard to restore the systems as best they can.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, supplementary.

Deputy Gabriel: Sir, thank you. Will the President commit to a full independent review of the systems and the failures, and report back to the wider public and the Assembly?

The Bailiff: I think you will find it is going to be answered in a moment, but … Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: That is another … I will deal with that when Deputy Soulsby puts her next question.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.
In response to the question, Deputy Ferbrache referred to the 'necessary remedial works', so my question is are the costs of the remedial works the responsibility of the States or Agilysis?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: A perfectly good question. The truthful answer is that I cannot answer that clearly at the moment. When we give a more detailed response, I will answer that. But it would be too early to make that comment now.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, supplementary.

Deputy Inder: I think that I can help here, sir.
In a recent Presidents meeting, would the Chief Minister agree with us that questions were raised in that, over the element of data sovereignty? Of which we have decided as an Island to keep everything, including web services on the Island. Would he agree with me that in that conversation, elements of that will be reconsidered, the basic point of data sovereignty along with web services is to ensure that portions of this may not happen again?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Yes, sir, that was discussed. That is my understanding.

The Bailiff: And your fifth and final question to the President, please, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Yes, sir. Does the Committee believe that given the seriousness of the incident, there should be an independent review into what happened, rather than an internal incident report?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache to reply, please.

Deputy Ferbrache: A multi-disciplinary internal report is in the process of being produced, that involves input from the States' Property Unit, the Intelligent Client Function, Agilysis, Guernsey facilities companies, equipment manufacturers, Guernsey Telecos and other Guernsey-based IT companies with expertise in the area. This report will be thorough and will take some time to finalise due to the complexity of the issues faced.

This internal-facing report will be used to understand exactly the events that led to the issue and the lessons to be learned to avoid it happening again. Once the report has been completed, reviewed and scrutinised, a decision can be made as to whether a further review is required. An appropriate summary of this report will be published.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

Doesn't the President understand from this less than illuminating response to my initial Rule 11 questions, the reputational damage caused and the fact that two and a half weeks have passed and teachers are still not able to send emails or record pupil attendance and there are concerns that the States' payroll will not be ready to run on Friday, that this demonstrates exactly why an independent report is required?

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: I take a little offence that we have answered the questions; perhaps the questions were not posed as well as they should have been, rather than criticise the answers. So look at yourself, I am saying generally of course rather than specifically, than criticise everybody else. There is no intent to hide anything.

I think it is terrible that two and a half, three weeks, we are in the position that we are in. I do not seek to disassociate myself from that at all. All answers must be given. All answers will be given. If we do an internal report and it does not do the job, then no doubt we will have an external report.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Yes, sir. Deputy Ferbrache has referred to an internal report, I would like him to consider asking two questions as part of that internal report. The first is, at the time of the incident, the original incident, was all of the air conditioning in the computer room working and when was it last checked or serviced prior to the incident?

The second question I would like him to consider asking is, it has been said that 500 servers failed; clearly, many if not most would be virtual machines. So what physical equipment reached the point of thermal failure in actuality?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Those are two excellent questions. They will be asked.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Le Tissier.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you, sir.

Would the President agree with me that publishing an appropriate summary is not what we would like to see? We would like to see the full report. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, that will be under review. There may be, I am not saying that there are, because I do not know what the report is going to say, because it has not been prepared yet. There may be some commercial matters that we cannot … or some matters that would protect the States if we did not publish it in full, confidentiality to protect the States. I do not mean that the States in

any liability claim, I just mean the security of our systems. I am not confident enough to be able to say that.

But I can say unreservedly to Deputy Le Tissier and others, there is no intent to hide everything. The public are entitled to know and States' Members are entitled to know. It is not satisfactory in the 21st century that an organisation like the States, three weeks on is still in the position that it is in. I make no pretence about that otherwise. I unreservedly say that is unacceptable.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

States' takeover of St John's Residential Home – Anticipated financial risk; employment of staff

The Bailiff: We now move on to the next set of questions, which are going to be put by Deputy St Pier to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care. So your first of the two questions please, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you, sir. Following the takeover by the States of the St John's Residential Home, can the Committee please advise what, if any, is the anticipated financial risk or exposure to the States?

The Bailiff: President Deputy Brouard to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

The States of Guernsey will be taking on similar financial obligations and risks in operating the St John's Residential Home as the current operators. There will of course be consideration of opportunities for efficiency or to benefit from some economies of scale. But the overriding consideration for the three Committees involved; the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security, the Committee *for* Health & Social Care and the Policy & Resources Committee is to ensure continuity of care for the residents.

The Committee *for* Health & Social Care will receive payments from the long-term insurance fund on the same basis as the current operator. As part of the arrangements and to ensure as much continuity as possible, the States intends to purchase, at market-value, a property currently owned by the current operators and used to continue to house staff working at St John's Residential Home.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I have two supplementaries (**The Bailiff:** Okay.) arising from the answers given.

Deputy Brouard has indicated that the States will have similar financial obligations and risk in operating as the current operators. Presumably, the current operators are facing some kind of net liability otherwise we would not be in the position where we are needing to take the home over. So can the Committee, either now or subsequently, provide Members with the net estimated annual additional costs to taxpayers of running the home?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you for the supplementary. We will certainly give that consideration at the Committee. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, in relation to the acquisition of an additional property to house staff members, will the Committee advise Members in due course what the anticipated net revenue costs for owning and running that staff property will be, once it has been acquired?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Again, the property will probably fall into the portfolio of Policy & Resources. I have not got access to that information at this time.

The Bailiff: I do not see anyone else rising. Deputy St Pier, your second question to the President please.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, sir. Will the staff running the home become employees of the States, subject to States' terms and conditions or will they continue in separate employment subject to their own terms and conditions?

The Bailiff: President Deputy Brouard to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

All staff who currently work at St John's Residential Home and wish to continue working at this care home will transfer their employment to the States of Guernsey on 1st January 2023 and become employed on States of Guernsey terms and conditions of employment. Staff, however, will not be financially disadvantaged by the transfer.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, sir. Deputy Brouard has advised that staff will not be financially disadvantaged. Is it correct that staff employed by the home are generally better paid than those undertaking similar roles in States' employment?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: I have no knowledge of that particular issue.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

I am intrigued by Deputy Brouard's answer and also his answer earlier about taking an item about the revenue budget back to Committee. Has this been a Committee decision, has it been a P&R decision or has it been a presidential decision?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I am not sure that really arises out of the answer that has just been given, Deputy Gabriel, about the terms and conditions of those who are currently at the St John's Residential Home, who will be transferring to States of Guernsey.

Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: I have got a supplementary, sir, but I am not sure if it does arise from the question. Shall we try it and see?

The Bailiff: If you would like to, Deputy Trott. *(Laughter)*

Deputy Trott: Righto. Righto, sir.

The Bailiff: If it is that time of year …

Deputy Trott: Thank you. At the last session of the States, I asked my good friend Deputy Brouard if he could advise on whether there were any difficulties at St John's Residential Home, particularly around the infrastructure. He told me that he was unaware of any and that he would respond to those questions.

He has not and I just wondered why, with the home getting nationalised just over a week later, if he is as bemused as I am as to why he did not know more about this particular issue bearing the critical state it was clearly at? And I think you are right, sir, that does not arise from the … *(Laughter)* so I am going to sit down.

The Bailiff: I am going to rule that no answer needs to be given to that question which does not arise out of the answer that was previously given. Any other …?

Deputy Gollop, supplementary.

Deputy Gollop: I worry that this might be on the border, as well. But as far as Deputy Brouard and his Committee know, are the staff happy to continue working now that it is part of the States rather than traditional St John's? In other words, has the nationalisation, to coin a phrase from Deputy Trott, been accepted as a good thing by the team in keeping morale as high as possible?

The Bailiff: Alright, Deputy Brouard. I mean, that just about arises out of whether they wish to continue working.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

As far as I am aware, the staff are all very pleased to move across. The alternative was not attractive at all because there would be no home. We would have as a community some 40 elderly relatives that we would then have to try and find new accommodation for, which would have been extremely difficult to do in the current marketplace.

So we are extremely grateful that the staff are moving across to ourselves and we can provide continuity of care for our fellow Islanders who need it. So I think that the alternatives would have been quite dire.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: No further supplementaries on that answer.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

Safeguarding processes report and recommendations – Request for publication

The Bailiff: So, Deputy St Pier, you have a slightly different line of questioning but also to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care.

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Your question, please.

Deputy St Pier: Before I give the question, I should declare under Rule 11(7) that I have a direct or special interest in the question.

In May 2022, in response to a Rule 14 question seeking publication of the September 2021 report by SEW Consultancy Limited entitled 'Learning following a local investigation into complaints from families about the use of safeguarding processes', together with the accompanying spreadsheet entitled 'Learning recommendations from Miss Walter's Report of November 2021', the President advised that the Committee is giving this matter further consideration and will provide an update as soon as it is able to do so.

On 14th November 2022, the families whose cases were the subject of the investigation met Members of the Committee among others. During that meeting, the families requested publication of the report and recommendations, to which the author had no objections. Will the Committee now immediately publish in full both the report and recommendations?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard to reply, please.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir. No, but the Committee will be pleased to review this in 2023.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Mindful of your previous advice, sir, I am going to attempt two. The first of which is the response the President has said that the Committee will be pleased to review in 2023. So my first supplementary is what would be the criteria for a review in 2023 which would produce a different decision?

The Bailiff: Now I will allow that, Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

Multi-faceted bits of information need to come together. We have many stakeholders involved in this particular issue. There is ongoing dialogue. We have issues with regard to our professional staff, which we are making sure that the team is up in place.

There is ongoing dialogue; there is even, I believe, a meeting this week that is going on. So we want to make sure that all of these things are in place and embedded so that we have got a fuller understanding before we go to the next stage.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: The second is a little trickier but I will give it a go, sir.

Given that the author and families have consented to the publication of the report and the independent designated safeguarding professionals have recommended its publication, what are the reasons for the Committee declining or refusing to publish?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: We appreciate that there are some Members who wish to have the report in the public domain. But unfortunately – or fortunately – we have got a wider mandate of due care and consideration. There are many other stakeholders besides these particular individuals and we need to look at it holistically and in the round to make sure that we have a really good safeguarding service and we do not disadvantage any families, especially children in this particular instance.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater, supplementary.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

Would the President agree with me that the Committee in agreeing to review the decision in 2023, the Committee is mindful of the ongoing processes that are involving the report and in the absence of permissions from all of those who may be identified by its publication, the Committee feels that it would be inappropriate to publish at this stage, but it has agreed to publish the action plan which is being developed in association with the relevant professionals and families, which the Committee is meeting again on Friday?

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you very much indeed, Deputy Leadbeater. I completely concur with what he just said. Yes, absolutely. We have got a lot of work to do and we need to get on with it. It does not always necessarily help to do it in a goldfish bowl. It is sometimes better to do these things discreetly and in private with the professionals concerned.

COMMITTEE *FOR* EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

Reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education – Revenue savings, completion timetable and capital costs

The Bailiff: The final set of questions in respect of Rule 11 also come from Deputy St Pier but this time to the President of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. Your first question please, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

With the States and the community understandably keen to see cost savings in light of the upcoming tax review debate, and having regard to the Committee's recent evidence given to a Scrutiny Management Committee hearing in relation to anticipated efficiencies, can the Committee please advise what revenue savings can be delivered through its reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education and indicate the effect these savings might have in budgetary terms?

The Bailiff: The President, Deputy Dudley-Owen, to reply, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, I really am grateful for his question.

Since the Scrutiny hearing almost 12 months ago in January 2022, more work has taken place in the secondary and post-16 education target operating models. So we now have greater certainty over derived financial benefits. The reorganisation of secondary education is expected to release about £600,000 of recurring revenue savings by operating more efficient, slightly larger roughly equal-sized schools. In addition to this, there will be cost avoidance as we will no longer be maintaining a school building that is reaching the end of its lifespan.

Because our 2021 policy letter had promised that in the medium term, the new model would be no more expensive than today's revenue cost, as part of our ongoing budget reprioritisation workstream, we have made and will continue to make a targeted reinvestment of some of these savings into initiatives that improve educational outcomes, a point made at the time of the debate. The Guernsey Institute will generate further annual savings of between £800,000 and £1.1 million. Through early efficiencies we have already unlocked and returned to Treasury about £220,000 of those savings.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, I have two, sir, which arise from the answer given.

I am grateful for Deputy Dudley-Owen for her response. In it she referred to 'targeted reinvestment', presumably of course if those funds are reinvested they will not be returned to Treasury so, is it correct that there will be no net savings following that reinvestment? Other than those that have been identified in her response, in respect of the Guernsey Institute.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: There will be net savings in some areas, because obviously in not all instances will we be able to reinvest in the way that we want to. So it would not be true to say that there would be no net savings made in regard to the efficiencies that the new structure puts in place and is already starting to put in place.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you, sir. Can Deputy Dudley-Owen be more specific, either now or perhaps following the meeting, as to what comprises the £200,000 of savings referred to in the response that have been returned to Treasury?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, I can actually do that now, sir.

The £220,000 referred to, we are looking at value-for-money initiatives that have been undertaken by the TGI in relation to their budget lines and work that has been undertaken. As well as reductions … I need to look at my phone here, which is why I do apologise for the noise earlier; that was me trying to reinvigorate my phone without the volume on … That reductions in grants with component parts of the TGI being the GTA, College of Further Education, budget reductions and Institute of Health. So a total of £220,000 returned to the Treasury in relation to those savings were made.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: I will give this a go, sir. In response to savings or revenue savings, the temporary relocation of the sixth form, we have heard announced recently, to La Mare de Carteret site, will that have any impact on those predicted savings?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, would be the short answer. But it is more complicated than that because the sixth form moving to La Mare de Carteret is part of the work around staff reorganisation and movement of children from La Mare de Carteret school into Les Varendes from the 11-16 phase. So yes, this is all part of the planned reorganisation of secondary and post-16, which in and of itself unlocks revenue savings.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford, supplementary.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

In Deputy Dudley-Owen's response, she mentioned and I also recall when she mentioned this maybe the better part of two years ago, that the model that the Committee are pursuing would not be any more expensive than our current model of education. But would she not agree that our current model of education is a very expensive model?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I cannot agree with what Deputy Burford has stated because I am not sure what she is comparing it to. I can state that actually it is not working as efficiently as it could do and those efficiencies are exactly what we are looking at, because part of those efficiencies are in terms of making sure that the money that is spent on education is having the greatest impact for the child and the classroom.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, supplementary.

Deputy Gollop: The supplementary question and answer imply cost savings are desirable, which they are. But would the Education, Sport & Culture Committee agree that their focus is predominantly on achieving greater outcomes and performance from students and learners, not at the expense of cost reduction?

The Bailiff: That does not arise out of the answer that was given to the original question asked by Deputy St Pier, I am afraid, Deputy Gollop. It is question creep again.

So your second question to the President please, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

I should be explaining this, of course, was submitted before the announcement yesterday. But, can the Committee advise what information it currently holds in relation to the completion timetable and the capital costs for the project?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to reply, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Until the issues with R G Falla Limited emerged in recent weeks, we were on track to complete the reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education by September 2025 within the agreed budget. Following our decision to end the relationship with R G Falla Limited last week, it is too early for us to quantify the cost and time indication for the redevelopment of Les Ozouets Campus but we believe that the need to contract with a different construction company might impact both time and cost.

Our project team is currently engaging with alternative suppliers to allow us to quantify this and we will of course provide updates as the position becomes clearer. As we announced yesterday, we plan to temporarily relocate the sixth form centre to La Mare de Carteret in September 2025. This will ensure that any delay in the redevelopment of the Campus at Les Ozouets does not delay the implementation of the new secondary school partnership target operating model which allows us to unlock both educational and financial benefits.

We are satisfied after consultation with the senior leaders of the secondary school partnership that temporarily housing the sixth form at La Mare de Carteret will have minimal impact on those students.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I do have two, sir.

In the response, Deputy Dudley-Owen said, perhaps unsurprisingly, that this news might impact both time and cost. My question, sir, is what are the triggers that the President and all the Committee consider would be in terms of the change of either time or cost that the matter would be brought back to the States? In particular, of course the cost envelope.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen …

Deputy St Pier: … or what are the parameters for bringing it back to the States if there is an impact on time or cost.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: That would have to be a discussion undertaken to ascertain whether the impact was significant and what 'significant' means can only be determined when we have the information back. So I am afraid that I cannot give a definitive on that one.

The Bailiff: Your second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, the announcement yesterday that we are moving the sixth form students from a purpose-built 15-year-old sixth form centre to a school designed 60 years ago for 11-16-year-olds so that the 11-16-year-olds can move into a purpose-designed sixth form centre will no doubt leave many parents and students a little perplexed. My question though is in light of that news and the response that has been given, can Deputy Dudley-Owen confirm that no teachers will be teaching in more than one location?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, I can and if I can address the point about being perplexed relating to the use of the buildings. I think that it is very pertinent to note, very important to remember that up to 70% of teaching for the sixth form centre is done in the 11-16 part of the building. A point that I made very strongly in the debate last year.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Also in relation to the part of the answer relating to moving the sixth form centre to La Mare on a temporary basis. Can the President confirm my understanding that this must mean for two cohorts of sixth form students they will have to move school twice in successive years – once at 16 and once at 17? And isn't that appallingly sub-optimal at that incredibly important part of their education?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Not two cohorts, I do not believe. It would be one cohort of the entire sixth form and one of the group would be moving anyway. Well, both of those groups would be moving anyway. Some children will be moving to a new sixth form from their 11-16 setting and others would be moving down to the Les Ozouets Campus as planned at that time anyway.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: In pursuit of the first, does she not agree that people who have moved to the sixth form centre to start their sixth form studies after one year may have to move then out again to go to La Mare and additionally, people who moved for the first time into La Mare from St Sampson's or Les Beaucamps for the year that it is going to be there, halfway through, out of that into another school. So surely she can accept the premise of my first supplementary?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I understand the premise of Deputy Roffey's question, but what I would say is that all mitigations will be put in place and all support that all the cohort needs will be put in place by our staff.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, supplementary.

Deputy Inder: Having a child in a sixth form centre who may not fall foul of this move, would Deputy Dudley-Owen agree with me that the sixth formers and those coming to sixth form are far more resilient than Deputy Roffey, to make a political point, might want them to be?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, I would. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, supplementary.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

Relating to the temporary move of the sixth form to La Mare de Carteret, obviously, we are going to have a situation where secondary students who live broadly within the catchment of La Mare de Carteret will need to move up to Les Varendes and the all-Island catchment that encompasses the sixth form will have to make their way to La Mare de Carteret.

My question is whether the cost and logistics of the transport for those moves has been taken into account by the Committee and whether there are going to be any logistical or budgetary implications arising from that, as far as the Committee is yet aware?

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I know that the plans have been extensively challenged and looked at and all component parts which include transport. I would suggest that moving one cohort to Les Varendes and moving another cohort over to La Mare de Carteret is cost-neutral because children have to travel as it is and those are details that … quite honestly in terms of what exactly the budget will be for those travel plans, I am sure that Deputy de Sausmarez will understand that I do not have those to hand in the Assembly today. But as plans evolve and materialise those sort of details can be challenged later.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, supplementary.

Deputy Gabriel: Given that the transport arrangements that will have to be put in place with different children attending different schools than what is going to be planned, what level of confidence can members of the public and the Assembly have in the Committee's ability to deliver its mandate in relation to educational matters?

The Bailiff: That does not really arise out of the answer that was given, Deputy Gabriel. But Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you wish to comment at all?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: No. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Well that concludes Rule 11 questions. Greffier?

Billet d'État XXII

APPOINTMENTS LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman – Appointment of Chairman and Ordinary Members

The States' Greffier: Yes, sir. The following appointment is laid before the States. The appointment of Chairman and Ordinary Members of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman.

The Bailiff: I have received no indication of any motion to deal with that appointment and therefore we simply note that it has been laid before this Meeting of the States.

1. Election of a member of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – Alderney Representative Roberts elected

Article 1.

The States are asked:

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a member of the Committee for Education Sport & Culture in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees to complete the unexpired term of office that is to the 30th June 2025, of Deputy R.C. Murray who has been deemed to have resigned from the Committee under the terms of Rule 39. (N.B. 1. Pursuant to the Constitution of the Committee for Education Sport & Culture shall not be the President or a member of the Policy & Resources Committee nor the President of the Scrutiny Management Committee.)

The States' Greffier: Article 1, election of a member of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

The Bailiff: I turn to the President of that Committee, Deputy Dudley-Owen, in relation to whether she wishes to propose an eligible candidate.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes please, sir. Alderney Representative Steve Roberts.

The Bailiff: And is that nomination seconded?

Deputy Haskins: Yes, sir, it is.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much, Deputy Haskins.
Are there any other nominations? Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I would like to propose Deputy Aidan Matthews.

The Bailiff: And is that nomination seconded?

Deputy Cameron: Yes, it is, sir.

The Bailiff: Are there any further nominations?

No. Well, we have two candidates for the vacancy on the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. Now in accordance with Rule 16(6), I will invite the proposer of each candidate and then the candidate themselves to speak. But on this occasion it is for no more than three minutes each time. So it is comparatively brief so I will call Deputy Dudley-Owen first to propose Alderney Representative Roberts.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Steve has been in politics for nearly a decade, having been elected to the States of Alderney in 2013. A politician of experience who has served his Island well. Being returned in the plebiscite is testament to that. Steve is one of the most personable and emotionally generous people that I have met. He is always upbeat and positive. Positivity is a great quality and I want to tap into this because it helps to maintain our existing can-do approach to work on Committee. He is a natural team player and will help the Committee immensely with our valuable and important Alderney education service.

He is also inquisitive to learn, keen to commit his time and will challenge our thinking. His innate knowledge of his community in Alderney will challenge us and help us understand the needs of that community better, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) enabling us to provide the right educational services there. Recently he shared with us some of his childhood experiences in the context of the debate on the amendments of the Bailiwick's Children Law. I cannot imagine there was anyone listening who was not moved by what he said, giving an account of an unsettled upbringing involving his adoption and a period of homelessness as a teenager was difficult to listen to and to reconcile with the confident, cheerful and forward-looking man before us.

The depth to his character and his life experiences, which are quite different to anyone else in our Committee or in this Assembly, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) his fortitude and resilience make him an amazing role model for anyone of our young people, especially those who may be experiencing similar trials in their lives. Having him on our Committee brings a breadth of life experience that cannot be matched. As we progress to the final stages of the Education Law development, having an Alderney Representative on board would be of great help so that we can see through the Alderney lens when deciding if and how the Law extends to our sister Island.

Having someone who will develop an insider-knowledge of the Law with Steve's first-hand and deep understanding of the local context in Alderney will be really valuable to us during this process. Cementing another brick in the foundations strengthens our links and working relationship with Alderney, especially for essential transferred services, such as education. Of course, that is not the extent of our mandate and Steve is very interested in all areas, including the sports and culture elements, all that brings and the links also there with Alderney.

The physical distance that separates us is not an impediment to close working. My style of leadership embraces hybrid working with the benefits and flexibility that brings. Any logistical challenges are easily overcome and this extends to all areas of our work, including some interim governing board meetings. After all, sir, we are now in the business of making reasonable adjustments in the workplace.

Sir, I commend Alderney Representative Steven Roberts to the States for our Committee place.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Roberts gets the opportunity to speak to his candidature.

Alderney Representative Roberts: Thank you, sir.

I worked in Alderney for 20 years in the airline sector and was schooled in Alderney's St Anne's School itself. My childhood experiences, though not positive, have given me much enthusiasm to help young people because they are our Islands' future and our world's future. The world does not belong to us, it belongs to them. Once we are gone, they will be left as tomorrow's adults and they will need to be well-educated to see their way though and improve our Islands.

Education is so important. I invested in education for my children and supported them even though I could not afford it, to be successful in their lives. I left school at a young age, but times have changed and I want to be involved in these changes for my Island and what I can do for St Anne's School, my own school. Too many children are written off too young and I want to change this. I know that I can make a difference, not just in Alderney but also here in Guernsey too – understanding some of the difficulties that I have had in my life.

I am in full support of the agreed model of the secondary and post-16, this matches my vision of how children must be educated together and not left behind. Post-16 is a very important time for young people. Behind the first steps of adulthood and it is vital that we deliver post-16 campus as agreed. I want to understand how the educational system works in the Bailiwick and how this extends to Alderney. Because we have an older population in Alderney, it will be so important for St Anne's to be as successful as it can be – attract and retain younger people.

We know that families coming back to Alderney look at the school first and they need to have confidence in that school before they move to the Island or decide to stay and raise their families. I will scale my duties back in Alderney and have time, capability, capacity and interest to sit on the Committee in all areas of their work. I understand the time commitment and have spoken with the President on just about how working with the Committee online is common practice and this is how it works with a lot of other Committees now.

I hope, sir, that Members will get behind me and support me for this Committee. I can make a difference, I intend to make a difference and I want to make a difference for our whole Bailiwick's young and our future.

The Bailiff: I now invite the proposer of Deputy Matthews, Deputy Gollop, to move his nomination.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir.

Three minutes is not very long but one knows as a Member that one is getting perhaps older or maturer when one is serving with the children of former States' Members such as Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Gabriel and of course, Deputy Matthews, who is the son of my good friend former Deputy Rhoderick Matthews.

I believe Deputy Matthews is around 47 years of age and he is a father of a young child and he is an extremely busy gentleman because he not only fulfils the role of being a parent and a States' Member but is a senior developer at First Central which is an insurance company. It is something like a Technology Stacker but, like Deputy Ferbrache, I am not very knowledgeable on all this world but he has been a senior applications developer for a leading Swiss bank, he has worked for Guernsey Post as a development specialist and for other banks and he is somebody of great ability in software projects and that kind of thing but also politically.

I think in the relatively short time he has been a Member I have been proud to serve with him on legislation but he has shown himself to be quite a deep thinker who comes at questions not from a particularly partisan point of view but from a different angle. His manifesto and personality since has shown a great interest in education on many levels. He very much wants to improve behaviour in school, he is a constructive critic, he is interested in perhaps greater self-government of schools and he supported strongly the pre-school model. So he would not be a 'yes' person but he would question but from a positive angle.

He is very strong on coming out with points and about looking at the well-being of people. He very much believes in openness and transparency and accountability, and I think one of the gifts that he will bring to education actually is communication because he will be right behind the Committee and the States in communicating to all stakeholders what is being done and what needs to be done, perhaps reducing the need for questions as we have seen today.

He is also a diligent worker on the very busy Health & Social Care Committee that again has got a huge workload but, as Deputy Dudley-Owen knows from the previous States, and some Deputies, you can sit on two Principal Committees and make an effective contribution and indeed the

workload that Deputy Matthews has had will actually be a degree of synergy because in many areas ...

The Bailiff: I am afraid your three minutes have expired so, Deputy Matthews, three minutes to speak to your candidature.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

When I first stood for the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture at the start of this States term I said I had been prompted to enter the election, and subsequently into the States, one Sunday afternoon in February that year standing in Market Square with about two and a half thousand other people who had come out to protest against the two-school model. I went on to say a thought occurred to me that the people that I was standing with were not just protesting the model itself, for which of course there a great deal of anger and disillusionment, but over the whole process by which it had been arrived at.

I stand by everything I said then because I meant it and I stand by the views on the model of secondary education which I supported along with Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard, a different form of three-school model to the Committee's preferred approach. However, we cannot turn back the clock and, as elected representatives, we must accept that the States voted decisively to pursue the Committee's approach.

Now, a lot has changed since then. There have been shifts in the States' financial and economic outlook, inflation and a new approach to strategic population policy. In fact, a lot has changed since I started writing this speech on Monday. The Committee has had to end its relationship with R G Falla and announced yesterday the relocation of the sixth form centre to the La Mare de Carteret on a temporary basis and this is absolutely not the time for an 'I told you so' approach.

The Committee will have its work cut out in finding a way to maintain momentum to deliver the overall aims of the Education Strategy and the priorities identified in the Government Work Plan. I am sure top of parents' list of priorities will be improving the standards such as literacy in our primary schools and addressing the shortcomings identified by Ofsted at the St Sampson's High School and reports of bullying are deeply concerning to the electorate. These are deep-rooted problems but it is most important that everything possible is done to minimise unacceptable behaviour in school. No doubt the Committee will seek to address these challenges head on.

It is not uncommon for States' Members to sit on more than one Committee. Many members do exactly that. When I sought advice from my good friend, Deputy Meerveld, about standing for the vacancy on ESC his view was that it would be taking on too much to sit on two of the States' busiest Committees, being a parent and doing external work. I value Deputy Meerveld's advice but I have never shied away from a challenge.

From that list of commitments being a parent is the hardest one of all. It is also the strongest motivator for me to want to do the best we can for all our Island's children. Every day, Monday to Friday, parents wave goodbye to children at the school gate, or the bus stop, and then we see them again at the end of the day but we have not forgotten about them during that time.

I believe I can offer constructive challenge to find a path to achieve these aims but always in the spirit of reaching a common position that the Committee can present a unified position.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, voting is by secret ballot under Rule 16(3). I simply remind you that we have two candidates for the vacancy on the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture. The first of those is Alderney Representative Roberts who is proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, seconded by Deputy Haskins, and the second candidate is Deputy Matthews, proposed by Deputy Gollop and seconded by Deputy Cameron.

There was a ballot.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting in respect of the vacancy on the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is as follows: there voted in favour of Alderney Representative Roberts, 20 Members; in favour of Deputy Matthews, 19 Members. There were no spoilt papers, no blank papers and therefore I would declare … *(Applause)* I will now declare Alderney Representative Roberts duly elected to the Committee. Congratulations.

2. Election of Members of the Development & Planning Authority – Deputy Blin elected

Article 2.
The States are asked:
To elect two sitting Members of the States as members of the Development & Planning Authority in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees to complete the unexpired terms of office, that is to the 30th June 2025, of Deputy A Taylor, who has resigned from that office, and whose notice of resignation is appended hereto and that of Deputy R.C Murray who has been deemed to have resigned from the Authority under the terms of Rule 39.

The States' Greffier: Article 2, Election of Members of the Development & Planning Authority.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I hope you have had sight of an amendment to this Proposition. That amendment will now be proposed by the Comptroller and, I understand, seconded by Deputy Ferbrache. It is very much to reduce the number of vacancies as the explanatory note explains. As you will realise, it is actually a Proposition emanating from me that is being amended under Rule 3(2) but I did not think it was appropriate to call myself to move the amendment.
Mr Comptroller.

Amendment
To replace the proposition with the following: "To elect a sitting Member of the States as a member of the Development & Planning Authority in accordance with Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to the 30th June 2025, of Deputy R C Murray who has been deemed to have resigned from the Authority under Rule 39."

The Comptroller: Sir, thank you.
Members, what I shall do is read the explanatory note to the amendment which you will have read, but just for the benefit of people listening:

> Under Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure, if a member of a Committee resigns from office by way of letter sent to the Presiding Officer, the resignation takes effect automatically on a proposition being laid before the States for the election of a successor to the office vacated. As resignation only takes effect when a proposition is laid, it is possible for a Member to withdraw their resignation at any time before the relevant proposition is laid. This amendment has been submitted further to the decision of Deputy A W Taylor to withdraw his resignation in order that he may continue to serve as a member of the Development & Planning Authority.

So this will effectively reduce the number of vacancies for election today, to one, created by Deputy Murray's appointment to the Policy & Resources Committee.

The Bailiff: And Deputy Ferbrache, do you formally second that amendment?

Deputy Ferbrache: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: I am very grateful, thank you.

We can see whether the voting system is working. *(Laughter)* So I am going to put this amendment which, as the Comptroller says, will change the Proposition so there is a single vacancy on the Development & Planning Authority. It is proposed by the Comptroller and seconded by Deputy Ferbrache.

Greffier, will you please open the voting?

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 2, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 1,

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	Dyke, John	Oliver, Victoria	Le Tissier, Chris	Bury, Tina
Blin, Chris	Vermeulen, Simon			
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Helyar, Mark				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
St Pier, Gavin				
Taylor, Andrew				
Trott, Lyndon				

The Bailiff: In respect of this amendment, proposed by the Comptroller and seconded by Deputy Ferbrache, there voted in favour 35 Members; against 2; 1 abstention; 1 Member did not vote, of the 39 who were here, and therefore I declare that amendment duly carried.

So there is a single vacancy on the Development & Planning Authority and I turn to the President of the Authority, Deputy Oliver, if she wishes to propose a candidate.

Deputy Oliver: Yes please, sir. I nominate Deputy Chris Blin.

The Bailiff: Is that nomination seconded?

Deputy Mahoney: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Mahoney. Are there any other nominations? I will start with Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Sir, I rise to nominate Deputy Yvonne Burford.

The Bailiff: Is Deputy Burford's nomination seconded?

Deputy Fairclough: Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Deputy Fairclough. Any other nominations? Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I would like to nominate Deputy Le Tissier.

The Bailiff: And is Deputy Le Tissier's nomination seconded?

Deputy Taylor: I would second that, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor then. Seconding is easy; you do not have anything to do! *(Laughter)* Anymore, because this has turned into a bumper field at the moment?

No, okay, we have got three candidates then, Members, for the vacancy on the Development & Planning Authority. There is Deputy Blin who is proposed by Deputy Oliver and seconded by Deputy Mahoney; Deputy Burford who is proposed by Deputy Le Tocq, seconded by Deputy Fairclough; and Deputy Le Tissier who is proposed by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and seconded by Deputy Taylor. So, once again, we go through the process of where I would invite the proposer of each candidate and then the candidate to speak for up to three minutes each and then we will get to the vote by way of a secret ballot.

So, first I invite Deputy Oliver who is proposing Deputy Blin, to speak.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

Firstly, I would like to thank Deputy Murray for all his hard work and input on the Committee. He will be very much missed and we do wish him good luck on P&R.

My nomination is Chris Blin. We had a number of Deputies really interested in coming on to the Committee, however, I knew when Deputy Blin answered his call for interest he would be an excellent fit. Deputy Blin brings a very different quality to the DPA which I believe will make a better, all-rounded Committee.

Deputy Blin was a Douzenier for four years therefore understands the various issues and challenges of planning and the impact it has on parishes, especially the more densely populated parishes such as St Peter Port and St Sampson's. I have always wanted to work more closely with the Douzaines and I think this will strengthen the link between the Douzaines and the Planning. I think Deputy Blin will be a fantastic asset in this area.

Deputy Blin is still involved in a number of businesses, both locally and overseas and is very much aware of the importance of maintaining an objective mind. He is a very good listener and, understanding the various agreements coming to an objective, reasoned decision, I know that Deputy Blin will be able to challenge the Committee's opinions while working within policy, being able to understand complex situations to find the best way forward. I know that Deputy Blin will make a valuable contribution to our mandate as we seek to act as an enabler for the economy and preserve and enhance what makes Guernsey a great place to live.

Deputy Blin has a very analytical mind and is able to look into high-level policy, interrogate what the purpose is and how it could be made better. With the review upcoming, this will be especially good and have new ideas and someone who was not involved at the start. Deputy Blin has a passion for culture, speaking a number of languages, and a love for historic buildings and architecture while

supporting a more friendly planning process that enables appropriate developments in the appropriate areas.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Then I invite the candidate, Deputy Blin, to speak to his candidature.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank Deputy Oliver for recommending me and I am humbled by her words and comments. I now need to convince my fellow Members of the Assembly that I could be the right choice to fill this vacant seat on the Development & Planning Authority.

As Deputy Oliver has stated, my background is in business and I have run and continue to run my various involvements in businesses here and away, and have done so for many decades and that is the key. It gives me this more entrepreneurial experience and flavour. It gives me the ability to make considered, impartial decisions, weighing up all the facts and coming to a conclusion without the emotions getting in the way. I am a pragmatic person and I feel that these will be assets that will be good for the balance for the DPA.

Equally important to my hopeful appointment to the Planning Authority is integrity, honesty and strong moral principles which are vital as a Deputy but even more so on Planning where you inevitably cannot please all of the people all of the time in making sometimes difficult and controversial decisions. Impartiality and integrity are vital and these are values that I would bring to the Authority.

I am well travelled and, wherever I go, I take an interest in architecture and the built environment. It complements my interest in history. Guernsey, of course, is steeped in history and our many buildings reflect our often dramatic past. Planning must protect what is good but also promote modern architecture and design but that design needs to fit into Guernsey's heritage and the visual look of the area. And there is the pressure of essential and affordable housing for our key workers who deserve a home. Space is at a premium but we have failed some of our hard-working community if we do not plan for affordable housing so, I admit, Planning has a difficult brief but it is something that interests and excites me.

Also, Guernsey is a beautiful Island and it has a stunning environment. Like many of you, I love its rich diversity of coastal and rural habitats but, like the UK, the natural world is being squeezed and we lose green spaces or lungs at our peril. This adds another layer of complexity to the planning algorithm, the need to plan for a future where we work with nature and not against it.

Sir, through you, I would also like to remind my colleagues that, prior to my role as the Deputy, I was serving on the Saint Peter Port Douzaine and, as Deputy Oliver pointed out, we were reviewing lots of the planning applications and lots of the areas were covered and this was very interesting because, as Douzeniers, we did not have the teeth to make changes so it was a very good learning curve and exposure.

Members will also know that I am the Chair of …

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin, your three minutes, I am afraid, are up.

Deputy Blin: Sorry, sir.

The Bailiff: I am going to turn next to Deputy Le Tocq who has proposed Deputy Burford, so Deputy Le Tocq please.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Sir, I first came across Deputy Burford in 2012 when her aviation career made a rather unexpected landing in the field of politics – the bumpy field of politics, one might say – and Deputy Burford intrigued me in that she threw herself completely into two very busy and somewhat

controversial departments, the then Public Services Department and the Environment Department, certainly the latter of which at the time was considered somewhat of a poisoned chalice.

Probably that has been taken on by the DPA now but, nevertheless, two departments that were involved intrinsically in infrastructure and in the built and natural environment and Deputy Burford threw herself into that. She was not frightened of controversy. She eventually, in fact, became the Minister of the Environment Department at the time when I was Chief Minister and, whilst there are many issues that she and I did not and do not agree with, I found her to be a constructive Member around the Policy Council table.

I think it is wise for us to have people who can think differently to us, challenge us and either persuade us to come to different views or to help us understand our views better. She certainly did that and, although there were many challenges at that time, I also found her to be, sir, someone who was constructive and effective in coming to pragmatic and compromised positions on things and, as such, she threw her energies totally into that. I am sure she would do this here again.

She, in fact, comes from a building family, in that her father was a builder and she herself has been involved in constructing two homes and renovating two homes. She has practical involvement.

During her time as Environment Minister she championed open planning meetings which were rather a novelty at the time but I know that one of her main aims is to ensure that our decision-making is transparent. I really feel that she would be a valued member of the DPA.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I turn next to Deputy Burford to speak to her candidature please.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

Having recently unsuccessfully proposed a candidate for a Committee vacancy with my speech majoring on the theme of experience and knowledge of a mandate, it is with some trepidation that I am about to use that same argument of experience and knowledge in a bid to win Members' support in electing me to the vacant seat on the DPA.

In the 2012-16 term the DPA sat within Environment of which I was a Member for two years and a Minister for two years. I sat on numerous open planning meetings which were conducted under the old Urban and Rural Area Plans. I was also part of the process of the emerging Island Development Plan which the next Assembly debated and voted for. I recall sitting in my cold, un-renovated cottage kitchen, night after night, with mice making regular appearances, reading through every single representation made by members of the public and other stakeholders on various aspects of the Plan and checking every single draft response from the officers – and there were thousands of them.

The IDP is not a perfect document. It is something that seeks to satisfy often conflicting wants and desires and it can never be perfect. That does not mean, however, that there is not room for improvement. I am pleased there is to be review of the IDP. It is necessary. I think the DPA are taking a pragmatic approach to that process by effectively combining the five and 10-year reviews into one to be completed this term. The overriding priority of that review must be housing.

The President outlined at a scrutiny hearing the potential scope of the review which, unsurprisingly, includes Policy GP11. I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that GP11 is not fit for purpose in its current form. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The fact that it is not delivering the extent of what was hoped for in terms of affordable housing and, equally, it has become a bone of contention with developers. This thorny issue must be wrapped up in the wider consideration of enabling housing across the board while still protecting the environment and I believe that both of those things are possible.

The other issue which cannot be ignored, and which I know the Authority is keen to pursue, is that of housing density in the north of the Island. There must be space to breathe and adequate amenity and open areas. Coupled with the unremitting pressure for housing this will be a difficult circle to square but it is certainly not impossible and I feel that I can bring relevant experience and a positive approach to all of these issues. Traffic –

The Bailiff: The time is up, I am afraid, Deputy Burford.

We move next to the proposer of Deputy Le Tissier, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, to move his nomination.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

Not even three hours ago Deputy Le Tissier was the joint favourite front-runner for the two positions we had. However, this has changed but we have not had time as a Committee to meet and discuss so I am sure that Deputy Oliver would have good reasons why she, personally, decided to choose Deputy Blin. But I thought it would be unfair not to offer the opportunity to also talk about the candidature of Deputy Le Tissier.

The reason I wanted to propose Deputy Le Tissier, because he has been a Member of the Committee, and, having now been on the Committee for more than two years, I appreciate how complicated the mandate and the details and the documents we have to understand and learn are, so Deputy Le Tissier has already had a really good induction into that. So he has relevant experience and I know that he is definitely someone who is not afraid to ask challenging questions and I think that is a crucial, an absolutely crucial skill and what we have to show, both in Committee meetings, DPA, but also in all the open planning meetings that we have to undertake.

And, also, Deputy Le Tissier, as someone who lives in the northern parishes and has strong views about what should be or should not be done in the northern parishes, I think, actually, would be a really strong voice for Islanders in our northern parishes to make sure we approach development in the right approach and we also help to preserve and ameliorate some of the issues they face, such as traffic. So, I am standing here and I hope that Deputy Le Tissier surely has an already prepared speech. I think it would be unfair not to offer him the opportunity. It will up to the Assembly to actually make a decision on what would have been a jointly, equally, good candidate in the faces of Deputy Blin and Deputy Le Tissier.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: And finally, Deputy Le Tissier, I invite you to speak to your candidature.

Deputy Le Tissier: Well, sir, this is a complete surprise. I was intending to stand as one of the preferred candidates. That was not possible so I resigned myself but I did not seek to stand but Deputy Kazantseva-Miller nominated me. There we go. I am not sure if it is appropriate, but I have decided that I would continue to put my name forward because I have had the endorsement of two members of the Committee. So here is my prepared speech that, luckily, I did not rip up.

Planning has got to play its part in the housing crisis. I am sure no one would disagree that we need more homes, both 'Affordable' with a capital 'A' and 'affordable' with a small 'a' – that is, affordable, reasonably-priced homes that ordinary people can buy. We are well on the way with Affordable homes – with a capital 'A' – with the GHA. However, at the risk of stating the obvious, we do not have any money to do it ourselves, the Committee so we need to work with developers. And so we need to continue having a good relationship with them. Young people who are starting out are crying out for homes and in increasing numbers, we are seeing our young people, the people whom we need to power our future, leave the Island, probably never to return – and I have personal experience in that in my family.

Of course, there is a balance between providing suitable homes for our younger people and protecting the environment. There is often conflicting views, but I have always judged all applications fairly and with an open mind and in accordance with the IDP.

GP11 – well, it is plainly not working as it was intended to. Whilst repealing it or modifying it is an option, I have not come to a conclusion as to which we need to do. Look at Briarwood this week: GP11 obviously did not work for that. So I would hope to work with the members of the Committee to come up with a fully researched proposal.

Now, I work on consensus and attention to detail before coming up with a plan. I believe I can still work constructively with Committee team members together to make Guernsey a better place to live and work. So I have let my name go forward, I was not expecting it …

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tissier, your three minutes are now up.

Deputy Le Tissier: Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we will have a secret ballot in respect of the three candidates for the vacancy on the Development & Planning Authority. I simply remind you that Deputy Blin has been proposed by Deputy Oliver and seconded by Deputy Mahoney; Deputy Burford has been proposed by Deputy Le Tocq and seconded by Deputy Fairclough; and Deputy Le Tissier has been proposed by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and seconded by Deputy Taylor.

There was a ballot.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, whilst we are waiting for those votes to be counted and the reason that we will not get on with anything immediately is that we are waiting to see what the outcome is, Deputy Dudley-Owen was leaping to her feet like a gazelle.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Not quite. I am not sure whether I was allowed to ask a question but I would really… because I am perplexed by what has just taken place, sir, and notwithstanding obviously the vote as that has gone through and you have allowed it, is a Member allowed under our Rules to be nominated from the floor without their knowledge?

The Bailiff: I would normally have expected a candidate who is being nominated and seconded to at least have agreed to that. *(Laughter)* When Deputy Le Tissier spoke he did say that he had agreed for his name to go forward but it had come as a bit of a surprise. I think it is fair to say, Members of the States, there has been a fast-moving … if I adopt the words of Deputy Prow, we have been at pace in relation to what has been happening this morning. It was only late last night that Deputy Taylor indicated that he wished to withdraw his resignation.

I had taken some advice from the Law Officers, as the Comptroller has explained to you, and the view is that that is permissible under the terms of the Rules as they stand, in particular Rule 13(7). For that reason, that is why we have done what we have done today.

In relation to who was nominated, if Deputy Le Tissier had stood up and said 'I do not want to be a candidate' then I think that would be end of story for him but he did not do that. He stood up and said he wanted Members to consider electing him to the vacancy that has been created by the deemed resignation of Deputy Murray. We will await the outcome.

In respect of the votes cast for the vacancy on the Development & Planning Authority, they were as follows: Deputy Blin received 20 votes; Deputy Burford received 17 votes; Deputy Le Tissier received 2 votes; there were no spoiled papers; there were no blank papers. As a result of that, I will declare Deputy Blin duly elected to the vacancy. *(Applause)*

Procedural –
Order of business

The Bailiff: Now, Members of the States, before we get to anything further, although there are some people who are desperately keen for the next item of business to be commenced, I have been informed by Deputy Ferbrache that he does not think that he will conclude his opening before we rise for lunch, and we do want to rise reasonably sharpish today for obvious reasons.

LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Long-term Care Insurance (Guernsey) (Entitlement to Benefit) Ordinance, 2022;
The Wastewater Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022;
The Water Charges (Amendment) Regulations, 2022;
The Waste Disposal and Recovery Charging Regulations, 2022;
The Waste Management Services (Charging) (No. 2) Regulations, 2022;
The Airport Fees (Guernsey and Alderney) Regulations, 2022;
The Harbour Dues and Facilities Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022;
The Mooring Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022;
The Pilotage Dues (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022;
The Economic and Financial Crime Bureau Financial Intelligence Unit (Amendment) Regulations, 2022;
The Forfeiture of Money etc. in Civil Proceedings (Designation of Countries) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2022.

The Bailiff: So what I am going to suggest we do to fill a little bit of time is to ask the Greffier to read out those items of legislation that are being laid before the States.

The States' Greffier: Yes, sir.

The following items of legislation have been laid before the States: the Long-term Care Insurance (Guernsey) (Entitlement to Benefit) Ordinance, 2022; the Wastewater Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022; the Water Charges (Amendment) Regulations, 2022; the Waste Disposal and Recovery Charging Regulations, 2022; the Waste Management Services (Charging) (No. 2) Regulations, 2022; the Airport Fees (Guernsey and Alderney) Regulations, 2022; the Harbour Dues and Facilities Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022; the Mooring Charges (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022; the Pilotage Dues (Guernsey) Regulations, 2022; the Economic and Financial Crime Bureau Financial Intelligence Unit (Amendment) Regulations, 2022 and the Forfeiture of Money etc. in Civil Proceedings (Designation of Countries) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Regulations, 2022.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we will simply note that each of those notes of legislation has been laid before this Meeting of the States. I have not received any motions in respect of any of them.

Procedural –
Order of business

The Bailiff: We have a choice now. We can either move on to the next item, or any of the items that might be dealt with, or we rise early for lunch. Is there any requests to take any of the other items out of order at this stage?

Deputy Ferbrache: I do not want people to have too much time enjoying themselves *(Laughter)* so if, sir, you were to so direct, I do not think the matter of the Policy & Resources Committee Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No.3) Ordinance is going to tax anyone too much. Perhaps that could be called if you agree.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, shall we just fill the next five or 10 minutes with whatever we can by deferring the Alderney Airport matter until after lunch. We will start that straight after lunch. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: Then we will call the next item of business please, Greffier.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

4. The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No.3) Ordinance, 2022 – Proposition carried

Article 4
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No. 3) Ordinance, 2022", and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States' Greffier: Yes, Article 4, the Policy & Resources Committee, the Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No.3) Ordinance, 2022.

The Bailiff: I invite the President, Deputy Ferbrache, to open debate.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I have nothing to open. I just ask that the Ordinance be approved.

The Bailiff: Is there any debate in respect of this draft Ordinance? In that case, Members of the States, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 1,

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	McKenna, Liam	None	Helyar, Mark	Bury, Tina
Blin, Chris			St Pier, Gavin	
Brouard, Al				
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				

Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: The voting in respect of the draft Income Tax (Guernsey) (Amendment) (No.3) Ordinance, 2002, is as follows: there voted in favour 36 Members; 1 Member voted against; there were no abstentions; 2 Members did not vote because they are not currently in their seats and therefore I declare that duly carried.

COMMITTEE *FOR* EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

5. The Family Allowances Ordinance, 2022 – Proposition carried

Article 5
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Family Allowances Ordinance, 2022", and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Bailiff: Shall we take one more? *(Interjection by Deputy Prow)* I thought we might take the legislation rather than anything else, Deputy Prow, on the basis that these are things that have been debated previously. Are you happy with that, Deputy Roffey, because the next ones are ...? Greffier.

The States' Greffier: Article 5, the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security – the Family Allowances Ordinance, 2022.

The Bailiff: Anything to say on that, Deputy Roffey?

Deputy Roffey: Not really. This legislation, and indeed the next two items, both just reflect the decisions the Assembly has already taken during the Uprating Report debate a month or so ago.

The Bailiff: I do not see anyone rising to debate this matter so I will simply ask the Greffier to open the voting on Family Allowances Ordinance, 2022.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 1,

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Helyar, Mark	Bury, Tina
Blin, Chris			Matthews, Aidan	
Brouard, Al			St Pier, Gavin	
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				

De Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dudley-Owen, Andrea
Dyke, John
Fairclough, Simon
Falla, Steve
Ferbrache, Peter
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Haskins, Sam
Inder, Neil
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Le Tissier, Chris
Le Tocq, Jonathan
Leadbeater, Marc
Mahoney, David
McKenna, Liam
Meerveld, Carl
Moakes, Nick
Murray, Bob
Oliver, Victoria
Parkinson, Charles
Prow, Robert
Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Taylor, Andrew
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: The voting on this Proposition is that there voted in favour 36 Members; there were no Members voting against; nobody abstaining; 3 Members did not vote because they are not here and therefore I declare that Proposition duly carried.

COMMITTEE FOR EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

6. The Severe Disability Benefit and Carers Allowance (Amendment) Ordinance, 2022 – Proposition carried

Article 6
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Severe Disability Benefit and Carer's Allowance (Amendment) Ordinance, 2022", and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Bailiff: Shall we try one more while the system is still working? *(Laughter)*

The States' Greffier: Article 6, the Committee for Employment and Social Security – the Severe Disability Benefit and Carers Allowance (Amendment) Ordinance, 2022.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey, if there is anything to say?

Deputy Roffey: Likewise, this absolutely puts into Law the recent decision of the Assembly.

The Bailiff: Similarly, as I do not see anyone to debate this draft Ordinance I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on the Severe Disability Benefit and Carers Allowance (Amendment) Ordinance, 2022.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 3, Absent 1,

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Blin, Chris	None	Aldwell, Sue	Helyar, Mark	Bury, Tina
Brouard, Al			St Pier, Gavin	
Burford, Yvonne			Taylor, Andrew	
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				
Queripel, Lester				
Roberts, Steve				
Roffey, Peter				
Snowdon, Alexander				
Soulsby, Heidi				
Trott, Lyndon				
Vermeulen, Simon				

The Bailiff: In relation to this Proposition there voted in favour 35 Members; no Members voted against; 1 abstained; 3 Members did not vote and therefore I declare that Proposition duly carried.

COMMITTEE *FOR* EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

7. The Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No.2) Ordinance, 2022 – Proposition carried

Article 7
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No. 2) Ordinance, 2022", and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The Bailiff: One more for luck as that will finish the legislation, Greffier, then we will rise for lunch.

The States' Greffier: Article 7, the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security – the Income Support (Implementation) (Amendment) (No.2) Ordinance, 2022.

The Bailiff: And similarly, Deputy Roffey, is there anything you wish to say?

Deputy Roffey: If I did it would be tedious repetition, sir. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: But not on the same topic. And therefore, if I do not see any Member rising, I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on this Proposition please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 3, Absent 1,

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	DID NOT VOTE	ABSENT
Aldwell, Sue	None	None	Helyar, Mark	Bury, Tina
Blin, Chris			St Pier, Gavin	
Brouard, Al			Taylor, Andrew	
Burford, Yvonne				
Cameron, Andy				
De Lisle, David				
De Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dudley-Owen, Andrea				
Dyke, John				
Fairclough, Simon				
Falla, Steve				
Ferbrache, Peter				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Haskins, Sam				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Tissier, Chris				
Le Tocq, Jonathan				
Leadbeater, Marc				
Mahoney, David				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Meerveld, Carl				
Moakes, Nick				
Murray, Bob				
Oliver, Victoria				
Parkinson, Charles				
Prow, Robert				

Queripel, Lester
Roberts, Steve
Roffey, Peter
Snowdon, Alexander
Soulsby, Heidi
Trott, Lyndon
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: In respect of this Proposition there voted in favour 36 Members, no Member voted against, no one abstained, there were 3 Members still absent at the vote and therefore the Proposition is declared carried which means we have filled in the legislation.

We will adjourn now till 2.30 and a sharp return at 2.30 please, Members, and we will start the Alderney Airport then.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.27 p.m.
and resumed at 2.30 p.m.

ARTICLES ADJOURNED OR DEFERRED FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF THE STATES

3. Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation – Debate commenced

Article 3
The States are asked to decide: -
Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation' of the Policy & Resources Committee and the States' Trading Supervisory Board, they are of the opinion:-
1. To agree Option C+ optimises public value in Alderney Airport by way of restoration of the existing pavement surfaces of the runway, including its re-widening and extension, and the redevelopment of the terminal building and other building alterations to secure improvements to enhance service provision; and therefore to replace the previously agreed proposal with this Option C+ scheme in the Government Work Plan.
2. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee on behalf of the States of Guernsey to negotiate with the Policy & Finance Committee of the States of Alderney in order to update the operational relationship and secure capital funding for the Option C+ scheme to redevelop Alderney Airport and runway; and if a reasonable and robust agreement cannot be reached, to direct that the Policy & Resources Committee reverts to the States of Guernsey for further consideration of options to secure funding for Option C+.

The States' Greffier: Article 3, Policy & Resources Committee and States' Trading Supervisory Board – The Alderney Airport Runway Rehabilitation.

The Bailiff: I invite the President of the Policy & Resources Committee, Deputy Ferbrache, to open debate.

Deputy Ferbrache: Thank you very much, sir.

This is a joint policy letter, as has been read out by the States' Greffier already, on behalf of P&R and STSB but I will be making the opening speech and the closing speech in relation to this debate.

In connection with where we are, the thought that I would like Members to carry with them through this debate today and tomorrow, is that we are two Islands with one economy. We have

shared interests. We have: the benefits for Guernsey are the benefits for Alderney, and the benefits for Alderney are the benefits for Guernsey; and I will explain that more in due course.

I would like to start in a place that I did not expect to start in, and I look back to *Hansard* on 16th October 2020, when Deputy St Pier and I were standing for election as President of P&R, and Alderney Representative Snowdon asked what I thought was an equally apposite question if he were asking it today. He said this:

> With staycation bringing the Islands together, which has been fantastic to see, how will the new P&R team Committee strengthen relationships between Alderney and Guernsey over the next four years?

Deputy St Pier said this:

> There are some shared challenges, for example the support for the airline and the travel connections with the Island.

He went on to say:

> I also want to have more Alderney representation within the States of Guernsey Committees and in particular … about how we get a greater voice for Alderney at the top table for P&R and how we get input of Alderney issues so that P&R is better informed about some of the challenges when it is making decisions that affect Alderney.

Very appropriate comments made in October 2020, comments that I echoed then and I echo now.

We are all in the Bailiwick of Guernsey together. Now, the policy letter, as I have already said, is a joint policy letter by the States' senior committee, i.e. P&R, and the States' practical working committee, i.e. STSB. The membership of P&R has changed since the policy letter was originally published, at the time that it was published there was a majority of P&R in favour; those Deputies in favour were myself, Deputy Helyar and Deputy Mahoney. Deputy Soulsby and Deputy Le Tocq had a different view. Now the Committee has changed and Deputy Soulsby has left, Deputy Murray has joined, and Deputy Murray supports the proposals that have been put forward. So there is a 4:1 majority in P&R; and as I understand it, STSB are united – all three political representatives are united in favour of the policy letter, together with the two voting as they are but not in this Assembly, voting STSB members.

Now I would ask you to have regard to just the input in relation to some of those. Since the STSB was created and had it's first day of breath on 1st May 2016, it has had four Presidents. The first President was Deputy Jones, who sadly was not with us for very long. So the three longstanding Presidents of STSB were Deputy Parkinson, then me and then Deputy Roffey; and the two Presidents of Economic Development during the last term were myself and then Deputy Parkinson. So we are all united, we have worked with this situation in relation to Alderney, in relation to Aurigny, whose name features in the policy letter and it will feature I have no doubt during the course of the debate and will certainly feature in my speech.

We will no doubt, we have all worked with this particular issue over a long period of time. We have looked at it the proverbial up hill and down dale and we have looked at every conceivable option and every conceivable contingency that could take place, to decide what is not only in the best of Alderney but what is in the best for the Bailiwick of Guernsey and Guernsey, because we are united.

Now, we have had, to a large degree, not complete, fiscal unity since 1948. So for the last 74 years, if my arithmetic is right, we have been in large measure in fiscal unity. Alderney Representatives, I am sure they pay tax, Alderney citizens pay their tax to Guernsey, they pay their Social Insurance to Guernsey, we are all in the same fiscal pot in that regard.

But much, much more important to me is our cultural heritage. We are cousins in this Bailiwick. We are only 20-odd miles apart. We are, in my view, under the same umbrella, we are the same people, we have the same history, we have the same values, we have the same principles. We are just living on separate Islands.

Alderney has significant challenges. It's population in recent years has diminished. At one time not that long ago it had a population of about 2,400. It had 240 children, 10% of its population going to St Anne's School. Now, the school population diminished significantly, albeit I think it has increased a bit recently, and I will be talking about the aspirational elements of Alderney in due course, because Guernsey is not there to give Alderney a present, it is not seeking to do so, I do not seek to do so on behalf of the citizens of Guernsey. I regard us as the citizens of the Bailiwick, but even so I realise that if we want Alderney to prosper it is in Guernsey's best interests, and one of the key things Alderney needs is connectivity, and I refer back to the quote that I made from Deputy St Pier's address or comments in relation to a question back in October 2020 as its connectivity. It needs decent connectivity.

Now, I believe that clearly we must spend, as representatives of the peoples of Guernsey and Alderney, every single penny that comes into the States' coffers, wisely. It is not our money, it is not Peter Ferbrache's money or Deputy Lyndon Trott's money; it is the money that comes in from the taxpayers of Guernsey and Alderney in direct and indirect taxes. And there is never a good time – I have never ever in my States' experience going back to 1994, ever heard that there was a good time but we know these are particularly difficult times. But we have still got to make decisions in difficult times, and difficult decisions have to made all the time, and this is a difficult decision, I appreciate, for people. Everybody in this Assembly is a sensible, decent, intelligent person and he or she will have different views and those views will be respected. But I believe that the policy letter, and in particular Option C+, is the best value for money.

In relation to this I regard us as a family really, and I was sitting right near my colleague, my able colleague, Deputy Lester Queripel at lunch, and he was talking about a Christmas lunch he went to some years ago where everybody was bickering. Well, we tend to do that here, don't we? We have a little bicker on occasions in respect of such matters, but we are still a family, and we have to make decisions which are in the best interests of our family.

My family, my political family, if I can say that, are the people in the Bailiwick of Guernsey and I have a particular responsibility to Guernsey as its President of Policy & Resources and a Member of the States of Guernsey. Now Alderney is now in need, there is no doubt that Alderney is now in need. Its need is vital to its resilience as a sustainable community. It needs a modern, secure and appropriate runway for the 21st century. It also needs the upgrade, really a replacement of the attendant facilities. So it is a matter of need, requirement and necessity.

I know that my colleagues, all of my colleagues in this room, will have carefully read the policy letter, but in the course of my remarks, because of the importance particularly to Alderney – but I emphasise again, and I will mention this again without any apologies in the course of my speech – also to Guernsey as the proposal contained therein, I will be making a detailed reference to what I regard as resonant postures from the policy letter.

Now I hope that it will not be thought of as hyperbole, because it is certainly not intended to be, but this matter is far too important for that, but when I say, and I say this, that to the Islanders of Alderney, this is probably the most important issue for them for many, many years. I ask all my colleagues to bear that in mind when making the decisions in respect of this policy letter. Let's not speculate, let's not be territorial, let's not hope that some solution will drift in on a gentle wind on a summer's day. None of that is going to happen. Let's be factual. Let us make our decisions as citizens of the Bailiwick.

Now, when we look at the policy letter, I am going to start by having regard to the very first sentence of that policy letter, because I think it is appropriate and sets the tone. It says it in just, what, 12-14 words:

> The rehabilitation of Alderney Airport's runway is a critically important investment in Guernsey and Alderney's future.

Let me just repeat those words: it is a critically important investment in the future of both islands. Now in respect of that, we have to look forward as to the cost of it, and we will deal with that in due course. Now we, Guernsey, if I can use that word just for the moment, have every economic interest,

even if we cast aside philanthropy, even if we cast aside this spirit of the family of the Bailiwick of Guernsey, we have every economic interest in insuring that Alderney is a stable and vibrant community. Because if not, who is going to have to pick up the fiscal and financial tab? It will be the taxpayers of Guernsey. If Alderney is not given the opportunity to develop its community, the buck will come back to Guernsey.

As I said, we in Guernsey are in what I regard as a fiscal partnership to a greater or lesser extent, and I think it is really a greater extent with Alderney, and if Alderney cannot prosper the real likelihood, as I have already said, is that Guernsey will have to provide the additional financial assistance. Now the policy letter continues the next sentence:

> The runway provides an essential social and economic lifeline for the community of Alderney.

In fact, there is no realistic alternative. As I have already said Alderney, needs a runway fit for the 21st century. It needs a runway fit for the future. By any balanced consideration of that requirement, it does not have one. Sir, Members will recall that the runway had to close on 26th October, not all that long ago, and I will quote from a report forwarded to me on that day from one of our senior officers:

> I just wanted to advise you that Alderney airport's runway is currently closed after a defect was identified during an inspection last night. A previous repair has dipped in the runway resulting in a change in level of approximately 19 mm. The recommended tolerance is a maximum of 3 mm. We have spoken to our regulators this morning and the difference in level is too great and therefore they are unable to open the runway until the repairs can be carried out.

So just to emphasise those figures, the maximum tolerance is 3 mm. This particular defect, this particular thing that emerged presumably on the evening of 25th or early morning of 26th October, was more than six times that.

Now we are going to hear, because I know we have had discussions with our able colleagues from Alderney, from Alderney Representative Roberts, just how much rubbish they are sweeping up from their runway every single day, and I will be referring to the figure of, I believe, as it is information given to me as recently as yesterday by one of our senior civil servants who deals with this topic regularly, that since the beginning of the year 3,000 kilos – listen, *3,000 kilos* – of the runway has disintegrated; 3,000 kilos, that is what, 6,600 lbs in weight if my arithmetic is right, of rubbish has come out of that runway. It is not going to last much longer.

Now the officer continued further on, bearing in mind we were late October the 26th/27th October:

> alternative transport options being considered may be mainly marine commercial transport options.

– but the weather is not favourable today, and that is Alderney's problem. You cannot get regular sea travel there seven days a week, 365 days a year, 52 weeks per annum.

Now Members will recall that the runway did not open again until lunchtime on 27th October so it was closed for over a day. Now this will happen again, and it will happen again with greater regularity with more dislocation, with more frustration, with more cost, with more damage to the reputation to Alderney. 'You can't get there, the runway is not fit for purpose.' Why would you set up a business there? Why would you go there for your holiday? You are just not going to go there because you cannot get backwards and forwards with regularity.

Now those quotations that I have just referred to are indicative to me of, firstly, the very poor state of the runway. It has been patched and mended on various occasions and that option is now reaching a point where it is no longer possible. It is certainly not economic, but more important than that, it is not safe. And secondly, a maritime solution, especially in autumn and winter, is not going to give the community who want to not only continue, but to prosper any kind of regularly needed connectivity.

Some of you may think what is he on about? Well, some of you think that often I suppose! The States have already resolved to invest in a major rehabilitation of the existing payments – well true

that was in 2019, albeit nothing has happened in relation to that yet, but that has been delayed because of our two major outbreaks of COVID. But that would only do half the job. The thought that goes through my mind and has gone through my mind with that viewpoint ever since I looked at this issue is pennywise but pound foolish. This is what we as an Assembly would be, in my view, if we chose not to adopt C+. If we are not looking for frills we are not looking for dilettantes, we are not looking for luxury, we are not anything other than is properly required to ensure that Alderney can not only continue, but can develop.

Now on the questions of politicians making difficult decisions, they never like to do so even at the best of times. There is always a decision or solution tomorrow. Let's have another report, let's just think about this, let's delay until we have seen whether we can have joined up planes with Jersey, let's just see if we can wait until we have had a Resolution rescinding the States' Resolution in relation to the Guernsey runway. Let's just wait, let's just wait. Well, it is Christmas time and I like Charles Dickens, but Mr Micawber waited for everything to turn up. Mrs Micawber had to talk sense to him. Nothing is going to turn up. There is going to be no magic. There is going to be no flash of brilliance from Jimmy Greaves. There is just going to be practical reality and we have got to make the decisions that we have got to make now. There is no charging white horse coming over the horizon. This is the real world.

Now no community can stand still. Why do we need an answer now? Let me say when I was President of the STSB we had proposals brought to us then about the Alderney runway extension, and a bit like Guernsey runway, when Guernsey had all the diggers here and they were doing all of that, if they had then carried out the extension to the runway, it would have cost a lot less than if it is ever extended in the future. That is exactly the position in relation to Alderney runway. And I checked the figures again just as recently as yesterday from that report that was presented just, I think, in early 2019, and the figures then were the late 2018 figures, and what we were told was that if we did up to Stage A or even a bit of Option B, and then you went away and in a few years' time we decided, well, we are going to come and extend the runway now, it would cost not only the extra cost of doing that, it would cost an extra – and this is 2018 figures – £6.6 million. So that is the cost of doing the extra bit, plus you would have an extra wasted, somewhere between £6-7 million. Probably now, that was four years ago, I guess something well over £7 million, certainly £6.6 million then. It does not make sense to defer the decision.

Now as I say, no community can stand still. When we were due to have this debate last time but we ran out of time, some States' Members attended the presentation just across the road at the OGH via the Alderney Chamber of Commerce, and it was presented by three of the younger members of Alderney community, three younger members of the Chamber of Commerce. Now if anybody who attended that presentation was not impressed – sir, I am sad that not everybody attended and I appreciate that some people could not – then I do not know what you need to do to impress people. Because these were three young people with families who had business commitments in Alderney and in Guernsey. They had set their lives up in Alderney. They wanted a future for their families. They wanted a future for their communities.

Now they were not there with a begging bowl, they were there saying what the realistic position is. If we say all we are going to do is Option A, or something or some twiddly bits like that, we are really saying to Alderney, 'We are doing the basic, you don't mean that much to us, we have got to do this because it is our legal/political obligation,' but we are not helping you benefiting from what you should have, because if Alderney prospers, if Alderney is allowed to continue to develop, we in Guernsey will reap the benefits of that manyfold.

There is an old adage, I will probably have to change to football now because I am one of the oldest people in this room, but there is an old adage that you cannot stand still. Only Stanley Matthews could stand on the ball. Now Deputy Trott would remember that, I remember it, one or two others would remember it, others do not. I would say Tony Grealish or Jack Grealish, somebody like that now, very few people can stand still in relation to where we should be.

Now to retain the length of Alderney's current runway is short term. It is short termism of the worst possible kind and it will not provide Alderney with the resilience it needs.

On the question of pure financial considerations, I am going to ask colleagues to look in the course of my little address, to two particular tabs or two particular tables, and that is table 6 on page 19 and table 7 on page 20. So firstly, if Members would kindly turn to page 19 and to table 6, which is headed 'Estimated 15 year whole life costs for each of the shortlisted options'. Now we know what they are because they are A, B, C and C+. Now you range initially from Option A which is replacing what you have currently got at £13,825,000, to Option C+ £24,016,000. Then you have got additional costs in relation to the operating costs, because clearly it will cost more because you have moved from one type of airport to another etc. it will cost more to operate over the next 15 years if you extend the runway than if you do not, and those costs vary between Option A £675,924 to Option C and C+ at £2,575,446.

But against that, and Deputy Trott, who is a person who does attend presentations – not everybody in this Assembly, not every senior Member does, but he does – attended one of the Alderney presentations. They were both the same so he did not miss anything, but he attended one and what he said wisely, was that you cannot expect a community of around 2,000 people to ever have an airline service that would make a profit. It is just not possible. That is what he said. He was wise on that occasion. If he repeats that as he may speak during the course of this debate, I am sure he will bear that thought in mind. Because he is absolutely, on that particular point, 100% right.

So, if we look at the four options, they are listed and ranked and we can see that the one that gets the biggest tick on that table is Option C, C+ is three, A is two and Option B gets the lowest mark.

Now the cheapest, but the option that is ranked number 1 as I say, is Option C, and there is the net cost. Now the point that I was making in relation to Deputy Trott's comments is that we have a Public Service Obligation (PSO) commitment to Alderney at the moment, and it has got three years to run. It runs out at the end of 2025. But if anybody thinks realistically that at the end of 2025 there is going to be some magic and we will not need a PSO or we might not need a PSO, then they are living in … it is Christmas, it is a lovely time. I spent time with my five-year-old granddaughter on Saturday lunchtime. I had lunch with her, it was lovely to see her, she was telling me how excited she was, she told me every single word of her nativity play, all the things that she did, but that is not the real world. It is a lovely world, but it is not the real world. The real world is much different from that. Alderney will need some kind of assistance in relation to its air links, and that is its only main connectivity, there is nothing else that will replace it for years and years to come, well beyond 2025.

So, if we look at the options – I do appreciate of course, and Deputy Trott was right to say well, because he sent a note last night saying you have got to look at the cost of capital as well, you cannot, how much that is going to cost, etc., and I fully accept that, and I am going to attempt to deal with it in the course of my address because I think that is a very fair point. Because clearly if you buy an egg for £1 and you buy two eggs for £2, you have got to come up with £2, you have got to come up with more money, you have got to come up with more money up front, and if we do the full, if the States approves the full C+, you have got to come up with a fair bit more money than you would have to come up with if you adopt say, Option A or Option B. Actually, not that much more money, but some more money.

Now, are we really saying, by the way … because we have been to Alderney, most of us have been to Alderney, the terminal has been there since 1968. So it is 54 years old. The tatty old bit that they use for the fire brigade has been there since 1968. It is 54 years old. It is detailed in the policy letter: neither are fit for purpose. So, as I said, if I move from table 6 to table 7 which is on the following page. You can see that is headed 'Unavoidable associated in future capital costs,' and on the left its provisional sum for existing building refurb or replacement within a five-year timeframe, due to track dilapidation, triggers for options A, B or C. So, in Option C+ the £4½ million or thereabouts, is built in for the costs of replacing the terminal, replacing the fire station, upgrading and doing what is necessary.

Now they are going to have to be done anyway. They are going to have to be done within the next five years. They are going to have to be done sooner than that really, because they are not, to use a phrase I have used before, fit for purpose. So if you add the £4½ million, and if you do it together it is a bit less, I am sure that Members have done their arithmetic, because you would not need the temporary building that you would need or the smaller building that you would need if you adopt Option C. You then see what the figures are, and bearing in mind if you take off the subsidy, the reduction in the subsidy for the PSO from £2 million to £1.2 million, which would be the saving of about £800,000 a year, you can see the figures in that table.

Option A: potential total cost over 15 years, £19 million. Option B: £20,300,000. Option C: £15.671 million. Option C+, and it goes from 3, if you remember it was before, to 1: £15,131,480. So, you get a proper job, you get the full bit, the Airport done, the terminal done, etc. So, what I would like to ask Members is just below that table is paragraph 5.15, and I will just read that in full:

> Inclusion of this provisional sum changes the potential overall ranking, and evidences that Option C+ would provide the overall longer term cost benefit, taking into account the need for existing building refurbishment or replacement within the lifetime of the overall payments project anticipated life at Options A, B and C.

Now if we go back and look, I refer Members back to paragraph 3.6 of the policy letter, you will see there that it reads, if I turn it up, as follows:

> Despite being well maintained and upgraded where possible over time, the current term on the fire station at Alderney Airport need significant improvement or replacement. Irrespective of which runway rehabilitation option is selected, for the reasons stated in paragraphs 3.7 to 3.11, a substantial investment in those buildings …

– listen, is the mandatory word, it is not an option, it is not a frivolity –

> … will be required within a five-year timeframe.

And just look at this, if we were saying to people nowadays, this is satisfactory, we would be saying, no, it is not. Paragraph 3.7:

> The current airport terminal was constructed in 1968. It is a wooden structure and has no insulation. Whilst it has coped well with many changes over the last 50+ years in the way air passengers are needed to be security screened, it has become increasingly unsuitable. A lack of insulation results in high summer temperatures within the building. In winter, the lack of insulation leads to excessive heating costs. When poor weather causes flight delays there is little or no waiting room.

You know that, you have all been there when two or three flights have been delayed. You are cheek to jowl.

> Additionally, the arrivals hall is cramped and provides poor facilities for baggage claim, customs checks and interviews. The security area is small. Departing passengers are required to queue between café tables before entering the search area. Once security cleared, the passengers must wait to be called for boarding from the constricted and open-air waiting area, with no refreshment or toilet facilities. The only shelter from inclement weather is a small portacabin which houses the pre-flight safety video.

At 3.10 about the fire station, which again was constructed in the same year:

> It is a single block construction with asbestos roof cladding.

Now that word sends tingles of fear through people when you say asbestos now. They have got a roof cladding with asbestos.

> Despite being subject to annual safety inspections by a competent agent, there remains a risk that the roofing product has been made brittle by age …

– will get more brittle by age –

> … and is more likely to be prone to damage. The unsuitability of this type of roofing is heighted as the roof supports, made of the same asbestos cement product, make attempts to install extractor units to deal with exhaust fumes from the fire vehicles quite challenging. The appliance bay provides workshop facilities which enable the firefighters to undertake maintenance and repairs on site. The building and its current accommodation are very small, with the most recent appliances having to be adapted to fit within the station.

Now that means they cost more, because they have got to be purpose built, you cannot go and buy one off the factory.

> The existing station has no insulation and does not provide a sufficient standard of accommodation for staff in winter or summer. It comprises three small rooms totalling 23m^2, which created specific challenges in implementing social distancing recommendations during the pandemic.

So, stating the obvious, you cannot have an airfield without a functioning terminal and fire station. This terminal and fire station are at the very end of their lives, in fact really they are beyond that. Now we know in this real World Cup we are having 10 minutes of overtime, we are in the 12th minute of overtime in relation to where the terminal and the fire station are. They need to be replaced now, not just very soon. We cannot put off doing basic repairs to the runway which the States, in principle, already agreed in 2019, and it is cost-effective and sensible to do all of this at the same time.

As Deputy Roffey has said on more than one occasion, it is not intended to build a Heathrow Terminal 5, but a modest and appropriate building. At one of the presentations to States' Members, two Members made comments about the proposed cost of £4.5 million. I emphasise that is the cost of both replacing the terminal building and the fire station.

Both of the Members who particularly referenced that cost are, in my view, sensible and balanced States' Members in their opinions. One, Deputy Aldwell, was sceptical that costs could be limited to £4.5 million. The other, Deputy Dyke, thought that you could build a suitable terminal for half a million, rather a divergence of views. That shows that even though you have decent, intelligent, sensible people, how their views can diverge. I respect both their views because I respect them as sensible States' Members, but they are not experts in this field and the advice received from experts is that £4 ½ million is a realistic figure for the work.

I am not going to read out paragraphs 5.17 and 5.18 and I ask Members to read those themselves, but the conclusion is that the ATR 72-600 would be able to operate effectively with this extended runway.

I would ask Members when considering which option to choose, to have regard both for the immediate need of the Airport, but also to the not-too-distant future. Paragraph 5.19, I think you need to turn – well, I would ask Members to turn to that, they turn to whatever they want to turn to – gives 13 reasons in summary why Option C+ is the right option. I am not going to read them all, but I am going to read some of them.

Now one of the things we are worried about, people fall ill. Alderney has medical facilities but of course *ipso facto* because it is a small island they are limited. The first bullet point, it:

> Enables dedicated, specialist medevac aircraft operators to operate to Alderney (the current runway is too short);

So what is being done is the best that can be done, but it is far from perfect. So that itself should cause the box to be ticked.

It also assures sustainable commercial passenger and cargo operations for the longer term, particularly noting the continuing uncertainty with smaller aircraft manufacturers post-pandemic. Now we were told in relation to that, at one of the presentations from the CEO of Aurigny, who has no axe to grind. I am sure in a real world he would rather, with great respect to Alderney, leave it alone, let somebody else do it and go somewhere else. He is obligated, we are obligated; Aurigny were the only show on the road, the only horse on the racecourse, whatever you want to say, to put forward a sensible, balanced, workable long-term solution when it came to the PSO. And the previous P&R and this P&R, considered that long and hard. There was no other show, you just had

to watch the Aurigny show because there was nothing else to see. There is nothing else to see, there will be nothing else to see in the real practical world.

So Members, as I say, will have heard from the CEO of Aurigny, and he said that the hourly maintenance costs of the Dornier aircraft are at least twice those of the ATR. He gave the figures, and in fact is was two and a half or three times, it was significantly more that twice. There is only one other jurisdiction that uses Dorniers as a regular passenger provider, and it is way out somewhere – I do not know if it was Japan or America, he did tell me but I cannot remember, it is a long way away. There may be, and probably will be, difficulty in the future, both in getting adequate spares and replacing the Dornier, and he gave an example of some part that he needed for March. They are lucky they had sufficient parts to cover the replacements until March, otherwise he would not have been able to get parts, particular parts until March. We were having this conversation at a presentation a month or so ago. So that is the position we are in. 'Tell the people of Alderney when they cannot get an aircraft that it is alright really, we will be able to have electric planes,' and I will talk about all of that in due course.

Now we live in a regulatory world. I know that Deputy St Pier in one of his very many columns in one of the very many journals that he writes in, reminds us about that, that I have been President of P&R for the last two and a bit years and we have got more and more regulations. I accept that. But it is not a world I particularly like, it is not a world I like living in, because regulations, although of necessity on occasions, do not make the business run any better. They do not put any more money in your pocket, but we have got to live in the world we live in, not the world we might want to live in.

Now, C+ would future-proof aviation security requirements, as it says in this paragraph 5.19:

> … by bringing Alderney in minimum compliance with EU and UK aviation security requirements …

We are told that it is always foreseeable that this could happen at short notice. I know from my experience as President of STSB when we had the baggage handling scanners or whatever they are called, that we were told if we did not do it within a certain time, Guernsey Airport was going to close. They would have closed Guernsey Airport. And that was within a relatively short period of time. I would hope that the authorities, whether EU or wherever they may be, CAA, would give Alderney time, but I would not guarantee that, and we know that these things tend to move slowly.

Now although these proposals are not premised on an extra seat being sold, it does give the opportunity for extra capacity above the PSO levels of 20,000 passengers per annum. So, at no extra cost, because that service would already be provided by the ATRs, you would instantly have available an extra 20,000 seats, that is what we were told by the CEO of Aurigny.

Now it is almost a side issue, but I think a relevant one, and I have emphasised it again and I make no apology for emphasising it again now. We all want Alderney to prosper. This would give it its chance. The better it does, as I say, the less of what some would consider it as a burden on Guernsey. The extension is a potential economic enabler. It would offer potentially substantial savings on the PSO. Section 7 of the policy letter deals with those, I am not going to go into that in great detail because, again, you have that before you. It is headed Alderney Public Service Obligation and it deals with what the savings would be, £800,000 etc., it deals with the Dornier, it deals with the ATRs.

The current arrangement has about three years to go, and I have already said that it would be unrealistic in my view to expect there not to be some kind of need for a PSO beyond the end of 2025.

Now it would also enable – and again it is in that paragraph 5.19 – a much wider range of business and GA aircraft to use the Airport, and this could potentially attract new businesses, leisure users and visitors. It would open up Alderney considerably. A variety of larger planes could use Alderney. There is at least the possibility of attracting high net worth individuals to visit, stay and perhaps invest in the Island. I do not generally like reading from newspapers but we saw in the *Guernsey Press* yesterday, a letter from people who have invested in Alderney, who have invested in Guernsey, who have actually run businesses, who have developed businesses, who know what

they are talking about. They are not theoreticians, they do not sit on their backside theorising about what might happen in the future, and they are, their names were given: Guy Hands and Julia Hands who are CEO of Terra Firma and chairperson of Hand Picked Hotels; Gavin Rihoy, managing director of J Rihoy Ltd.

Now of course we have got no confidence in J Rihoys, have we, because they have only just built Admiral Park, they built the Premier Inn, they built the new office block, they built all the attendant facilities around there, they built that wonderful office that is just across … I am glad for the sense of direction, thank you Deputy Vermeulen – it is just across the road from here. They are building, and getting on very well and doing it very well, the first phase of the Hospital redevelopment. So I think Mr Rihoy and his brother, Jeremy, know a little bit or other about building. Martin Belcher, well known in the finance sector, chairman of Polygon Collective. Penny Ball, again well known chair of the Fort Group; Julie Anne Uggla owner of the Blonde Hedgehog Group

Look what she has done for Alderney. Look what she has done by pumping in millions of pounds into the Alderney economy. That is because she liked it. Other people of her ilk, if they visit that wonderful Island, may well like it and may well do the same as that particular lady. And the other person who signed it, again a person well known, a person who is running a business in Guernsey, Holly Fisher, who is chair of the Georgian House Group, which I am sure you will be familiar with.

Now what they say is this, and I make no apology that this is going to be a long speech, but there we are:

> The planned £24m. extension of Alderney runway and airport has caused much noise in the press and social media recently. Whilst some of the comments have been positive, many, especially from the Assembly have been negative. We, the undersigned, have considerable business interests on Alderney …

Just pausing there, I think these people have got more business nous that anybody in this room, or collectively in this room, and that is no disrespect to anybody in this particular room.

> We, the undersigned, … have … business interests on Alderney as well as large operations in Guernsey and beyond. We are some of the recent few who have shown enough confidence in the sister island to substantially invest and establish new businesses. In our opinion, Alderney is a valuable asset to the Bailiwick and deserves our support.
> The business case for the airport is that should the island not provide a runway long enough to accommodate the intended monotype fleet operated by Aurigny, then the island will most likely not have an airline operator at all. The airline market for planes with less than 19 seats both for manufacturers as well as operators is very limited as they are not profitable on a stand-alone basis and very few, unless heavily subsidised to the tune of £5-6m. per annum, are interested. Thus the real cost of not allowing the island to have a runway that could accommodate larger aircraft, whether Aurigny or not, would require unaffordable annual subsidies or start-up costs way more than the additional one-off payment of £8.5m. being asked of the Bailiwick taxpayer.

In fact I have addressed that figure, it is not quite that, but never mind, that is the figure they refer to.

> It has also been brought to our attention that much of the focus of the debate has been on the £24m. as if it was the additional cost to the taxpayer, over and above the agreed £12m. runway refurbishment. Its current state is precarious to say the least. In fact, Alderney will be paying £3.5m. towards the additional costs in the guise of a treasury loan, thus the real additional cost is …

And they give a figure.

> As big businesses and employers in the Bailiwick, we are continually made very aware that the outside world of increased regulation is a very fast and demanding beast in all sectors, not least in the aviation sector. The compulsory new baggage scanners at Guernsey airport are an example of that. It is our firm belief that Alderney Airport will be subject in that not so distant future to the many more CAA regulatory requirements, nearly all of which will be covered in the extension and refurbishment programme. To merely put heads in the sand and hope the regulators stay away would be foolhardy, costly and ultimately disastrous for the future of Alderney's airport. Any reliance on a ferry service to the island also carries huge regulatory/viability issues as well as serious meteorological challenges. Alderney lies in one of the roughest tidal stretches in north Europe. If Alderney financially fails, the real cost to the Bailiwick will far outweigh the sums involved in this project. The 1948 agreement comes with its responsibilities and the last thing the Bailiwick needs, as a

> respected Finance Centre, is to be seen to require the UK Ministry of Justice to get involved in its affairs should a dispute arise.

Let me just say in relation to that, that is a long, long way away.

> The latter would seriously damage our credibility in the outside world, particularly in the highly competitive offshore industry.

Now just pausing there, we all know those of us that work in, or have had, dealings in the finance sector, that any stick is used to beat Guernsey. Jersey has got a longer runway. They do this in the Isle of Man. Cayman does this. Anything that can be used to criticise Guernsey will be used, and in the outside world, if something happens in Alderney, they look to Guernsey to resolve it. They do not differentiate between the two Islands in that regard.

The letter continues, and I support this 100%:

> We believe that Alderney deserves the investment as much as any other 'parish' faced with a similar infrastructural predicament. A reliably-connected Alderney will mean a wealthier Alderney, reducing its current deficit to manageable levels. It has already shown in the gambling licensing receipts that it can return many millions to the central coffers when it is given the correct tools to work with. We therefore urge you all to support this project and approve the expenditure without further delay.

And that is from people with no axe to grind, who have invested, put their money where their mouth is, who have considerable financial experience.

Now the cost of capital in relation to this. Firstly, it may be that we do not need to borrow at all. We may be able to get the money from capital reserves etc. We may be. But assuming that we do – and I think it is a fair point that Deputy Trott has raised – need to borrow, so the cost of capital has to be looked at.

Now I am told that at the moment, the information was originally given to me on 24th November, it has been re-given to me again today because a few weeks have elapsed since then, to see if there is any change. Interest could be at 4.47% but borrowing over a 15-year period. Now of course we are talking about rough order of magnitude figures that you can see in the figures. But using a rate of 4.47%, the capital investment under Option A, if you take into account the terminal and the fire station, is £18.3 million. The capital, if you do the whole hog, Option C, is just over £24 million. Now the cost of that capital per annum over a 15-year period: Option A is £860,000 per annum and Option C+ is £1.13 million, so that is a difference per annum of £270,000. However, that assumes that no capital sums are repaid during any loan period of 15 years, and that is not the way it works. If you have your own mortgage, unless you have an interest-only mortgage, you pay down your mortgage a bit every year so generally at the end of a year you owe a little bit less than the previous year, etc. So that is, as I am instructed, how they are financing the work here. So on a straightforward mortgage-type loan over a 15-year period at the rate I have mentioned, then the average interest per annum over the 15 years reduces. We all understand that.

Now under Option A, annual payments would be £1.7 million, so the total repaid over 15 years would be £25½ million. Under C+ it would be £2.2 million, total repaid over 15 years would be £33½ million, the difference is £8 million. But the total interest paid over the period under Option A is £7.2 million, average interest £480,000 per annum. Under Option C+ you would pay £9½ million interest over the 15-year period, or £630,000 per annum. The difference per annum in interest, would be £150,000. So Deputy Trott's calculations as he gave them, when he states the cost of capital is about £50,000 per annum, that is right, for every £1 million of capital, that is what we are talking about. But if we wanted to borrow at those rates and make capital payments as well, then the average interest paid over a 15-year period would be £630,000 per annum for Option C.

So it may be that the States come up with that money up front, in the sense that the building is not all going to be done at once. Whenever you do the work it is not going to be done in a week, but you pay for it as the work is done. So the question that I ask is do we have to borrow at all? And the answer is this, it was decided when Policy & Resources refreshed the economic plan as part of

the Government Work Plan in June 2022, that borrowing in this term was less likely to fund the prioritised portfolio. This view was included about £20 million, so £4 million less than we are talking about. However, due to the many uncertainties, inflation etc., as we know investment returns are pitiful at the moment, and the cost of other schemes within the portfolio, it is difficult to say with any certainty right now, whether borrowing would be required or not going forwards.

P&R advised SMC in a recent enquiry:

> The Committee is currently focused on fully understand the implications of the rising cost of living. Present and future levels in inflation in the island and wider local, national and international factors, which impact capital projects including the availability of workforce and materials. As a consequence I can provide you an assurance that the Committee will revert in writing on this matter in good time before the next hearing, but it is not currently in a position to be able to provide more details at this time.

It is also important to note that any reprioritisation of the capital portfolio that may result from consideration of these factors, would require a decision of the States, so we would have to come back to the States for the States to make that decision.

Now, there is always talk about Alderney's subsidy and I have heard my good friend, and he is my good friend, Deputy Brouard on many occasions talk about that figure. So I checked what it was last year, which is the up-to-date figures that we have got, and it includes the PSO sum. It was a figure of between £8 million-9 million. That was the – I am not using the word 'subsidy' other than for the purpose – subsidy that Alderney received overall. I do not know what the taxpayers of St Peter Port pay towards Torteval or the taxpayers of St Martin's pay towards The Vale, whether that balancing exercise was also done. I am unable to give you those figures.

In relation to where we are, I also asked some questions because I am a very simple soul and I like to know answers to questions that I can put forward. Now one of the questions I asked is what is the pedigree of the people who advise on this, i.e. what experience do they have? Now we are talking about this phrase the 'rough order of magnitude costs' and those are those included in the policy letter, have been provided by Guernsey Ports' technical advisors, AECOM. Now I am told, and I have looked them up to the best that I can, they employ designers and planners with considerable experience of aerodrome reconstruction and undertaken worldwide, including in the UK. The run costs also reflect the findings of extensive site investigations in Alderney Airport, as to the current ground and pavement conditions. Where appropriate, AECOM has included other members of its team for the development of cost estimates on building, and has undertaken specific scoping and costing for any EIA requirements. Extensive pre-application consultation has been undertaken with the UK CAA and the Office of the Director of Civil Aviation, to discuss aerodrome design and the general proposed layout and usage of the aerodrome for larger Code C aircraft, such as the ATR-72.

These discussions have included seeking clarifications on the level of security provision at Alderney Airport, as well as the requirements for fire category and sustaining operations. All that advice has been captured within the specification used to formulate the costs. So lots of work has been done by lots of people who know what they are talking about, by lots of people with experience over a long period of time. Now I know we have experts in this Assembly who are experts on many topics, but I wonder if they have the degree of expertise that these people have.

When were the costings carried out, because there is no point if you have got a costing carried out 10 years ago if it is realistic. The run costs were last updated in January of this year and I am told this by civil servants who advise me, who took the opportunity to discuss updates to these costs with AECOM in the summer of 2022, but were advised that due to the short-term volatility of the markets created by a number of unprecedented events, there was a risk that we could then be citing a snapshot that was not representative of its view of the market in the longer term.

The next question I asked was what was the likely inflation in respect of the costs? Answer: an allowance for inflation since January 2022 has been included in the tables. However, this will need to be tested at tender and take into account any movements in the cost as a result of world events since that time. It is also worth noting that no allowance has been made for any evaluation of

engineering post-works, which may offset, in other words diminish, any of the anticipated movement in costs generally over the time. I have already dealt with the costs of capital. I have already dealt with many of the other points.

How are we going to pay for it anyway? Well we either borrow, as I have said or go to general revenue capital allocation.

Now the dimensions of the terminal building, because again the words of Deputy Roffey were ringing loud in my ears about Heathrow Terminal 5 – I prefer Terminal 3 actually, it is much easier to get round than Terminal 5 – but what we were told is this:

> The existing terminal building and external hut, portacabin departure room

– would you really call it a departure room? But that is what it is termed –

> total approximately 275 m^2.

The new proposed terminal building footprint would be approximately 500 m^2, so not quite double but up a bit, and we know that at present it is already very cramped in relation to that.

Now, I also asked something about electric planes from an expert, because we have all got this vision. I mean I am old enough to remember when Neil Armstrong walked on the moon in July 1969. We all had the visions of people going to Mars and we would be able to do Dr Spock stuff. Not much has happened really. I mean you can send things to Mars etc., but you have not sent too many people to Mars, so over that 50-odd year period since then not a lot has happened. But we were promised all kinds of stuff. So I said this, Carl … I do not know what I was talking about. Carl talks about electric planes. What would the costs be? What is the realistic date when they could be achieved by? And I was advised this:

> On future propulsion options as you infer, we are in speculative territory. It is certain that there will be evolution, the form, timing and cost being the speculative portions. The main difficulty with proffering any form of educated guess, is that the early stage in lifecycle these alternative technologies find themselves in, engineering design phase with regulatory approval and productisation, commercialisation will follow. But I will nevertheless make a couple of observations specifically looking at electric propulsion. The concept of electrically powered flight is literally more than a century in the making, with interest ebbing and flowing based on either the advances in battery technology, periodic fuel shortages, or over the last number of years driven by environmental considerations. To date, designs around electric planes have been hamstrung by the weight of batteries given the energy density of today's battery technologies. Based on currently available technologies, a materially long runway that the 1050 m is being proposed for Alderney, would be required to compensate for the battery weight needed. There are more than 200 companies actively trying to develop a viable electric passenger aircraft, ranging in size from 9 seaters to a 186-seater. These companies claim different hypothetical performance capabilities for their respective designs, but generally appear to have approximately a 30 mile trip length limitation on 12-19 seat airframes, taking account of diversion and airport holding time requirements, both of which could be particularly relevant given the island's challenging weather conditions.
>
> When the first electrically powered passenger aircraft and modified 6-seater seaplane undertook a flight in December 2019, none of the engineering designs had been certified yet. The airline that undertook the December 2019 demonstration flight then stated that they hoped to have their complete fleet electrically powered by this year. In practice the first certification test flight only took place on 21 August this year.

For me, this lies at the crux of pure electric propulsion, that engineering designs associated have not been settled, requiring large ongoing investment in R&D, along with an uncertain timeline then to be followed by a typically lengthy certification process up to seven years, only for the current battery technology to limit deployment to a very small subset of the passenger aviation market. Journeys of below 30 miles account for less than 5% of aviation emissions. The financial and environmental investment case they have limited with this small subset of aviation, is unlikely to stack up such that the next set of investments necessarily for 'productisation' commercialisation is guaranteed to easily follow.

From the above you may detect that I am sceptical of any purely electrical passenger aircraft being available in the near term. The earliest claims that I have seen, noting that those claims are mostly made from companies during the process of raising further R&D funding, is 2025-26, typically for retrofit designs. Even if these timelines for potential first commercial lines were met,

and new aircraft designs timelines are almost never met, production ramp up timelines, pecking order for delivery, costs, slots etc. are unknown. Note that in my view it is not that they will not be purely electrically powered planes ever, I simply believe that the battery designs are not yet sufficiently advanced to allow identification of which aircraft is designed by which manufacturer and which format would be certified. And it then goes on in relation to that.

So, electricity are not going to come and give us anything in the immediate future and we are in the immediate future. I also, one of the most inspiring events – and I am not just saying it because I am presenting this policy letter – that I have attended in my experience as a Deputy, was when Deputy Roffey and I, the CEO of Aurigny and officers from the States of Guernsey went to Alderney on 17th October. We met their senior committee, but after we met their senior committee we met the people of Alderney for five and a half hours, and we were busy from the very first second to the last minute when they were ushered out the door because we wanted to go and get a drink before we went home.

For five and a half hours we met people. Over … not quite 100%, because in any democratic organisation, in any democratic debate, you are going to get different views. Different people generally hold different views. But overwhelmingly, the view of the Alderney community, and 10%+ of the Alderney adult community came to see us – 10%+! In Guernsey that would be the equivalent of 3,000 or 4,000 people. We had well over 200 people in Alderney come to see us.

They said this makes sense, they were erudite people, they listened to what we had to say. There were some that did not like it, as I have said. I do not want to be ageist or sexist or genderist, or whatever it may be, but every person aged under 40 of Alderney, who had families, who were young people who were making their lives in Alderney, every single person, and we talked about the future of Alderney before – Alderney Representative Roberts talked about it when he was making his speech in relation to education – they are the future. They are the ones who are going to take the community forward. Every one of them was in favour of this project. They did not expect Guernsey to give them money. They did not expect Guernsey to be their banker. They said that this was the future for them, this was the future for the Bailiwick. And just about all of them had interests in Guernsey as well.

I have got lots of other notes but I am already speaking too long so I am just going to finish off quite briefly now. I could conclude now that by saying in my view as representing the joint proposal of the policy letter, that the economic face for these proposals on behalf of Guernsey, and I stress that, and Alderney is laid out. The more Alderney can be safeguarded and the more resilient its key infrastructure can be given, is for the benefit of both Islands.

There is an old Guernsey legal principle, *le bon forez est presume* which means good faith is presumed. Without exception, the Alderney politicians who I have met, and I have met them all, all believe unreservedly that the C+ proposals are best for their Island – for its security, for its future, for its increased viability. I trust and respect their judgement. Like so many people nowadays, every decision that is made has to be questioned. I do not question their decision; I have looked at the information. I am convinced in my own right.

Now all of them, without exception, are grateful to Guernsey, but are not of the view that Guernsey must provide come what may for all their needs. They know they have a duty, not only to their community, but to the Bailiwick as a whole. They believe – and I very much accept their good faith and integrity – that this proposal, i.e. C+, is vital and necessary, and will give them the best chance of being more independent and less reliant fiscally.

I would add other comments which I believe are material. I regard myself very much as a citizen of Guernsey. I am a Guernseyman, I was born here. My heritage is here, my family have been here for hundreds of years. But also consider myself fortunate to be a member of the community of Islands that comprise the Bailiwick of Guernsey. We all, together, are a community of no more than 67,000 folk, living on a number of small Islands. We have similar heritage and values. We are too small to be divided and territorial. We are all citizens of the Bailiwick of Guernsey. We all have to look after each other and act in the best interests of each other.

Those needs are not always equal, and we recognise that in so many ways. One of the good things to come out of that evil virus that is known as COVID, is that we in Guernsey re-established our links with the other Islands of the Bailiwick. We realised just how important they were and what wonderful places they are. Our brothers and sisters in Alderney are saying, 'Please trust us and help us,' and in this instance by so doing we are helping ourselves.

So I would just like to conclude by saying this: that these proposals, overwhelmingly the evidence from experts, from people who know what they are talking about, from people who are well researched in every aspect of this particular proposal, is that there is only one proper and sensible and economic choice. I go beyond the economic choice in my own view, because I am a citizen of the Bailiwick of Guernsey, but I say Option C+ is the right option, please vote for it.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there have been a number of secondary Propositions submitted, and we will try and work out what is going to happen next. Now normally I would take a sursis motivé first because clearly it is going to be sursised, that is it, but my understanding, Deputy Burford, particularly with a later amendment that has been submitted, is that you and Deputy Soulsby no longer wish to move the sursis motivé. Is that right?

Deputy Burford: That is correct, sir.

The Bailiff: So the amendments that have been submitted thus far, I think, run to seven, is that right? Does everyone have copies of the seventh amendment yet? Yes. Well, I also understand from Deputy Blin that amendment 1 is not to be laid either. Is that right?

Deputy Blin: Yes, sir

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Well, on that basis the first amendment that I am going to propose, that is considered with the motion under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the Reform (Guernsey) Law 1948, is Amendment 6. I am doing that by way of explanation on the basis that it is to delete the Propositions and replace them before we start adding to them. Deputy Burford, do you wish to explain briefly why the motion under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the 1948 Law should be approved to allow the amendment to be considered?

Deputy Burford: Yes, sir. It is simply that because there is an implication that if there was a slight delay on progressing works, there could be some maintenance work required on Alderney runway. It is not possible to say at this stage if that would be the case, but the Rule declares that if there may be a cost involved then it needs to be laid within the timescale, and clearly as that was back in November that has not been done. So I would ask Members please to support the motion to suspend the Rule so that the amendment can be debated.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second that motion?

Deputy Soulsby: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I think I can put this to you *aux voix* on the basis that it is a procedural motion. Those in favour; and those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Bailiff: I will declare that carried and therefore we will proceed to Amendment 6. Deputy Burford, do you want to read it or do you want the Greffier to read it?

Deputy Burford: No, I think I will just crack on into the speech, if that is okay?

The Bailiff: Of course you can crack on.

Amendment 6

To suspend the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the Proposition set out below to be considered.

Deputy Burford: So, let me say first that Alderney holds a special place in my heart. During the many times I worked as a freelance Trislander pilot with Aurigny between 1994-2011, I spent a lot of time there. I had the pleasure of working with Alderney Representative Roberts and all of the Alderney air and ground crew, in a close-knit community, running an efficient and friendly operation. I do absolutely believe and understand that Alderney need a reliable air service of sufficient capacity and frequency for present and future demand to help sustain their economy.

I have read and watched all the material sent to me from our Alderney neighbours. I attended the presentations by STSB and Aurigny, and the young families from Alderney, and I submitted no fewer than 20 questions to P&R and STSB arising from my reading of the policy letter and I thank them all for their engagement. I am not an airfield designer but I am a commercial pilot of 25 years' experience, flying in command of Boeing 737s/8200, 300 and 400 series, BAE146s and of course the humble Trislander amongst other types, so hopefully I have some perspective on the subject. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

As the original Propositions stand, they offer Members the option of either voting in favour of Option C+, or reverting to the previously approved scheme, now called Option A, by voting out the Proposition. This amendment does not change that binary choice between Option C+ and Option A, which will be voted on after main debate. And neither is it about whether C+ or A is the right solution. I will address the pros and cons of C+ and A in my main debate speech, not here, including some of the points that were raised by Deputy Ferbrache in his opening speech.

What this amendment does, is maintain that choice between those two options, but with two differences, as follows.

The first difference applies only to Option C+. If C+ is supported by a majority of this Assembly, progress on that option will be contingent on there being a States' decision by whatever means, that there will be no runway extension in Guernsey. Now I think the chances of this Assembly voting to extend Guernsey's runway are vanishingly small, but they are definitely not zero, and in my view a definitive decision is needed. If by some remote chance this Assembly did vote to extend Guernsey's runway, a move I would personally describe as an act of self-harm, then Proposition 1 of my amendment directs that in that case we revert to implementing Option A in Alderney.

And the reason, I believe, that we must decide the fate of Guernsey's runway before the fate of Alderney's, is this. The entire case, and I mean the *entire* case, for the Option C runway extension in Alderney, hinges on the fact that we and Aurigny, and it happens to operate ACR-72s on its regional network. Under no other circumstances whatsoever would we be proposing such a plan. It is my firm contention that if for any reason Aurigny was no longer operational, then the rationale for extending Alderney's runway would disappear. I am far from alone in saying if we extend Guernsey's runway it would be the end of Aurigny. The President of Economic Development has said:

> If we want to see a post-Aurigny world, my advice is to give great consideration to the extension of our runway. Past and present management of Aurigny have warned that a runway extension with a low-cost carrier would make them unable to compete.

And let's be honest, attracting a low-cost carrier is the entire rationale for spending maybe £80 million on an extension. York Aviation have said that extending our runway could cost Aurigny, i.e. the taxpayer, £25 million a year. Something which would become unsustainable very quickly.

I asked at the STSB presentation whether these two proposals, extending the Alderney runway to accommodate Aurigny's partly-loaded ATR-72s, and extending the Guernsey runway to accommodate competition that would be the end of Aurigny, are in direct opposition to each other.

Deputy Roffey in answer said that if that happened, then because the Alderney runway would be longer, attracting other operators into Alderney would be easier. I have a lot of respect for Deputy Roffey and generally consider him to be one of the most able and hardworking Members of this Assembly. But frankly, and to put it politely, that claim is total poppycock. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Let me explain why. If, as is extremely likely, Aurigny become uneconomic as a result of the Guernsey runway extension, and therefore can no longer serve Alderney, then despite claims in this policy letter, no airline based outside of the Channel Islands is going to find it remotely economic to operate the two routes out of Alderney, irrespective of the runway length.

It was reported in the news recently that Doncaster-Sheffield airport is set for closure, an airfield with a catchment of millions of passengers, and yet we appear to kid ourselves that sticking a couple of hundred metres on to Alderney's runway to make it just very short instead of extremely short, is going to make it attractive to airlines. It is pure fantasy.

The only possible operator who might pick up some flights, subject to available capacity and future schedules, would be Blue Islands, simply because they are Channel Islands based, and they would rightly want a substantial subsidy, doubtless in excess of the current PSO, and as the only operator left our negotiating strength would be zero, that is if they wanted to do it at all.

And at this point it is vital to remember, and I really cannot stress this enough, STSB and P&R are not proposing to build a runway for ATR-72s. They are proposing to build a runway for two thirds full, at best, ATR-72s. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) To be able to operate an ATR unrestricted around 1300m would be required. The proposal before us is just for 1050m. In the footnotes on page 9 of the policy letter we are told that with the proposed extension Alderney will be able to attract Code C aircraft; that is exactly what it says.

Members might assume from that statement, not unreasonably, that if an aircraft is Code C it will be able to use the new runway. This claim is outrageously misleading. Code C aircraft include Boeing 737s, Airbus A-320s and indeed our own Embraer 190. Of course, none of these aircraft will be able to use all Alderney's new 1050m runway, most of them require in order of 1,700m-plus.

So what codes of aircraft could reasonably operate here to Alderney's length of runway, apart from two thirds full ATRs? I did some investigating. Well, the Dash 8-200 series could. The nearest operators of this type are located in Algeria and Norway. The ATR-42 could, that is a bit closer to home, there is one located in Scotland, well it is a fleet located in Scotland. And that is it as far as I can see.

But in case I was missing something I asked STSB to tell me which airlines that are currently operating Code C aircraft which could utilise a runway of 1050m, might come to our rescue if Aurigny was no longer able to operate. In addition to Blue Islands, which I have already mentioned, they cited three airlines who also operate ATR-72s. All of them based over an hour's flying time from Alderney.

It truly troubles me that this is being suggested with a straight face. The idea that an airline would position an aircraft from Scotland to Alderney to take a payload-limited half load of passengers the 20 miles to Guernsey or 80 miles to Southampton and back a couple of times, before positioning back to their home base, is ludicrous beyond belief. And this claim that Alderney will become a viable option for more airlines was repeated by Deputy Roffey in the press last month. I really do have to wonder what is in the water at STSB, to use one of Deputy Roffey's favourite sayings.

When I pointed out that they only cited aircraft, namely ATR-72s, which would require to be heavily payload-limited to operate, I was told that payload limitations in aircraft operations are common. Well, my quarter of a century of experiencing command of numerous types and operating into numerous places, tells me that having to offload a few bags or offload the odd passenger or odd tank of fuel, does happen. But to suggest that leaving a third of the seats routinely empty is in

any way a normal or common procedure, only further makes me question the STSB water supply. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

So what I am saying here, is that we need to decide the fate of the Guernsey runway before we finally decide the fate of the Alderney runway. I put this to the President of STSB, and his view was that the idea of extending Guernsey's runway was mad and no one was going to vote for it, so do not worry about it. Yet we have a committee of five people who have been working away on it for some considerable time. They have commissioned a second frontier economics report, and those do not come cheap, and I understand that further information was sought after that. Economic Development is spending time and money on this project, which the States supported as part of the GWP. If it is a totally dead duck, why are they doing all this work and spending all this money?

So to sort this out once and for all, this amendment makes the approval of C+ contingent on Economic Development bringing their long-awaited policy letter back to this Assembly in March for a decision. And just to put this timeline into context, in April 2021 the President of Economic Development told this Assembly that the policy letter would be presented by the end of 2021, a full year ago.

In September of 2021 Deputy Inder said that the work to upgrade the original 2020 frontier economics report was complete, and that they just needed to look at EMAS, presumably to try and address the substantial cost of the project. In November 2021 at a discretely public hearing the President advised me that the policy letter would now be presented to the Assembly in May or June 2022. In March 2022 the President told this Assembly that we could now expect to see it before December 2022. In September 2022 the President informed us it would now be the first quarter of 2023, or possibly the second quarter.

I am sure matters are not helped by the fact that the Committee has been split down the middle on this issue. The President has had two Members in favour and two Members against, and although I understand the conclusions of the York Aviation report may have tipped that balance.

Deputy Inder: Point of correction, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of correction.

Deputy Inder: We have not deliberated it. Deputy Burford is entirely misleading the Assembly. There has been no deliberation on the policy letter in any way, shape or form, because we have not had the EMAS report and neither have we had the policy letter, so this is a continuation of misleading the Assembly.

Also on that, sir, while we are on the matter, Aurigny have never said the extension of the Guernsey runway is a death knell. So, with the greatest respect, sir, I think this has to stop, especially as the President of the Scrutiny Committee is saying things which have just neither been said, or never happened in our Committee.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford to continue please.

Deputy Burford: Thank you.

I did not say that you had debated the policy … Sorry, I did not say that Economic Development had debated the policy letter, I said the Members' views on whether a runway extension were viable. Deputy Vermeulen is quite clear in his view that he is a supporter of the runway extension, and the same goes for some of the other Members of the Committee. In terms of Aurigny I have certainly heard it said, by Aurigny, that they believe that a runway extension in Guernsey and a low-cost carrier would make Aurigny uneconomic in the same way as happened in the Isle of Man.

This amendment instructs Economic Development to essentially pull the stops out and bring this policy letter to the March Meeting. To write a short covering policy letter, draft Propositions append the various reports that have been commissioned and let the Assembly decide.

The President of Economic Development has said that if this amendment is successful, he will seek to amend this date to May, and that is of course, a matter for the Assembly.

The second change that this amendment introduces over the original Propositions relates to the investigation of other solutions that could work with Alderney's existing runway length. A single event nearly 20 years ago can be identified as the reason we are being asked today to approve a course of action that no one starting with a relatively blank sheet of paper would countenance. That event of course, was the removal of the sole operator protection from the Guernsey/Jersey route, thus opening it up to competition, and with that ideological decision the problems began.

But what does the Guernsey/Jersey route have to do with Alderney, you may ask. It is this. The reason that the current Alderney PSO is uneconomic and unattractive and the reason there has not been anyone else credible wanting to operate Alderney routes, is that a route network comprising purely routes in and out of Alderney is too small to run a coherent, break-even operation that sufficiently occupies crews and aircraft and that can absorb all the fixed costs of running an airline before even one passenger is carried.

However, if one could bring together again the Guernsey/Jersey route with the Alderney routes, all of a sudden it makes for a viable route network for a small fleet of small aircraft, such as Twin Otters, to operate a service. This would have to be as part of an existing locally-based airline operation, or Channel Islands based airline operation, so that economies of scale could be made on commonalities such as ground handling and scheduling and other fixed costs. It does not work as a stand-alone airline.

For while the desire to rationalise an airline's fleet is correct and obvious, having two aircraft types is not an issue if you had two distinct markets, each best served with a certain size and type. The cuckoo in Aurigny's fleet is the jet, because it serves the same market as the ATRs. Quite a few speakers in the debate on the Budget amendment to work more closely with Jersey, bemoaned the loss of the frequent Guernsey/Jersey flight schedule, and whilst I do not ever see us going back to the passenger numbers of the early 2000s, which routinely necessitated 10 or 12 flights a day in either direction in a 16-seater aircraft, there is no doubt that one of the reasons for falling passenger numbers, apart from Zoom and COVID, is the lack of flight frequency caused by directly operating a large 72-seat aircraft in between Guernsey and Jersey. Putting oversized vessels on a route is always a mistake.

I have always believed that the Guernsey/Jersey route should be a lifeline route limited to a single operator, and it is likely that it could qualify as such under the current air transport licencing policy statement. Given the savings to be made from crew and aircraft stand-by costs and the at least triple passenger numbers over what is carried to and from Alderney now, not to mention the significantly increased aircraft utilisation, such a proposal could have the potential to operate at break-even across the CI routes, saving the cost of extending Alderney's runway, the increased cost of maintaining it, the PSO cost of over £1 million a year, and all whilst delivering a better service.

The Dorniers are a problem, not just because of servicing and spares, but because a fleet of just two aircraft it is too small to operate economically. The solution is to examine if there are other economically viable routes which need a small aircraft and which would permit fleet expansion, and with it, economies of scale. If such a solution is possible, it would undoubtedly serve our Alderney friends better than what is being proposed in this policy letter, because it would mean at least the twice the flight frequency to Guernsey and Southampton, with the added possibilities of Alderney to Jersey and Guernsey or Jersey to near France thrown into the mix, and with an aircraft that can carry stretchers based overnight in Alderney for an immediate Medivac response.

It would also serve both Guernsey and Jersey much better than the current arrangement, and it would be likely to grow the market. This is not a criticism of the current route operator. They are legitimately using the regional fleet that they have to provide a vital service on an open skies route. But it is illustrative of the effects of using an aircraft that is too large for the optimal service needed. At the very least this option should have been thoroughly bottomed out, before this policy letter was submitted.

This amendment directs that in the event of Option A being approved, such investigations are undertaken. It does not delay the works on the runway from commencing in any way at all.

I am not going to address the financial and operational issues around Option C and A in this speech, that is for main debate, but it is fair to say that I have concerns. All I want to do here is to explain things which are directly pertinent to this amendment. This amendment is not in any way about which option I think is best, rather it is about making sure we do things in the right order, making sure that Alderney are not going to be left in the lurch in five or six years' time, and making sure that all avenues to achieve an optimal outcome have been explored.

I ask Members to support this amendment.

Thank you.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you formally second the amendment?

Deputy Soulsby: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

Where to start with this amendment? It is hard to know because it wraps up lots of different concepts and lots of different Propositions really into one motion, and the weird thing is I actually agree with a number of Propositions being made by the proposer, but come to an absolutely different conclusion as far as the best way to move forward.

Sir, I do not want to pre-empt general debate but I think, as Deputy Burford showed, it is almost impossible not to, to a certain extent, because the same arguments are relevant to this amendment. And the point is that when we get to general debate, P&R and the STSB will be arguing strongly for Option C+. Now I can say that on STSB's part, that argument will be 90% financial. I will be taking a slightly different tone to Deputy Ferbrache and also a quite shorter tone as well. *(Laughter)*

We will be arguing what is both far the best value for money, and that Guernsey is horribly in no position to be wasting money. In a nutshell, the estimated cost to the Guernsey Exchequer – to the Guernsey Exchequer – of extending the Alderney runway is less than £3 million. And that is not just extending the runway, that is doing all the other works to allow an ATR to land there. And the resulting savings in revenue expenditure by the Guernsey Exchequer will be £800,000 a year. An incredibly short payback period, an absolute no-brainer.

Now whether the P&R and STSB will be successful in persuading the States that point of view, I do not know. We shall see. But even those Members in the Assembly who are opposed to C+ must surely accept that that is one possible outcome from the debate. And therefore, if that is the outcome, how will this amendment impact on it? In a word, it will mean further delay – further delay to one capital project which really brooks no further delay.

I apologise that we have not been able to drive this, or my predecessors and now me, have not been able to drive this further forward. Believe me, we were physically unable to carry out the site works, investigations works, the things that were required to allow that to happen, because the COVID restrictions simply did not permit it. We have not been dragging our feet. The only dragging of feet possibly, has been over the last two or three months, when the STSB realised, blimey our main case here is really financial, it revolves around the PSO; therefore, we should not be bringing this alone, because those are actually matters for P&R and therefore it became a joint policy letter. Other than those few months, all those delays have been unavoidable.

Even if you look on the surface of this amendment, it means at least another three or four months' delay. Then we are being told by Economic Development that they will say they cannot bring this in March. I accept everything Deputy Burford says about that delay after delay on it, but

I am being told, I am looking at it not from who is to blame for what, I know I have got a runway up there and we are the operators of that runway, and no further delay is acceptable beyond what is absolutely necessary to carry out the works.

I can see, Deputy …, even if March goes through and if a motion to move it to May is not successful, I can see in April saying, as we are so often here, sorry that was the timetable that was set but we cannot meet it, we are not going to bring it back in time. But in reality, it is not a question of three or four months' delay, or six months' delay, it is a year's delay, because Members look at page 27. Look at page 27 of the Billet and there you will see the timetable for the work for C+. And you will see that the mobilisation everybody, all the expert staff, the huge tarmac batching machine, everything moving on site, is due to happen in the second quarter of 2024.

Now the whole project will then take a year to complete, so all weathers, all seasons, but the work then needs to be done up front, the real physical work out there that really needs the summer season, that will be lost. If it is six months' delay, nobody is going to mobilise in autumn to start that project. We cannot afford that. We simply cannot afford the risks that that entails.

And we do not know what the outcome is going to be of the Guernsey runway debate. We are assuming, or Deputy Burford is assuming, it is going to be a yes or a no. I suspect it might be inconclusive. I suspect it might be, 'Oh, we cannot just decide at the moment but let us wait and see how much the air traffic bounces back over the next couple of years after the pandemic.' Then surely, under this amendment, the Alderney runway project, which is genuinely urgent, will also be indefinitely delayed. Or we will have to take a decision then, not knowing what eventually is going to happen with the Guernsey runway.

Now, make no mistake, Deputy Burford outed me, she did not need to out me, I will out myself. I see no business case at all for an extension to Guernsey's runway. Indeed, Deputy Soulsby and I tried to kill it off in the last Assembly. We failed, but I will happily vote to kill it off today, and it looks like I am going to get a … , well, it probably will not be today, it might be Sunday afternoon, but it looks like I will get the chance later in this debate having seen the amendment from Deputy de Sausmarez. And I suspect that Deputy Burford agrees – well I know she does. But what we think should happen and what the States end up deciding may be two different things. And therefore, the tones of this amendment just bring very real significant risks of delay to a capital project where such delay is very unwise, to put it mildly.

Now, by saying that, I am not holding a gun to Members' heads and saying you must back C+ because we need to crack on. We do need to crack on, but it will be entirely the States' decision after we get on and have general debate, whether we crack on with Option C+ or whether we crack on with Option A. If Members vote for Proposition 1 in the Billet then we will crack on with C+. If they vote against Proposition 1, then we will crack on with Option A, because you will vote not to rescind the Resolutions that tell us to do that. We will get that choice in general debate. But what this amendment does, introduces significant and unquantifiable delay to a project, if the States does select C+. As the operator of Alderney Airport, I can tell you that would be very unwise indeed.

Now I understand some of the concerns. There may be some in this Assembly who think that if we were unwise enough to take policy decisions down the road which led to the demise of Aurigny, the complete disappearance of Aurigny, then, as Deputy Burford says, we may not be able to attract another airline to fly an ATR-sized aircraft into Alderney. I accept that. So the question they are putting is that in those circumstances wouldn't the States of Guernsey have wasted the extra £2.75 million that the extra extension to the runway is going to cost them, on what would become a white elephant?

To those concerns I would raise the following points. Firstly, if Aurigny was gone, I do not think the only issue would be attracting a serious player to operate ATRs into Alderney, it would be far more a question of attracting a serious player to operate *any* sort of significant air service to Alderney using whatever size planes you wish to select. Frankly, in my view, Aurigny is the only realistic game in town. And I fear for Alderney if they are to disappear, if they are to go; I do not think they are going to.

Secondly, it would not only be Alderney's air connections which we would worry about if Aurigny disappeared, it would be Guernsey's just as much. It would leave us in an incredibly fragile situation. Probably the best scenario we could hope for will be what happened in the Isle of Man, who ended up with worse connectivity and fares that have risen far faster than Guernsey's in recent years. And the worst outcome in that scenario would be very much worse. After losing our insurance policy with Aurigny we could well find that the competition which drove them out loses interest in our miniscule market in the longer term. They could review their network and decide that there are other markets on which they would prefer to use their precious equipment, leaving Guernsey in a catastrophic situation. We must remember, sir, we are not Jersey. Both our domestic and our tourist markets are far smaller. We are far more akin to the Isle of Man and we should take lessons from that.

But finally I would say why on earth – I just do not believe it is going to happen – would this Assembly take any decisions which scuppered Aurigny just now, when the new-ish leadership team are leading a truly impressive turnaround in that business.

So I can see that ideally in an ideal world, we would already have decided on the length of the Guernsey runway. But sir, things are hardly ever ideal in politics and they are certainly not in this situation. We have a decision that needs to be taken very soon indeed. And do Members really expect to be taking decisions down the line which would destroy their own airline? And even if they did – and I do not believe they will – then the modest extra expenditure to extend the Alderney runway will – and I do not know what is in the water in the STSB, but it will – open up the range of possibilities in respect of a replacement on that route. I am not saying that it is going to make it easy. I agree with Deputy Burford. I think it will be very difficult to find one, but at least the options will be far wider. For instance, persuading the current Guernsey/Jersey operator on to that route with a PSO. Yes, they would expect a PSO, of course. Of course they would.

That brings me neatly on to the final part of the amendment, which really is on a very different tack. As I say there are lots of different concepts really bundled up in one amendment here. It seems to be largely based on the premise that an alternative operating model is achievable, with all of the inter-island routes being operated by an established Channel Island based airline, using aircraft which are able to land on the existing runway length in Alderney.

I am certainly not against P&R and Economic Development looking at the idea of a single operator on all the inter-island routes. Like Deputy Burford, I thought the Guernsey licencing authority were absolutely – I must not use the 'b' word sir, absolutely foolish to; I will use the 'f' word instead! – foolish when they issued a second licence for an operator to create competition between Guernsey and Jersey. I do not think it did either airline any favours at all and it certainly led to a far worse service.

So I am not against them looking at that context. In fact, I do not think that this amendment goes far enough in that respect, in saying that it should only be looked at if Option A is selected. Whatever option is approved it is worthy of consideration. But please, do not hold it out as something that is going to be an alternative any time soon. Please do not hold it out as a safe route to an alternative solution, because it throws up all sorts of issues.

These routes are currently operated by two separate Channel Island based airlines. Blue Islands are the dominant player on the inter-island flights as the operator of the Guernsey to Jersey route. But they have given no indication of wanting to buy any small aircraft to operate into Alderney with its current length of runway. So, I do not see that that really is likely to be an answer; indeed they did not bid for the recent PSO.

Now Aurigny are currently the lesser operator of the inter-island routes by serving the much smaller market, the Guernsey to Alderney routes. While they may not object in principle to operating between Guernsey and Jersey as well, history tells us that to do so in competition with another airline will create enormous losses. That would be a complete breach of trust with this Assembly. When we recapitalised Aurigny, we did so on the basis of a financial turnaround plan which would be completely blown out of the water by going back into competition on the Jersey route. They

decide their operational policy but their shareholders would be making quite clear that that would be a breach of trust insofar as what they were promising to this Assembly when we recapitalised.

So to be an attractive proposition for Aurigny to go back onto the Jersey route, firstly Blue Islands would need to helpfully vacate the route, which seems to me to be highly unlikely. I am not saying that pigs never fly, they sometimes do, but I assume it is very unlikely. Secondly, to justify investing in a new fleet of smaller aircraft capable of landing on Alderney's existing runway length, Aurigny would really need to be granted sole operator status on the Guernsey/Jersey route for a period of years, and it is very hard to see how that could be achieved.

Certainly, simply making the Guernsey/Jersey route a lifeline route will not achieve that. It will not. Great care. All that would mean is that it would be subject to … it would be no longer quasi-open skies, it would be subject to licensing. But great care would need to be taken in ensuring that no competition rules were broken in even trying to achieve such an outcome. And I think in this respect the States need the utmost caution not to be seen to be directing the Transport Licensing Authority in the exercise of its quasi-judicial role.

Of course, we can lay out the criteria which they judge licences, but to say it has to be a sole operator, which is what this is doing, I think would be really at risk of doing that. Likewise, the amendment seeks to limit the proposed operator to CI based airlines. Now I do not know what that means. Does that mean ones that are currently based here or ones that would be willing to come here and be based here? If it is the former I think while it is maybe logical to assume that, to actually exclude those that are not based here at the moment – I mean there is an airline that has been lobbying us, it has got Alderney's name in its title but it is a UK based airline; are they going to be excluded from consideration because they are a UK based airline? I think they would challenge if that would happen.

But thirdly, and this is by far the most important, Aurigny advised us that even if all of these issues that I have just referred to can be overcome – and I hope they do, I hope they can be, and I support the idea and not just this amendment, I support the idea of Economic Development and P&R looking into whether or not they can be a sole operator ... But Aurigny advise us that even if that nirvana could be reached, it would still remain far more financially advantageous to service all of those inter-island routes using ATR aircraft.

Let me put some figures on that. We asked the very professional CEO of Aurigny to go away and work up the likely PSO requirements for Alderney if somehow we managed to give Aurigny a monopoly on all inter-island routes. He put an awful lot of work into that. A really detailed study. And I can tell you the outcome. If Aurigny then were to service that theoretical monopoly with a fleet of 19-seater aircraft, they could be Dorniers or they could be Twin Otters, then our Alderney PSO could be reduced by circa £400,000 a year. In other words, roughly half the benefit of just extending the Alderney runway. Obviously at a far higher capital cost because 19-seater planes do not come free of charge.

On the other hand – still with Option A, so do not extend Alderney runway – if they continue to service Alderney there from their 19-seaters, but used a mixed fleet on the Jersey route, in other words ATRs at times of high demand, so early morning, late afternoon teatime, the ATRs would be going backwards and forwards, but they would then be able to use some of their spare 19-seat capacity that they have got for the Alderney service, in the middle of the day to Jersey because the demand is not so high, that would really increase the reduction in the subsidy that would be required, so instead of the £2 million subsidy they require now, they could do the same level of service to Alderney for a PSO that ran for about £900,000. Definitely worth having. Definitely worth looking at in the unlikely event of a monopoly situation being obtained. That is a really big saving to the Exchequer.

But by far the most cost-effective way of servicing that hoped for inter-island monopoly would be to spend the modest amount that has been proposed under C+, to extend the runway in Alderney and then service all inter-island flights with ATRs. Under that scenario, the PSO effectively disappears altogether. Certainly, the estimated subsidy goes down well below £100,000 so effectively you can do away with it altogether.

So Members can clearly see that the business case for the proposed investment of £6.25 million in extending the Alderney runway, of which, remember, just £2.75 million would come from the Guernsey Exchequer, is just as strong even if the last part of this amendment, achieving an inter-island monopoly, presumably operated by Aurigny but could be for somebody else, could be achieved.

So my advice is to reject this amendment to avoid further delay if C+ is selected, and just to crack on and make a decision. I cannot stress strongly enough, we need a decision this week. Whether it is C+, whether it is A or whether if you are absolutely barmy go for B, which was the bottom ranking one of all, but give us a decision so that we can get on with it. I really fear that if this amendment goes through and then we vote for C+, which I think there is a hugely strong case for, we will walk out of here in despair, saying sometime never, when, maybe March, maybe May, then we will make a decision, then they will not be able to mobilise in the Spring of 2024, then it will be 2025, and then when the whole blasted thing unravels, how are we going to look? This is a really well-intentioned amendment. A lot of thought has been put into it. A lot of intelligent things were said on it, but it's basic fault line is that we just cannot have the delay and uncertainty it introduces. Please reject it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

I am going to try and stick to just debating the amendment and leave my broader comments regarding the different options to the general debate. I am supporting this amendment, and if this amendment is laid, I have already informed Members I will not lay Amendment 2, but I also will not lay Amendment 5 because my preferred option, Option A, is inserted by this amendment.

Now it is interesting because this amendment has picked up something I have not considered previously. It has picked up the fact that if we do – and remember, Members, I did support extending the Guernsey runway – if we were to make that decision, which is a Resolution of the States to bring that back to this Assembly, if we did extend this Resolution by proceeding down this route, we could end up in a trap in a few years' time, where Alderney is turning around to us and saying, 'Well actually, now we have got a longer runway we might want a different aircraft, a better fleet. We can save money by having a larger aircraft fleet, flying less rotations, and save a considerable amount of money and become a lot more efficient.'

There is another issue. For many years, Gatwick has been muttering about banning turbo-prop engines from landing at Gatwick, because they are small and are relatively slow in the circuit and require a greater spacing on landing. So there are scenarios I can see whereby you could end up with a decision to extend our runway or an issue with Gatwick that forces Aurigny to look at an alternative fleet, and then we find that this extended runway in Alderney cannot be serviced, not with that fleet.

So, I think it is absolutely right that that decision on extending the Guernsey runway should be included if C+ is supported. Having said which, I do not support C+ for all the reasons I will give later; I do support Option A. As I said, I will not be laying Amendment 2 and I will not lay Amendment 5 if this is passed.

Before closing, I think it is worth mentioning, there is an old joke about if you want to make a million dollars in the airline business, invest a billion. Airlines inherently are unpredictable businesses and are subject, at times, to horrendous losses, as we have experienced with Aurigny, as we have doled out tens of millions, I think probably approaching a hundred million pounds in the last two terms, to subsidise Aurigny.

Here we are, given another policy letter with another promise from Aurigny, dependant on all kinds of factors. Now I acknowledge the new management of Aurigny seems to be a thousand times better than the previous management, but we were told when we bought a jet, 'Buy us a jet and we will be profitable'. We were told, 'Buy three new ATRs and it will make us profitable'. None of these things transpired.

Now we are being asked to invest in a very large chunk of infrastructure in Alderney, at a very high cost, for a business model that is questionable at best. So I want to see the original Propositions changed. I want to see Option C having the caveat that we need to make a decision on Guernsey's runway first, attached. And then I personally will be supporting Option A, for reasons I will give later. I have serious reservations about a lot of the issues raised in the policy letter, which I will debate later. But I would ask Members to support this amendment because I think it will be adding value.

Thank you.

The Bailiff*:* Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

So I thought Deputy Burford's speech introducing this amendment was genuinely one of the best I had heard for many a year. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And there are a number of reasons for that. Now Deputy Burford and I, sir, we learned to fly at about the same time. She went off and had a stellar career as an airline pilot and my career struggled to take off, one could say. But certainly it was very modest. But I learned with, and have remained friends with, many of the pilots that I trained with and they are now at the most senior level within the industry. They are all senior captains, as Deputy Burford was.

Every single one of them agrees with the points that Deputy Burford has just made. In other words, people who actually fly the things and use the runways, who really know what they are talking about, absolutely agree with her fundamental approach to route networking, because that is the genuine … that is the practice, that is reality.

Now I thought – and I am not speaking generally, sir, but I do need to make a point about Deputy Ferbrache's opening speech because it went on a little bit, but I congratulate him because he had very little to work with, but managed to use what he had to the best of his ability, and one of the things he said was that a number of people who are current investors into Alderney, they knew a thing or two about business and of course, they had invested into Alderney historically with the runway the length that it is. So they had already made that investment decision.

But they are business people. We are talking about people who actually know about the aviation industry, which of course includes the Chief Executive, and many were there when I asked him the question about capacity. The fact – and Deputy Burford referred to this in her opening remarks – that the fullest the ATRs would be, would be about 60%. She said two thirds, give and take; between 60% and two thirds. Was that a viable business model? He said, 'Of course it is not. That would not be utilised anywhere else in the world. It is commercial nonsense to do that.' And that is why the aircraft type and structure and the scheduling is so important.

Now the language in the policy letter around the costs is really quite crucial here. We are told about potential economic enablers and we are told about potential savings, and of course, that is all they are, they are potential savings. But the cost of capital, there is no potential about it. Deputy Ferbrache, I thought, was very fair in saying that if you spend £24 million – and we will come back to Deputy Roffey's somewhat dodgy arithmetic in a moment, but if you spend £24 million – that the cost of repaying that capital as well, is a staggering £630,000 a year. So even if we believe that Aurigny will reduce the cost of the PSO by £800,000 – and Deputy Meerveld was right to say, right to call them out, that whilst they are very professionally run right now, history does not support any potential accuracy in these figures – then we are talking about a very narrow margin indeed.

But Deputy Roffey tries to explain to us that it is only really costing us £3.5 million because of course, Alderney are going to make a contribution, but then Deputy –

Deputy Roffey: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Roffey

Deputy Roffey: The estimated contribution for those is £2.75 million.

Deputy Trott: Sorry can you say that again, I did not catch that

The Bailiff: Would you like to repeat that please, Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Yes, Deputy Trott said I had tried to tell the States the runway extension would cost Guernsey £3.5 million; I actually said £2.75 million, although until we go to tender we will not know the exact figure, but the best estimate by AECOM will be that Guernsey's contribution would be £2.75 million.

Deputy Trott: Sure, and as he says, we will not know until it is tender tested, but I do not think there are many in this room, in this Assembly, or for that matter in the community, who believe that the final cost would be anywhere near £24 million. The current economic climate would suggest those numbers would be much higher.

I am going to come back to Deputy Roffey's comments in a moment, but let us just imagine, sir, let's just imagine I am right and that the £24 million becomes £30 million. Well, that equates to £15,000 per Alderney resident – *£15,000 per Alderney resident!* Now, if we were considering this project here today on a like-for-like per capita basis, and it is important that we do because as Alderney Representative Roberts is very keen indeed that we talk about equality and all the rest of it, and I agree with him entirely. So, if we were spending the equal amount on our runway, £63,400 x 50, that is a staggering £951 million on a like-for-like basis. That is why, if we are still here on Sunday afternoon debating this, there will be no objection from me. Because this is a *massive* infrastructure project for Alderney and we cannot afford to get it wrong.

Now, I promised my friends in Alderney that I would be soft in the message, so I am going to say this quietly. As we know the Alderney fiscal deficit is about £9 million. Now I thought it was £8 million, but Deputy Ferbrache, I think very fairly, said if you add in the £2 million from the PSO as it currently stands, the deficit is £9 million. Now Members, that is £4,500 for every person who lives in Alderney. Now if we were generating those sorts of per capita losses on an equal, like-for-like basis, we would be £285 million in the red. So this is why this is so important. The numbers are huge.

Now, Deputy Roffey. What Deputy Roffey did in his speech was that he completely ignored the cost of capital, which I am delighted to say that Deputy Ferbrache did not; he answered it very fairly. But of course, he also gave us the impression that there was going to be a real contribution from Alderney. But, of course, it is smoke and mirrors because the way that this would be paid back by Alderney would be from the dividends that they receive from the Alderney Gaming Commission. Now I would argue, and I would argue quite strongly, that those receipts should be used first and foremost to offset the deficit. So what we are saying here is, money that we allow them to keep, despite the fact they are £9 million a year in the red to us, would be used to part-finance the extension of the runway, which incidentally they have told us, is the only infrastructure project that they would consider spending that money on.

So you have to completely discount that, that is phantom accounting, and of course this is part of the problem we have when we are speaking to those who observe our accounts. Our accounts are so difficult to penetrate that it requires this sort of discussion about the relative costs and the real financing in order to bring out the issues.

So there is a long way to go in this debate, sir, potentially. But I very much hope Members have the sense to realise just how inter-related these issues are for both Guernsey and its population, the paymaster, and for Alderney the recipient, because if we get this wrong the damage would be quite significant. And remember, there will not be a single extra seat, we are not talking about increased capacity. The capacity is going to remain the same, the only difference is 40% of the seats in the aeroplanes that will fly in and out of Alderney will be empty. It is utter madness and there are so

many reasons why Deputy Burford's amendment should be supported, and I hope that Members will.

Thank you, sir.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I am going to try and speak just to the amendment without drifting to general debate.

I am grateful to Deputy Roffey for speaking to the whole issue of connectivity, Blue Islands, Twin Otters, and the fact that we seem to be doing three or four things. Trying to design the future aviation requirements on the floor of the Assembly based on policies which may, or should or should not have happened years ago. God only knows what Blue Islands are thinking today. This is a private enterprise, has not cost us a penny, there is no PSO, wending their way, doing what they should be doing, not costing us one penny, and we are sitting here discussing, in this Assembly, openly, how we effectively get rid of them. I mean I genuinely cannot see what is happening or why this is even happening. It is very odd and this has come completely out of the blue. There is no great drive to discuss Twin Otters, as seems to be the thing that is happening at the moment. Just a quick Google: £5 million a piece, five of them, two pilots. C+ is looking quite good at the moment; £14 million plus another £25 million, we are up to £39 million without even thinking about it.

I think Deputy Roffey was sort of touching on it as well. I have started writing this but there are probably two truths from the opening statement, and I would not want to suggest there is any dis-ingenuity maybe, if that is the word, in the Proposition, but there are two truths. The proposer and seconder are not going to vote for C+ and they are not going to vote for a Guernsey runway. I know that, we all know that. The proposer and the seconder are simply not in the business of lengthening either runways. In fact I wonder if they would not shorten them sometimes, with the smaller planes that we are likely to have.

So, isn't it better, as Deputy Roffey suggested, instead of creating an amendment, rattling business which is doing quite well, coming up on the floor of the Assembly because someone has been on Google and seen Twin Otters – we have had the conversation with Deputy Burford and I think Deputy Soulsby has had the conversation with Alderney Representative Snowdon and I am fairly sure he is going to tell us all about it – and then telling us that it is going to be the death knell of Aurigny. No one has said that. We have in presentations with the Chair of Aurigny, and he said it publicly actually, I think he said along the lines of – you are going to have to excuse me if I am mildly misquoting, but it is on the lines of – the States will make a decision – and we are talking really the Guernsey runway – and he will remodel his business around that. That is all he said. No one has said 'death knell'. No one has said it is the end of Aurigny. That is a fact. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Now, again I know Deputy Burford has got no intention for listening to the business case of Guernsey runway; they simply do not want an extension. She said it on Twitter, she has asked for it to be rescinded. Deputy Soulsby, why don't we just do that? Move to either the vote for C+ which Deputy Burford is not going to support, neither is Deputy Soulsby. Allow the Committee, our Committee, to at least finish the job that we have been given by, which in effect, as you know, is partly the Chief Minister's signatory on the requête. It just seems all a bit of a, if you do not mind me saying so, a bit of a bugger's muddle to get to something that –

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder, I do mind you saying that ...

Deputy Inder: Yes, okay, fair enough, I apologise. I apologise for that, sir.

But anyway, let us pursue this March 2023 date, and what we do sometimes, and I am not 'unguilty' of it, I hear what I want to hear. Because it suits me. Now, under a number of ... I think

where the requête went wrong initially, which was handed to us, some may say it went wrong because it just existed, but effectively the requête went wrong when effectively it asked us very quickly, it was a Jan Kuttelwascher requête and asked us to come back in 2020. Now I have already explained this: quite clearly, we hit COVID; but it makes good sport to go to Twitter and suggest that we are the bad boys because we did not come up with a policy letter in the middle of COVID, silly people that we are. We have then already explained that we had to do, as a consequence of every single aircraft in the world being on the deck, the landscape might have changed. The world landscape might have changed. It may come as a surprise and we decided, because we had the budget, to do a frontier economics 2 report. I did not think that was unreasonable, but no, we should have come back in May 2020 in the middle of COVID. This has already been explained but this has been ignored.

Then, sometime in the period, out of the blue, the York Aviation report turned up. Now, STSB had not even told us that there was an aviation report. Out of the blue all five members of Economic Development got an invite to a presentation and I have to reference this, because again this has been selectively used as a stick to beat this Committee when we know there is no intention for the proposer or seconder to vote for C+ or an extended runway.

But we did put a challenge in because the Committee does not take any threat. As I have said to Members before, we are certainly a Committee that is engaged – sometimes over engages with ourselves, but we do look under every corner of the carpet and try and put challenge where challenge is fair.

So, as I have explained and also I think for the record, I have explained to Members by email that we cannot make March 2023, I have also explained to Members but for some reason it has just been completely ignored. There has been every opportunity for the proposer and seconder to address that and at least show the Committee some respect. We are not making it up. We told this Assembly in my last update that one of the reasons for the extra delay was the EMAS report. We also said that because of the York Aviation report, which came out of the blue, we tried to align both reports so when we do consider the policy letter we will have the York Aviation report, which we knew nothing about until it turned up on our desks, and the two frontier economic reports.

That is not an unreasonable ask. We are 90% there. All the money has been spent. We have got some very serious cats – cats? – characters, people, Deputies in our Committee and some of us, it is true, are neutral and Deputy Vermeulen for sure is a flag waver for an extended runway. But he has a tether. He has four other Committee members that will pull him back or support him depending on what the outcomes are and it is not unreasonable for a substantial piece of infrastructure here to allow that to follow its pure course. And that is the point where Deputy Burford, if it comes to the Assembly with a positive result, she can then vote for it now.

But let us just read what this says and it is the weirdest of negotiations and I said I would talk to the amendment. So I have established that March 2023 is not possible and I will not be amending it. I am just going to vote this out because I think this entirely disrespectful, having told the proposer on a number of occasions that it is impossible. Still we see March 2023. I was going to play the game but I am not going to bother, I am just going to vote this out.

And it then goes on to say – and it is important to read this, it is the last paragraph; it is the weirdest of negotiations and this shows the desperation to stop the Guernsey runway, this shows it – it asks us to come back to the March 2023 Meeting:

> … and if the States resolve to progress an extension of Guernsey's runway, to direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board instead to arrange for the works under Option A …

So effectively what it is saying is that if you dare vote for an extended runway you are only allowed to have Option A. What kind of negotiation is that? (**Several Members**: Hear, hear!) That is exactly what it says. I will repeat that Members. If any of you dare – *dare!* – vote for an extended runway, vote for lower fares, vote for opportunity, vote for future, you cannot have … you will get Option A.

It is probably a deal for Alderney Reps here. I mean it is utter nonsense – utter nonsense! But I must get to the York Aviation report because again we have seen, via Twitter, that it has been used as a stick to beat us. But we did put some challenge in.

Deputy Trott: Will you give way?

Deputy Inder: I will give way.

Deputy Trott: I thought you were off Twitter? You seem to be …

Deputy Inder: He is right, I am but I have got a wife who keeps sending me images. Not those kind of images. *(Laughter)* Sorry, do not worry; we are getting close to half time now.

So we did put in some challenge. When we were presented with the original 'Guernsey Airport additional forecasting and economic analysis including runway extension effects' – this is the one that we knew nothing about until it turned up on our desk and we were called into a meeting, and it is important that Members understand that – the purpose of the study was to support the Guernsey Airport Masterplan as it was provided as I have stated. The key conclusions were travel demand, including air travel demand to and from Guernsey, has shown abnormal negative response to limited GDP population, thereby suggesting that there are structural issues in the economy. Well, congratulations. In the middle of COVID there has been stresses on air travel, that is genius. I do not know how much you paid for that. But also, to be fair to them, they did say that there is limited GDP and population growth suggesting that there are structural issues in the economy.

Well their challenge was we have just gone through a PIPR review so effectively that should effect the modelling. That now should affect the modelling because at the time we were looking at net immigration of 100, we are now looking at a net immigration of 300. So we have been through the PIPR and that one has been dismissed or at least should be looked at. So we cannot use something like a York Aviation report seven or eight months ago to inform today because everything changes and it changes very quickly.

It then goes on to say:

> These structural issues would need to be addressed to stimulate growth and demand regardless of low cost entry or not

– and I will get to low cost entry in a minute. Well that is okay, we have addressed that.

> There is a prospect of passenger growth and containment of profitable operations at the airport with productive GDP growth.

Well, productive GDP growth is already happening. We have already proven it.

So we actually found this York Aviation report actually very negative. Really quite negative. This is a York Aviation report that predicted a flattening off passenger demand by, I think and I may misquote, by about 2026. That surprised us immensely. When we looked at it looked like managed decline.

Now the key conclusions: performance of Jersey overall is a little better. Well congratulations. And to be fair, and I will speak to this, a low fare airline – and this is important – would almost certainly require to enter on the anchor Gatwick route to provide a basis for then developing network.

Now of course that was from York Aviation, this piece I have to agree with because it is not my area: effectively what they are saying is that there would be larger aircraft, less frequency and effectively in this regard the Island would effectively have an agreement with a low cost carrier, whoever that carrier might be, it would be larger aircraft, less frequency. Actually a bit like the Alderney runway proposal, weirdly enough. This is a runway that Deputy Roffey does not want because it is giving Guernsey less frequency and larger aircraft yet under C+ it looks like less frequency and larger aircraft, but there you go. And when we tested this with the Chair of Aurigny,

and this is what he told us as a Committee, he effectively accepted that. We had to put some challenge into him and what he effectively said was if that decision is made it just means Aurigny would become different. It is as simple as that.

The cost would, if I remember correctly, reduce because you would not be serving Gatwick anymore and the ATRs would be used elsewhere and there was no mention at all anywhere, anyone can find, where it means the end of Aurigny. That is a myth.

Now we went on for some challenge actually and I wrote back to the Director ... Well after we had the meeting I wrote back to the Director of Ports effectively at STSB and we had two of our NSM's here, we had our engaged members and we really did have a few issues with that York Aviation report. Because effectively as we understood – and Deputy Roffey has got to be a bit careful actually because the York Aviation report made it look like there was no point having a Guernsey Airport Masterplan, because if your view is that Guernsey is either going to be static or on a slide you can sack the Guernsey Airport Masterplan because there is no point doing it. No point doing it at all. Because if that is what you are looking at … because that report effectively negatively was of a moment, possibly a year before, and did not reflect the day.

Myself and Deputy Vermeulen had some concerns about the base assumptions, relevance of GDP, relevance of population stability and they assumed decline in bed space. Well, I do not know what York Aviation, the experts in the area, were telling us but the way I am looking at it I have just seen 110 beds go into the Island. The low point of Guernsey's bed stock was back in 2020. But yet the consultants, the experts, the ones that we are having our heads beaten with are telling us something else. I cannot help them.

Now two of our other members, one of our NSM's and Deputy Moakes, expressed some surprise at revenue generation oddities and he believed, quite rightly so, there should be more emphasis on what brings in revenue. What we saw in the Guernsey Airport Masterplan was basically spend, spend, spend. That is all we saw. This is the consultant from STSB being used by Deputy Roffey to beat ... We are quite sensible people here: when we smell it we will call it.

Now Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, same sort of thing. She is saying there are similar oddities as us. We were talking about working with enterprise zones; I think she bought that up in the same meeting. There were just huge gaps in that whole report, it was about build, build, build; nothing about revenue, nothing about generation – well not nothing, that would be unfair but a misunderstanding of the way the market was going.

One of our other NSMs made comparisons with other Island State jurisdictions opposed by Guernsey … why they thought Guernsey has topped out on its passenger figures, because there is literally very little indication of that.

So in short, sir, just because you have one side of the argument, which I think is worth debating at some point – and it will be May, it will not be March and we will not be supporting that, it is impossible … I can see what going to happen., I can see what is going to happen now: this amendment goes through and next thing we are going to get is everyone telling us off for not bringing a policy letter in March when we have told them we cannot bring a policy letter in March. We really are in Alice in Wonderland territory.

Anyway, sir, in short, what is our job? By direction from a previous requête we followed a path as quickly as we can. We have just recently had the EMAS report in, we have had no time to consider it. We do not wear *[inaudible],* I do not walk around the west end of the Airport measuring out in feet and metres and saying, 'I think ...' We have to wait for timelines and people to do certain things. So I will not take any criticism for us, at least facing the direction of what was a previous Assembly. Even though it plays politically well because it suits a certain narrative. But these are the facts that I have put in front of you today.

Our Committee has done nothing wrong, we have done everything that we have tried to do, we are trying to assist the future growth of this Island. The clue is in the name, this is a Committee for Economic Development – **(Several Members**: Hear, hear!) and what I will tell you now, Members, there is only one Member who is a true flag waver, the other Committee Members are fairly neutral on it and I do not know where the President of Scrutiny gets her idea that she thinks how we are

split. I do not remember her ever being in a room. Again more narrative, suit the idea, York Aviation, we are the bad boys. Entire nonsense.

So to that end, I would ask – and I know I hear there is another amendment about to be laid and it is asking you as Members to make a decision today with only half of the information, to basically rescind or at least to resolve that we do no more work. What a nonsense.

Allow this sensible Committee to carry on, come to its conclusions and we may decide that the business case is slim or too slim to put to this Assembly. I know there is but all I am asking you is, we have spent substantial amounts of public money, up to the tune of £280,000, we are almost there, the EMAS report is apparently in with officers, we are going to see it in January, we have got 90% of the policy letter. Do not be scared of it. Do not use an amendment to do something you cannot do in debate … which my job is to try and either argue for it, or Deputy Burford and Deputy Soulsby to argue against it. But do not use an amendment to try and stop something that you have no intention of supporting. This is procedural anarchy, the whole amendment is an utter nonsense and I would ask Members to throw the whole lot out.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Well hopefully, I will not create any more anarchy but we have heard a lot points. Deputy Inder's nightmare vision of a future Aurigny that is no longer going on the Gatwick lifeline route perhaps because of hypothetical low cost carriers but has completely new network ... Of course the issue would still remain then that the States of Guernsey through Aurigny own the slots but I will move on from there.

Where do I stand on this amendment? I would agree with speakers that there have been some excellent and commanding speeches today but I have not made up my mind whether to vote against the amendment or to abstain. Probably I will vote against but I will go through the reasons.

If it did become the Propositions I would actually have to think carefully because I do like some of it, I certainly like the first part, approving Option C+ and so on. That is one. Where I stand on this is as a long term, not resident of Alderney, but I did hold property in Alderney and I had a loving mother who lived there for many years. I have often attended Alderney political and People's Meetings and I hope I have got a certain affinity with feelings there and it is pretty obvious to me that Deputy Ferbrache entirely led us correctly earlier in saying that probably three-quarters of the population in Alderney, maybe an even higher number, are in favour of C+ and so did the Chamber of Commerce contingent that we met.

I think we have a duty to Alderney because we hear strong arguments from Deputy Trott and other Members about the relative costs. I read something quite comical that said Alderney actually used to have 12 Members and now it has 10 political Members plus the President; they downsized too. I think they had 15 before the War. And I read an argument that said that if Guernsey had as many politicians as Alderney for its size, we would have, I do not know what the figure was, it was something like 353 Members, which did seem rather a large Chamber. And that was because you can use statistics in any particular way. *(Interjection)* Yes, because the way it went was 10 times … well whatever.

But that is not the point, you have a critical mass and you have needs for a community and, as we know, different parts of America have different size of states but of course they also have the same number of members; and the UK cross subsidises places. Alderney people have reacted by saying maybe one parish in Guernsey cross subsidises another so I think we can move on from that point.

But on this amendment the problem I have with it, as Deputy Inder has pointed out, is the kind of brand hub. I know we often take part in Christmas sales where we do a lucky dip and if I am lucky I get a chocolate box out but this is a mixture of the Alderney air situation and the Guernsey situation. It seems to be like a menu, just as we would be having a Christmas lunch, whereby part and parcel of the menu after over indulging is, it is like do you have a *table d'hôte* or *al la carte*. And

if you go for the C+ scheme that Alderney wants, and maybe Members here want, you have to end the dream of the longer runway as part of the parcel.

I have always been in a conflict over the longer runway because the green side of me and the populous side of me does not want it, but I have always had an affinity I think with the Chamber of Commerce and their representatives; and they know that the longer runway would increase our flexibility, it would potentially bear boon for the renaissance of tourism. It would provide cheaper fares for the lower level of income, not States' Members, we do alright, but many members of the public have and there is an issue that has already been raised in this debate that there may come a time over the horizon when the bigger airports, especially around London, demand jets.

So I think there is a lot of factors about it, so I would not want to take a decision today and this is a curious amendment that kind of says you make the decision before you have even had the report. It is kind of like Alice in Wonderland, we are going backwards there.

But my main issue is, apart from being just a Deputy in the Chamber and a supporter of Alderney and of common sense in aviation, I am also the President of the States' Air Transport Licensing Authority and one duty that comes with that is we must not be seen as being partial to any one airline. We have had several airlines mentioned today and I too would love to go back to the sort of every half an hour bus service to Alderney or Jersey via the planes but I am … we are in a different era.

When I heard the prospect that we might need what was it seven de Havilland Otters I suggested to Deputy Snowdon I could bring in an amendment too to have a sea plane to Alderney. We were supposed to have a sea plane to Jersey a couple of years ago so we could look at a sea plane option. But experts in Alderney said that that was not a good idea because the sea is too rough around there.

So my point is we should not be voting for anything, especially the Air Transport Licensing Authority, that is perceived to give a monopoly to Aurigny and therefore any ideas of extending the runway both in Alderney and Guernsey to enable potentially more choice and move away.

And Guernsey-Jersey is not a lifeline route, nor is Alderney-Southampton in the technical sense of a point of view, but I want to see options that are neutral and where the States is not seen to be biased towards any particular airline and I think the best way of doing that is to vote for C+ but also to leave options open at this stage on the extension of the runway. Because some of the arguments we have heard from the York Aviation report and other quarters are very much, 'Oh, well, we have to be careful because we would see a lack of viability at the Airport or a lack of viability of the airline,' and I think from a sort of impartiality point of view some of us in the States, partly due to my role but I think generally, have to be more impartial than that and look at what the real good to the community is from the point of view of business and society.

I want to hear more too about the empty seats on the plane that Deputy Trott alluded to because, yes, the model would suggest an ATR would have some seats that they could not fill but we have been informed, I believe, that an ATR would still be able to have more passengers.

I will give way to Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

I think it is important that people realise there have been a lot of references to the York Aviation report. York Aviation were not asked whether or not it was a good idea to extend Guernsey's runway; they were asked what would be the impact on the Airport as a business, both financial and practically as far as facilities are concerned, if the Airport runway was to be extended.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you for the –

I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Yes, thank you.

The question was posed to the Chief Executive of Aurigny, 'At what capacity would the ATR 72 fly in and out of Alderney at?' and he said at 60% capacity. So the figure came directly from that

source. So 40% of the seats would be empty, otherwise it would not be able to operate with the proposed runway extension and proposed width. That was absolutely what we were told.

Deputy Gollop: Oh –

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, Deputy Gollop, for giving way.

What the Aurigny have told us is that the proposed service with ATRs operating within capacity restraints would provide an additional 20,000 seats per annum over and above the minimum requirements of the PSO and it would provide additional seats available for sale over and above the number of seats that they are currently able to sell on the services they are currently operating.

So it is not correct to say that changing the model to operate ATRs would not produce any additional seats for sale; it would produce additional seats for sale even respecting the capacity limits on the ATRs.

Deputy Gollop: Thanking all my colleagues. I think it would be useful if we had exact details of the ATRs that could be used, whether they will be 42 seaters or would have slightly more capacity than that. But in any case even at 60% levels you are clearly dealing with more seats than on a Dornier and that would potentially bring social, economic and demographic benefit to Alderney. So I thank Deputy Parkinson for his intervention.

I think the fact that the STSB have made the case that by extending the runway you increase the resilience of both potential planes being used because we know there are very few planes of the right size, also it would expand connectivity and capacity.

Indeed although I was impressed to hear of another airline that recently bought over three planes to Guernsey the problem was that they were small: two Islanders and a new Italian plane that is still relatively untried; and, goodness me, if we are worried about capacity, if we are in a situation where the only planes that are viable are nine-seaters that is not a good lookout.

I think, too, one final point I would make at this stage is sometimes States' Members give the impression that the Alderney-Guernsey service is for the benefit of the Alderney taxpayers, the Alderney residents, the Alderney citizens and therefore it is a disproportionate cost. But of course there are two other elements: there are tourists that fly there from England and Guernsey; in fact we have had some State's Members, past and present, who actually have properties in Alderney, and not just our Alderney Representatives; they regularly to Alderney too. So they have a benefit and they are residents of Guernsey.

But actually in the winter months a substantial proportion, I would argue, of people on the Alderney Guernsey flights are not just residents who come to Guernsey for business or health reasons but they are private sector and public sector employees and professionals who have clients to meet on Alderney. So it is actually part of their life, part of their job, part of their career and they live in all 10 of Guernsey's parishes, I am sure. So we need to get away from the myth that Alderney is just about Alderney. There is a connectivity to Guernsey and a significant proportion of Guernsey's public sector and, to a lesser extent, private sector benefits from having reliable robust and capable transport systems.

The Bailiff: Deputy Moakes.

Deputy Moakes: Thank you, sir.

One of our roles in this Chamber is to debate and then make some big decisions on many occasions: decisions that affect the Bailiwick, decisions that are sometimes really difficult, really complex. We are now faced with two really big, really complex decisions. The first is: do we simply repair Alderney's existing runway or do we repair and extend it with or without a new terminal or fire station? We have four options to consider.

The second really big decision we need to make at some point is whether we want to extend Guernsey's runway. Now this amendment worries me because what it is trying to do is ignore one

of these really big decisions: brush it under the carpet, prevent it being discussed. That is not democracy. Our job is to debate these big decisions, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) it is to really look deep under the surface, find out what it is about. I have changed my mind on various subjects before now and that is often what does happen in debates. You can come in with one view and perhaps make a decision at the end of it because your mind has been turned.

So I would like everybody to go home perhaps tonight and look in the mirror and consider that point I have just made about one of our jobs is to actually debate really big decisions and sweeping this Guernsey Airport underneath ...

Deputy Burford: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Sorry, I do not like to stand as I do have an opportunity to reply to debate. But I do wonder if Deputy Moakes is speaking to Deputy de Sausmarez' amendment because this one certainly does not seek to have the Guernsey runway situation not discussed, on the contrary.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I think that is probably right, Deputy Moakes.

Deputy Moakes: Okay.

So the point I am trying to make here is that I think these things should be separated and I cannot vote for this amendment, I think it is the wrong thing and I would ask everyone else to consider and vote in the same way.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Roberts.

Alderney Representative Roberts: Thank you, sir.

Alderney simply cannot delay further at the moment. I happen to know we are at red risk at this very moment in time with a chance of water invading the runway cracks and then freezing and breaking it up even more. So, it would be incredibly irresponsible to give further delay (**A Member**: Hear, hear!)

Smaller aircraft cost so much more these days. The five Twin Otter idea would cost £25 million to buy, plus the £14 million for the runway repairs. That is £39 million plus a possible up to £4 million subsidy. That takes to £43 million. Eye watering! And this would possibly, if running between Jersey, Guernsey and Alderney, bring Guernsey, Alderney and Jersey into confrontation. I do not know, but it may do.

Added to that, we would need approximately 25-30 more pilots to be hired for that operation, which is absolutely out of ... Too many companies use ATR aircraft and no plans are in place yet to ban them from Gatwick – and I would just like to say to Deputy Trott if I may, sir, the environmental worry that he had: we use 25% less fuel using the ATRs than we are using Dorniers coming into Alderney.

Smaller aircraft simply do not make money now. Profits anywhere in Europe with islands today, except perhaps for the Scilly Skybus which is shortly to go into retirement but runs at double Aurigny's fares per mile. In 1968 Islanders were truly the clean queens of the sky. Today they are still fantastically capable versatile airplanes, but they are not money spinners because they are small. And you have to go to Venezuela, the Wright Brothers or to the afterlife to find a Trislander, although elderly Islanders are known to hallucinate them after a long lunch.

Even in their glory days a long succession of firms tried and failed to make money with these small aircraft in Alderney: Alderney Air Ferries folded in 1982 after three stellar years of service; Air

Camelot threw in the towel in 1986; Air Sarnia totally collapsed in 1990 and Blue Islands gave up the Alderney route in 2011.

The moment that suitable electric technology is with us, all this may be different but that moment has got a long time yet to come and these decisions cannot be based on tech which does not exist yet. In any case it is likely that the hydrogen or electric aircraft may also require a longer runway! Another thing to say to Deputy Gollop, if I may, sir, is that 65% of the passengers travelling Alderney to Guernsey and Guernsey to Alderney originate in Guernsey. Okay. Thank you, sir.

With respect, just because you can fly an aircraft does not quality you to run BA. **(A Member**: Hear, hear!) We have hired experts in finance and aviation and why do we not heed their advice, why do we dispute it? Just to conclude, with respect again, sir, my good friend Deputy Trott makes 'what if' economics or 'what could be' economics or 'what would be' economics but I am going to be soft with him though. I respect him.

Look, what Alderney wants is to be out of deficit; it hates being in deficit. However, C+ is exactly our route *out* of deficit. Our good friend, Deputy Trott, seems oblivious to this fact.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

I was going to describe this as a dangerous and irresponsible amendment, but there is, weirdly, some stuff in there that makes quite a lot of sense. I am not going to vote for it, sir. I have got no intention of voting for this at all and my decision making and thought process on this is very simple.

I came here today to make a decision on Alderney's runway and I am perfectly happy to take that responsibility and make that decision here and now. I have got absolutely no problems in putting it off. We heard what Alderney Representative Roberts just said and he is quite right: when water gets in a runway and it freezes it expands and it cracks. I am so sorry that your runway is in that state of disrepair as it is now. I do not know how that has happened but I would say that has been probably since it was constructed and that has been on the go a little bit longer than just COVID.

So, yes. I can make a decision on what we are going to do with the runway, the terminal. I can make a decision on those things. I am not afraid of that and that is what we are here to do. That is really what we are paid to do. We are paid to come here and work here and make tough decisions. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We are not here to kick cans down the road and put things off. I do not really want to talk about the Guernsey runway length extension, the cost benefit analysis that Economic Development are charged with doing. It is an extant Resolution, sir, and we have a legal obligation to bring that through and that is being done very thoroughly. When the case does come I think people should have a look at it then.

But there is no doubt about it, Guernsey has two runways, it has got Alderney and it has got Guernsey and we should be here today discussing Alderney and making a decision. You cannot leave it how it is, that is not on. And obviously the guys in Alderney and everybody that lives there want the best for their Island.

We are at a time if money was no object it would be a different solution that we suggest I think, a different outcome. But we can go some ways, we can do what we can do and we can go to certain lengths, so I think that one should be addressed today.

I am not going to vote for this amendment. I would advise everybody else to reject it and we get on with looking at the rest of the many amendments which we have got in front of us.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

I came into this debate today actually undecided about the main points of the main policy letter and I wanted to listen to debate and I wanted to hear what was said around the amendments and I am still inclined in that direction as far as we have got.

There does seem to be quite a lot of confusion and I think so far the debate has been as much about aircraft types as it has been about runways and that is not really what we are here about today, although I do understand the point about consequences.

I do not believe that if we do vote for this amendment we are quashing the debate about Guernsey's runway. I want Guernsey's runway to be debated although, as I have said, I cannot come to a clear view on that and I am one of the, if you like, ditherers on Economic Development because I have not seen the full business case and we have not sat as a Committee and discussed what the policy letter might look like and what the Propositions would be. Until we do that, I do not really think I can have a firm view.

If I do support this amendment it is not the end of this week's debate for me because I could still listen to the remainder of the debate and vote against the amended Proposition. So perhaps not terribly helpful in terms of being clear where I am coming from! *(Laughter)* But I did feel, as a member of Economic Development, I needed to state my position.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I, like Deputy Falla, am actually undecided both in terms of this amendment and in terms of the options that we have before us presented in the policy letter and I would commend both Committees for, I think, a very good policy letter which does examine the issues very comprehensively. And I know a huge amount of work has also gone in by officers and I would like to thank them as well.

I think Deputy Burford has also put in a lot of work on this amendment. So I am undecided. I will continue to listen to debate but there is one thing that I am very clear about and there seems to be a little less clarity on this so far, so I am hoping that by speaking to this particular issue that might help explain the relationship between the Guernsey runway potential extension and the Alderney runway extension. So I am going to do my best in the context of the amendment that we are currently debating to explain the relationship between the two.

As Deputy Burford touched on when she opened on her amendment, the only rationale really for extending the Guernsey runway would be to support a low cost carrier. That really is the primary rationale and I see Deputy Inder helpfully nodding his head. That is the driving motivation for any business case for a low cost carrier.

Oh, this is interesting because Deputy Vermeulen is now shaking his head at me. I will come on to a few other points later on.

Okay, I happily give way.

Deputy Vermeulen: Well, there you go, we are back on to Guernsey; we should be talking about Alderney, we should be making a decision but here we are, we are back on Guernsey.

Now the Guernsey runway extension is not just about a low cost carrier, it is about creating growth – *growth*, sir – which is what we should be challenged to do and we should be charging ahead and going flat out to create growth, because if we do not you are just going to have to ratchet up your taxes and that time is getting closer and it is getting closer.

I have got 3,000-4,000 people that work in retail pushing behind these shoulders saying, 'No GST.' So it is very important you do not get hung up and think it is only about a low cost … or worse still it is only about Gatwick and this airline nicking it of Aurigny. Forget it! Look at the bigger, bigger picture.

You have got to consider that nowadays larger aircraft carry freight, it would improve the freight situation, it would improve the overall safety of the Guernsey runway *(Interjection by Deputy Trott)*

and it would also help bring in some of these charter operators from continental Europe, many of which would love to come to Guernsey but they find our runway too short.

And finally, sir, I had a lovely holiday this year; I flew the flag on Aurigny to Majorca. We could not fill the plane up with passengers and luggage in the hot temperatures because of runway constrictions with fuel load. So it would even help Aurigny when it operated larger aircraft.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Okay, I thank Deputy Vermeulen for that. I think that makes my points rather well.

So Deputy Vermeulen said it is not just about low cost carriers it is about growth. I am wondering how he thinks that growth could be delivered if it did not involve a low cost carrier and potentially some of the larger carriers. I am not going to give way again because otherwise it is going to get a bit silly, I think.

So really we have actually debated this in the last decade or so several times, whether or not to extend Guernsey's runway so I have been involved in some of those debates and I know what the primary arguments, what the main foundation stones for that business case potentially are and it is about those larger carriers.

Now fundamentally it comes down, I mean I am not going to go into any detail on where I think the flaws are in the business case but really it comes down to the size of the market and again Deputy Burford did touch on this.

So I do not think if we extend the runway we are going to have airlines queuing up to come to Guernsey because we have got a sub commercial scale market. It is as simple as that and even when you add in some of the more optimistic growth numbers or visitor numbers we still do not get near that viability level which I understand is much closer to Jersey's size of population than us. We are always going to be sub scale from a commercial point of view.

However, let's just say that we do extend the runway and we do attract a low cost carrier. This speaks to the points that were raised by Deputy Inder and Deputy Gollop. So Deputy Inder said that Aurigny have only said they would have to remodel, they have not said that they would have to go out of business or they would be unviable. If a low cost carrier comes in because of the scale of our market, realistically the only route they would be interested in servicing would be the Gatwick or another large London route.

If they come in Aurigny would not be able to compete on the same route. So Aurigny would have to – I am not going to give way, I am just going to try and explain this. So Aurigny would not be able to compete on the same route. Now that route is the backbone of Aurigny's business case. That is the backbone of Aurigny's business case. If they are not able to service that route then it is highly likely, accordingly to my understanding, that they would be much less commercially viable and potentially would need a subsidy – especially if we expect them to still be there as a carrier or last resort in the circumstance, as Deputy Roffey alluded to, that the low cost carrier thinks, 'Actually I can be more profitable elsewhere.'

So that is why there is a meaningful and important relationship between the issue of an extension to Guernsey's runway and the Alderney runway extension. The two are absolutely linked and the point that Deputy Burford made, and I thought she made it very well, was that if we are to make a decision on the Alderney runway before we make a decision on the Guernsey runway then we are potentially, retrospectively undermining the investment that we make in the Alderney runway because the two are so intertwined. So really that is the main point.

Deputy Gollop said that despite other misgivings that he thinks a longer runway would provide greater flexibility, greater choice and lower fares I think that the reports that have been done to date, and there have been a number and in fact the experience of the Isle of Man in particular, have shown that actually the opposite would be true. We are likely to have fewer flights because there would be greater capacity and certainly if the Isle of Man's experience is anything to go by then choice and fares do not go in the right direction either.

I do not think this is the right forum to debate any detail around the case for the runway itself, an extension to the Guernsey runway itself, but I definitely agree with Deputy Burford that there is a sequencing issue here and that if we make a decision on extending the Alderney runway ahead of any decision on extending the Guernsey runway then that is the wrong way round and I think we run the risk of pouring bad money after good – if that is the right way round.

So that certainly speaks to one of the main concerns I have in Option C+ and I think that people have got a little bit confused about what Deputy Burford's amendment seeks to do. So Deputy Burford's amendment would seek to bring that policy letter forward and enable a decision to be made on the Guernsey extension before the decision to extend the Alderney runway would be made.

So I think that is a really logical sequence of events. However, I am mindful of the warnings that Deputy Roffey has given us over the issue of delay and so for that reason I remain undecided.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

Well, unusually I disagree with almost everything that Deputy de Sausmarez has just said. I think there is very little connection between the debate on the length of the Guernsey runway and the need urgently to do something about the Alderney runway including, in my view, extend it. **(A Member**: Hear, hear!)

The logic that Deputy Burford and Deputy de Sausmarez have managed to contort themselves into is truly bizarre. They are saying, in effect, that if Guernsey's runway is extended low cost carriers would come here, that is one assumption and Aurigny losses would become unsustainable, that is another assumption. So the States of Guernsey would allow Aurigny to go bust, that is another assumption. So presumably the conclusion is Alderney would not need any air services at all or certainly Aurigny would not be there to provide them. This is a chain of assumptions not a chain of consequences and it could break down at any stage.

I agree with those who say we should be talking here about the Alderney runway. I do not think it has any material bearing on the issue of how long Guernsey's runway should be.

Option C – as a member of STSB of course I am supporting Option C+. Our case is simply that this is the best value for money and we are not, as STSB, here to make economic policy or even to develop an economic case for extending the runway. We have simply analysed our job is to run the Alderney Airport and we have simply done the analysis which suggested Option C+ is the lowest cost option over a 15-year-period and the reality is that we know that runway will have to last a lot longer than 15 years. I mean the existing runway has been there for more like 50 years. I hope that any new runway will be replaced long before 50 years but I think it will last a lot longer than 15 years and the longer it lasts, of course, the more value we get out of it.

But we are not here to, as I say, to argue the economic case. The potential for extra seats – and we have had a little exchange across the floor about how many extra seats would be produced by introducing the ATR service on longer runways; the official figure from Aurigny is an extra 20,000 a year over and above the minimum PSO requirement – we have not factored in the sale of a single extra seat, not one, into the business case because that is not our job. We are not here doing economic analysis, we are just looking at the cost of building an airport runway and operating it.

But the reality is there will be a lot of extra seats available on the Aurigny routes and that means there is potential for economic growth there, whether those seats will be filled or not is a matter for another debate but I think it is important to point out that supporting Option C1 at least gives the potential for economic growth. It gives Alderney hope and I think that is really fundamental here.

We are saying support Option C+ because it is the best value to the Guernsey taxpayer, to the Alderney taxpayer, but also this is actually a matter of faith in the future of Alderney and if we can stimulate a bit of growth in that economy that would be entirely to the good of the Bailiwick.

But please let us not get bogged down in discussions about whether easyJet will come here and whether that will cause Aurigny to collapse and whether therefore no other carriers will operate the

Aurigny route therefore we might as well just put on a boat. I mean this is an absurd chain of false logic. Let's please try and keep the discussion on the Alderney runway and support Option C+.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Sir, can I make a motion that we perhaps extend this evening so that we can get this amendment finished?

The Bailiff: Let me at least see how many people wish to speak and debate on this amendment first. I am just slightly surprised that the seconder does not want to speak on it but never mind. I think in those circumstances the answer is no. I am not going to put a motion because obviously we would have Deputy Ferbrache on behalf of the Committees that are proposing these matters and Deputy Burford and therefore I think we will now adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.29 p.m.