



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 15th February 2017

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

Volume 6, No. 4

ISSN 2049-8284

*Published by Her Majesty's Greffier, The Royal Court House,
St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. © States of Guernsey, 2017*

Present:

Sir Richard J. Collas, Kt, Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

St Peter Port South

Deputies P. T. R. Ferbrache, J. Kuttelwascher, D. A. Tindall,
B. L. Brehaut, R. H. Tooley

St Peter Port North

Deputies, J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel, M. K. Le Clerc,
M. P. Leadbeater, J. I. Mooney

St Sampson

Deputies L. S. Trott, P. R. Le Pelley, J. S. Merrett, G. A. St Pier,
C. P. Meerveld

The Vale

Deputies M. J. Fallaize, N. R. Inder, M. M. Lowe, L. B. Queripel,
J. C. S. F. Smithies, S. T. Hansmann Rouxel

The Castel

Deputies R. Graham L.V.O, M. B. E, C. J. Green, B. J. E. Paint,
M. H. Dorey, J. P. Le Tocq

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, A. C. Dudley-Owen, E. A. Yerby,
D. de G. De Lisle, S. L. Langlois

The South-East

Deputies H. J. R. Soulsby, H. L. de Sausmarez, P. J. Roffey,
R. G. Prow, V. S. Oliver

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives L. E. Jean and S. D. G. McKinley, O. B. E.

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

J. Torode, Esq. (H.M. Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur); Deputy T. J. Stephens (*indisposée*)

Business transacted

Evocation	201
Convocation	201
Statements.....	201
Policy & Resources Committee – 2016 year-end financial position – Statement by the President.....	201
Committee for Home Affairs – Cyber security – Statement by the President.....	209
Committee for Health & Social Care – General update – Statement by the President.....	211
Code of Conduct complaints – Personal Statement by Deputy Trott	219
Questions for Oral Answer.....	221
Forthcoming bank closure in Alderney – Policy & Resources Committee response.....	221
Airport landing charges – Discounts for sporting clubs.....	222
Billet d’État V	225
I. Development & Planning Authority – Election of New Member – Deputy Marc Leadbeater elected.....	225
Statutory Instruments Laid Before The States	226
The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Legal Professionals, Accountants and Estate Agents) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Financial Services Commission (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees for Insurers) Regulations, 2016; The Registration of Non-Regulated Financial Services Businesses (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Public Highways (Temporary Road Closures) (Fees and Penalties) Order, 2016; The Public Highways (Al Fresco Licences) (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Amalgamation and Migration of Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Financial Services Commission (Limited Liability Partnerships) (Fees) Regulations, 2016 The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) Regulations, 2016; The Guernsey Finance LBG (Levy) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Limited Partnerships (Fees, Annual Validations and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations, 2016; The Income Tax (Approved International Agreements) (Implementation) (Country by Country Reporting) Regulations, 2016.....	226
Ordinances.....	226
II. Committee for Employment & Social Security – The Supplementary Benefit (Residence Conditions) Ordinance, 2017 approved.....	226
III. States’ Trading Supervisory Board and Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate commenced	227
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	248
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate continued.....	248
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m.</i>	285

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

*The States met at 9.30 a.m. in the presence of
His Excellency Vice-Admiral Sir Ian Corder, K.B.E., C.B.
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey*

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCAATION

The Greffier: Billet d'État V. 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, 15th February 2017, at 9.30 a.m. to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État which
5 has been submitted for debate.

STATEMENTS

Policy & Resources Committee – 2016 year-end financial position – Statement by the President

The Bailiff: Members of the States of Deliberation, good morning to you all.
We begin today with a Statement from the President of the Policy & Resources Committee on the 2016 year-end financial position.
10 Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.
Mr Bailiff, I have good news and bad news. First, the good news: I am delighted to advise Members that the States returned to surplus in 2016 for the first time since 2008.
15 In June last year, Members will recall that I informed the Assembly that a deficit for 2016 was being forecast at that time in the order of £10 million to £15 million. This was largely due to a projected shortfall in revenues. Income tax forecasts estimated a deterioration of some £5 million to £8 million against the budgeted position, which continued the trend seen in 2015. In addition, Customs Duties and Document Duty were also lagging against expectations in the first three
20 months of the year; a trend which if continued would have resulted in a year end shortfall of £2 million to £3 million.

Revenue shortfalls were not the only reason for the projected deficit. Health & Social Care were also predicting a material overspend of between £2 million and £4 million, mainly due to off-Island referrals and reliance on expensive agency staff.

25 At that time, I outlined a series of measures put in place to seek to balance the position by the end of the year. This was an absolute necessity in order to deliver a balanced position, and given that the limited reserves previously held within the General Revenue Account Reserve to manage in-year fluctuations had been exhausted.

30 The measures included a series of expenditure controls put in place by the Chief Executive, including control of all vacancies; a review of overtime usage; closer control of the use of consultants; cancellation or deferral of non-pay expenditure; and the reprioritisation of routine capital expenditure.

35 My Committee announced its intention to limit any further use of the Budget Reserve in year and that it had approached the States' Trading Supervisory Board to request that it consider making a return of surplus capital to General Revenue in 2016.

Sir, I am pleased to report that these measures have had the desired effect and a material impact on the year-end position. Notably, almost £2 million was saved in-year by measures to limit revenue expenditure, including, in large part, control around managing vacancies. In addition, the States' Trading Supervisory Board returned £2 million to General Revenue.

40 The Committee for Health & Social Care arrested the expenditure trends across their services to turn a forecast overspend of £2 million to £4 million into an *underspend* of around £700,000, about which the President of the Committee for Health & Social Care may well say more in her statement.

45 The Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure benefited from higher bus fare income, following a 10% growth in journeys.

The Committee for Home Affairs had a 4% or £1.4 million underspend.

The Development & Planning Authority benefited from bumper receipts from Planning Control which may bode well for the recovery of our construction sector.

50 The Committee for Education, Sport & Culture returned £1.6 million of routine capital allocation previously held as a sinking fund for the future maintenance of Les Beaucamps High School – although I must stress that this will not affect plans for the maintenance of the school.

Tight control over the Budget Reserve resulted in £1.9 million remaining unused at the year end. All of these measures have had a considerable impact on the year-end position, and I wish to thank all Committees, and officers across the States, for the contribution that they have made.

55 In addition to these active measures, I am enormously pleased to report that an improvement in economic conditions has also contributed to a better outturn:

Firstly, claims for supplementary benefit have been significantly lower than forecast, contributing to an underspend on the formula-led budget of £2 million.

60 Secondly, Customs Duties have ended the year in line with budget, after significant shortfalls earlier in the year, albeit after a further fall of 2% in the volumes of fuel, continuing a prior trend which clearly presents a challenge for this as a source of income in the future.

Thirdly, an increase in the number of property transactions, 11% on the Local Market, has contributed to a limited improvement in Document Duty receipts. Despite falling short of the 2016 budget, Document Duty receipts rose by almost 3.5% against those collected in 2015.

65 Fourthly, investment performance over 2016 was exceptional, with our long-term fund achieving returns of over 14%, and the medium-term fund returning almost 7%. The funds overseen by the Committee for Employment & Social Security grew by 12.1%. These returns have contributed to investment income exceeding the budgeted figure by £5 million. I should also add that the return on the, as yet, unallocated bond proceeds, was £17 million – comfortably
70 exceeding the £7 million required to meet the annual 3.625% coupon and amortised set-up costs of the bond. This not only meets the shortfall experienced in 2015, of approximately £5 million, but also provides a cushion against fluctuations in investment performance until all proceeds have been lent on. Members may also recall that any above inflation returns on the Core Investment Reserve are now transferred to the Capital Reserve which will see the amount available to fund
75 strategic capital bolstered by over £15 million. This makes good the £14 million shortfall in the target appropriation to the Capital Reserve which we reported in the 2017 Budget Report.

Finally, income tax receipts improved steadily throughout the year, with a forecast shortfall of £5 million to £8 million after the first quarter, turning into a final shortfall of some £2 million. It, of course, remains a concern that we have fallen short of the budget for this important income stream. However, within this shortfall lie some good news stories. Importantly, the main income tax stream from employment income, ETI, has ended the year in line with budget, and increased by 3.7% on the 2015 receipts, a real terms increase of 2.1% which, of course, is an important indicator of growth in our economy in 2016; there has also been a modest 1% increase in other income tax receipts from individuals; and receipts from banks have ended the year in-line with budget contrary to earlier forecasts. The one area of shortfall has been from 'other companies' which has seen a like for like reduction of 3.2% between 2015 and 2016. This is largely due, it seems, to reduced profits from property developers.

Sir, I am pleased to report, subject of course to final year-end adjustments and audit, the outturn for 2016 is a surplus in the region of £15 million. This £30 million improvement on the worst case I set out in June is self-evidently extremely good news. My Committee will be making recommendations to the Assembly later in the year as to how this surplus should be used – for example to replenish the General Revenue Account Reserve, which I referred to earlier – it having been depleted in 2015 – or to make further appropriations to the Capital Reserve.

Now for the bad news. We are not out of the woods yet. The good news does not mean an end to our fiscal challenges (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) or an end to the need for ongoing firm fiscal discipline and pay restraint (**A Member:** Hear, hear.). The pleasing 2016 outturn should strengthen the underlying position but, as I have just outlined, many of the factors that contributed to the surplus were of a one-off nature. We cannot, of course, expect or rely on exceptional investment performance each and every year; the in-year returns from the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the States' Trading Supervisory Board are not regular income streams; and some of the restraint exercised over revenue expenditure may not be sustainable. Further, the declining numbers of economically active in our population is inexorably driven by that aging demographic – and this remains a challenge to our tax base and future revenues.

At this stage, we have no reason to revise the estimates set out in the 2017 Budget. However, work will now commence to consider the extent of any underlying improvement and what that may mean for the 2017 position and beyond. We will include the results of that analysis in the medium term fiscal strategy to be considered by the Assembly as part of the Policy and Resource Plan in June. In the meantime, it is vital that the efforts to deliver a balanced position in 2017 are maintained, including the delivery of the 3% savings agreed for the year.

However, it is worth noting that in 2016 every Committee underspent, totalling some £7.5 million in all. This puts the 3% target for 2017 of £6.6 million, of which all but £2 million has now been identified, in context.

Sir, Members will recall that when work on the 2017 Budget commenced, modelling showed that if existing policies in respect of capital allocations had been followed, no budget measures taken, and the increased cost of health and social care services met, there would have been a deficit of £25 million this year. This Assembly approved a balanced and responsible package of measures in the 2017 Budget to eliminate that expected shortfall through a balance of revenue raising and expenditure restraint, demonstrating how seriously this States takes the fiscal discipline required to return our public finances to a strong sustainable position. The 2016 outturn is another step towards achieving that goal – and should be celebrated as such.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Are there any questions within the context of the statement that anybody would wish to ask?

Yes. Deputy Ferbrache.

130 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, would the President of Policy & Resources say, despite the caveats that he said about the bad news, that a fair summary of his statement is that there is much more good news than bad news, but bearing in mind the caveats that he has put, quite properly, to his statement, that the tax base for the Island community needs broadening, and broadening quickly?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

135 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir yes, I would agree that the balance of good news considerably exceeds the bad news, and I would also agree, sir, that the question of our tax base as clearly has been identified by the previous States as an issue. In my statement I identified two elements of the tax base which we need to keep an eye on: fuel being one, and the shrinking working age demographic, and the impact that that has on our main source, 70% of all revenues coming
140 through ETI. So, absolutely, it is an issue which has been identified by previous Assemblies, and is recognised by this one as being one that we must tackle and cannot ignore, and we will not ensure a sustainable position until we have dealt with that issue.

The Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

145 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Thank you, sir.
Just a routine question really. I have not looked at my emails yet, so I do not know if he has done it, but will Deputy St Pier be circulating his statement via email to Members later on today?
Thank you.

150 **Deputy St Pier:** I will do that as soon as questions are finished, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

155 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I am heartened by the fact that the States have returned to surplus. But I would like to ask Deputy St Pier what new measures are to be brought forward in order to ensure budget surpluses of the years ahead?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

160 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, that is precisely the purpose of the medium-term fiscal strategy to demonstrate how this States can sustain its return to surplus, and indeed rebuild the reserves, which have been used in the last eight years.

165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sir, under the *[Inaudible]*

The Bailiff: Can you switch it on ... There we are.

170 **Deputy Gollop:** The top came off.
Under the incisive chairmanship of Deputy Green on Legislative Scrutiny, we spent a useful morning the other day covering a whole shaft of things related to the Population Management Regime. Deputy St Pier in his statement hinted at the demographic challenges of our economy.
175 Have Policy & Resources any plans to come back with a meaningful population strategy that could address some of those issues?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

180 **Deputy St Pier:** I am not sure that question arose from the statement.

The Bailiff: No.
Deputy Roffey.

185 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

Given that in his statement Deputy St Pier highlighted yet another 2% fall in the volume of fuel being sold in Guernsey, would he agree with me that relying solely on fuel duties to raise the amount that we currently do from motoring is an absolute cul-de-sac and something must be done to change that policy?

190

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, when I crafted that sentence into the statement I was fairly confident that it would be Deputy Roffey who would stand to raise a question around it. All I can do is repeat what is in the statement. It clearly is an issue which has been identified again well before today, that the consumption of fuel on this Island is on a downward trend. That seems to be inexorable with the increased efficiency of engines and, of course, as we start to move, particularly, to the use of electric vehicles. So it is an issue which, again, this Assembly, probably in this term, is going to need to consider what is the future in terms of that revenue stream.

200

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

I was pleased to hear, obviously, that the Development & Planning Authority has had bumper receipts in respect of planning applications. Would Deputy St Pier agree with me that planning applications turned into projects is what we need, and therefore suitable support is still needed for the construction industry?

205

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

210

Deputy St Pier: I absolutely would agree.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

215 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

Deputy St Pier said that there was a need to broaden the tax base and that without doing that the Island's fiscal policy would not be properly sustainable. Now, that being so, will there be proposals to broaden the tax base in the medium-term fiscal strategy, and if not in that strategy in June, then when will those proposals be laid before the States?

220

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I do not wish to presume what may or may not appear in the strategy other than the repeat that the purpose of that strategy is for this States to sign up to a strategy which will ensure a sustainable fiscal future. I can say no more than that, other than as again as repeating this and prior States, or the last States certainly, have taken measures to broaden the tax base recognising the challenges which we face.

225

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

230

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

235 Sir, Deputy St Pier mentioned again the issue of aging demographics and economic activity. To
add to the good news, is it not time we redefine what we meant by that, because there are many
people who fall into that category at the moment, who actually are economically very active, in
full employment (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) or even part time employment. In fact, I think, if one did
that I think one would get a pleasant surprise, and that would be another piece of good news. (**A
Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you.

240 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: It is another piece of good news, certainly: the number of people who are
economically active in our community is very high compared to many other comparable
jurisdictions in developed economies around us. The point remains though that, generally
245 speaking, as most people get older, even if they remain economically active, their level of
earnings, and therefore their level of tax contribution, does tend to decline, and that remains the
challenge, even if people remain economically active.

250 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

In light of the good news, will P&R be reviewing their policy to cut revenue expenditure by 5%,
and 5% in the forthcoming years?

255 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: No, sir, I fear Deputy Dorey may not have been listening to the second half of
the statement in relation to the bad news bit, which is the necessity to retain tight fiscal control
continues, not least because many of the contributing factors for the outturn in 2016 were one-off
260 and cannot be expected to recur year in, year out.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, will have another go at trying to ask a question that is within the
statement. Deputy Gollop.

Can you switch your microphone on again?

265

Deputy Gollop: I think this one might be outside as well. (*Laughter*)

Deputy St Pier mentioned the downside being that we might not deliver on the savings Deputy
Dorey and others have referred to. My question really is: how confident is Policy & Resources that
the whole States can deliver on the 3-5-5 formula, and if not, is there a plan B?

270

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, the level of confidence, clearly, is much closer in relation to 2017 and the
3% target, not least with the comments which I made in the statement. The delivery of the 5-5 is
275 very much dependent on us collectively being able to deliver the transformation of many of the
services. It is perhaps too early to provide a level of confidence around that, but it is largely
dependent on that outturn.

280 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir,

Deputy St Pier has said that as yet he is not prepared to give away any ideas in regard to
broadening the tax base that Policy & Resources might come forward with. Are Policy &

285 Resources open to ideas being brought forward by Members in regard to the broadening of the
tax base, and will those ideas be properly and seriously considered and assessed if that is the
case?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

290 **Deputy St Pier:** Of course we are always open to receipt of ideas from Members of this
Assembly, or indeed elsewhere. Of course, we are also under the responsibility, along with the
Committee for Employment & Social Security, in relation to several extant Resolutions, in relation
to income tax, and particularly those at the higher end of the income scale.

295 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize and then Deputy Green.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I am sorry to pursue this point, but Deputy St Pier has already acknowledged the importance
of broadening the tax base, so I will ask my question in a slightly different way. Would he expect
300 that by the end of this calendar year, the Policy & Resources Committee would have laid
proposals before the States, which would have the effect of broadening the tax base?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

305 **Deputy St Pier:** I cannot help feeling, sir, that Deputy Fallaize simply rearranged his first
question with a different series of words to ask exactly the same question, to which all I can do is
give exactly the same answer, which is that the purpose of the medium-term fiscal strategy is to
enable this States to determine a sustainable fiscal future. Inevitably a part of that is the tax base,
and how we choose to access it.

310

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you.

Deputy St Pier mentioned that the spending on supplementary benefit had gone down in
315 2016. Given the many financial and economic indicators that are looking increasingly positive.
Would he agree with me now, it is perhaps the right time to prioritise social policy initiatives,
perhaps, including the SWBIC proposals.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

320

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, the SWBIC proposals are very close to the hearts of the Committee for
Employment & Social Security, and indeed, the Policy & Resources Committee met with that
325 Committee early this week, and we are very cognisant of the fact that it is one of their priorities. I
would expect it to certainly form part of their submission to the Policy & Resource Plan on that
basis, and both the Policy & Resources Committee and ultimately the States will need to
determine what priority we collectively wish to give to that initiative.

330 **The Bailiff:** Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, the good news in terms of dealing with the budget deficit in Government is not reflected in terms of optimism and strength on the High Street, and within the economy in general. What measures is Deputy St Pier considering bringing forward to give confidence to the general economy as a whole?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I would very much hope that this statement itself, and the indicators of underlying economic strength should, quite rightly, help inject further confidence back into the economy. Clearly, different sectors of the economy perform at different rates, and we have already identified construction as being one at the moment which is struggling, retail, particularly High Street retail, is of course, another, for a whole plethora of reasons, which are not necessarily driven by our local economy in any event. But I think there are plenty of signs that growth returned to our economy some time ago.

Of course, we have only had one year of economic contraction, 2009. What we have experienced is a very flat rate of growth in real terms in the economy and median earnings, and that is where the pain has been felt. It has been relative discomfort in respect of our previous experience, I would suggest.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, would Deputy St Pier agree with me that bearing in mind those positive signs that he just referred to, and Deputy De Lisle also referred to, perhaps now is the time to actually start talking up our economic and fiscal position, rather than perhaps the rather down-beat statement that he gave in June of last year?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I agree, now is the time to talk up the economy, and of course, we have a great advocate in the form of Deputy Ferbrache who in his question absolutely made that point, and I have no doubt that he and his Committee will assist in doing just that. The statement in June was reflecting the situation as we saw the position in June. The position has transformed as a result of the steps that have been taken as a result of changes in the economy. So all I can do today is reflect the position as at today, which is considerably stronger and more optimistic than it looked even those few months ago.

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: As Deputy St Pier has just pointed out, June was not that long ago, and it was quite disappointing then. Can I have a reassurance that in a similar few months' time we will not have more disappointment, and that we actually have strong figures on which we can rely?

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, there is a suggestion that the figures on which we were relying in June were wrong. It was based on information up to that date. I cannot give Deputy Tindall the perhaps reassurance she is looking for. All I can say is I will continue as I have done in my tenure, to continue to keep the States informed, based on the information that is available at that time.

The Bailiff: I see no-one else rising.

**Committee for Home Affairs –
Cyber security –
Statement by the President**

385 **The Bailiff:** We move on to the next Statement to be made by the President of the Committee
for Home Affairs, on cyber security, Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

390 Sir, in 2015 the States of Guernsey commissioned an in-depth consultation and report into
cyber security threats facing Government, business and Islanders and what mitigations and
capabilities are required to ensure we can all be safe on-line. Over the last 18 months the
Committee for Home Affairs, with colleagues from the Policy and Resources Committee, have
been working with the National Cyber Security Centre and the States of Jersey to ensure that
395 Guernsey, and the Channel Islands, can meet the challenges of the growing cyber security threat.
Yesterday Her Majesty the Queen formally opened the National Cyber Security Centre, and today
the States of Jersey publish their consultation into Cyber Security. It is therefore timely to provide
an update on the measures Guernsey is taking in this area.

400 Following extensive work last week senior officers, including members of Law Enforcement,
hosted in Guernsey a senior team from the National Cyber Security Centre for two days to agree
the outline principles of collaboration between Guernsey, the National Cyber Security Centre and
Jersey. These principles focus on information sharing, access to specialist UK national capabilities,
and joint development of additional local capability, tailored to the specific needs of the Islands.

405 I am pleased to announce that the National Cyber Security Centre has now formally extended
their 'Cyber Information Sharing Partnership', better known as CiSP, to the Crown Dependencies
and that the States of Guernsey can now act as an approved referring body to any business to the
CiSP framework. CiSP is a joint industry and UK government initiative set up to exchange cyber
threat information in real time, in a secure, confidential and dynamic environment, increasing
situational awareness and reducing the impact on business.

410 Further, and following last week's meeting, the National Cyber Security Centre will be
developing a Channel Islands specific CiSP forum to provide a focus for information sharing on
cyber threats across Guernsey and Jersey.

415 I therefore welcome Senator Ian Gorst's commitment to joint working with Guernsey.
Guernsey's Chief Information Officer, and the Chief Secretary, Committee for Home Affairs and the
Head of Law Enforcement will be working with colleagues in the National Cyber Security Centre,
and Jersey, in drafting the principles of the Memorandum of Understanding. The Committee for
Home Affairs looks forward to reviewing, and authorising, the Memorandum of Understanding in
due course.

Thank you, sir.

420 **The Bailiff:** Are there any questions?

Yes. Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Yes, very interesting.

425 Last week I attended a seminar hosted by Barclays Bank, and there were many interesting
comments, and one of them was this, that it is easier to hack the person than it is the machine.
That is where most of the threats are. Now, nothing has been said about that. So my question is
this, do we need to carefully look at how we vet our staff who have access to machines with very
sensitive information? I am not sure that is even anything that has been considered as yet.

Thank you, sir.

430

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

435 I would like to give Deputy Kuttelwascher assurances that this will cover not only businesses
but individuals, and including the States of Guernsey. It is in its very early stages, it was only
launched, really, yesterday, but we had meetings two days before that. Obviously, it is so
important to everybody, individuals and businesses, to ensure we can do our best for cyber-crime.
Nobody can put their hands up and say 100% it will be safe, because there is always somebody
440 ahead of the game, but with this forum that we have got now, we cannot do any better than what
we are actually intending to do.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: At Beau Séjour there was a recent internet safety day, which was very helpful.
445 But I personally have had my Facebook account hacked with peculiar cartoons in the past year,
and I had a message on Twitter there was some revolutionary army from the Middle East on the
account for a bit. How far would Deputy Lowe be able to cyber protect social media accounts that
are held by States' departments, or individuals, or politicians connected to the States of Guernsey
or Alderney?

450

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Me personally, not at all, Deputy Gollop! (*Laughter*)

455 But this, as I say, the set up that we are actually carrying out, because we are all vulnerable ...
Everybody is vulnerable, and I think too often people sit in their own homes, or in businesses,
thinking that all the data they have got on there is actually safe. You can put in as much security
as you can but you have to be ahead of the game. That includes you, as an individual, taking
responsibility for your Facebook account and Twitter account, and indeed as the States do with
the accounts that we have got, that we operate within.

460

The Bailiff: Deputy Tindall.

Deputy Tindall: Thank you, sir.

465 Obviously, I am extremely pleased with Deputy Lowe's confirmation that the National Cyber
Centre has been extended to Guernsey. I think it is a very good initiative to share information and
learn about what is a most serious threat. Obviously, we also have the GDPR EU directive coming
in and I was hoping for confirmation from Deputy Lowe that equally there is the work with
businesses to ensure that our data is protected in the future.

470

The Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Sir, I can only reiterate we are working very closely with the businesses, and
being involved with this and having access to that is a huge coup and a help to all of us that we
are all working together.

475

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, safety generally has come under a lot of concern in this community over
the last few days. I would like to ask Deputy Lowe what measures are being taken to ensure, in a
480 general framework, that people are safe in this Island? (*Laughter*) I would also like to ask, can we
have our siren back in the West, sir? (*Laughter*)

A Member: Hear, hear!

485 **The Bailiff:** I am not sure that any of that arises from the context of the Statement.

Deputy Lowe: This is not my responsibility.

490 **The Bailiff:** No. It goes beyond the context of the statement, Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Well, that is pathetic, sir. I think that the – (*Interjections*)

The Bailiff: Well, I am sorry if you consider I am pathetic, Deputy De Lisle, but I will –

495 **Deputy De Lisle:** I challenge the President to actually answer –

The Bailiff: I do not know if you were saying I am pathetic or –

500 **Deputy De Lisle:** No, I am not saying that, sir. I am saying the answer was. I think –

The Bailiff: That was my answer, Deputy De Lisle! (*Laughter*) I think we will move on.
(*Interjections*)

Right, nobody else wishes to ask any questions on cyber security.

**Committee for Health & Social Care –
General update –
Statement by the President**

505 **The Bailiff:** The next Statement is to be delivered by the President of the Committee for Health & Social Care, Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, my Statement today is intended to update Members, and the community generally, on what has been happening to Health & Social Care over the last quarter, and our plans for the coming months.

510 Of course, Health & Social Care is a large and complex organisation with a mandate that stretches across many areas that touch people's lives on a daily basis. It would be impossible to cover every aspect of what has been achieved this quarter. I therefore apologise to those staff who have made a huge contribution to significant pieces of work in the last few months and
515 which I do not cover in this Statement. But I would like to thank them all now for making good things happen. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

It has been an intense, but productive quarter for the Committee for Health & Social Care.

520 In November, we received a visit from the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC). This was the latest in a series of reviews following the circumstances surrounding the death of a baby in 2014. Each visit has demonstrated improvements since the NMC undertook its first extraordinary review.

525 However, this visit was different. What the NMC found in November gave independent confirmation that Health & Social Care is a very different organisation from what it was two years ago. In fact, notable changes were found since the NMC's last visit seven months previously. They noted, in particular, the impact of positive leadership, significant improvements in culture and team working.

530 For the first time, the NMC said they have no intention of returning unless they feel it necessary, or are invited. It is really difficult to put across what that really means. Those at the debrief meeting who had helped make it possible knew. There was an audible intake of breath when Jackie Smith, the head of the NMC told us. Sir, the 2014 extraordinary review had a huge impact on health and social care generally and the nursing and midwifery staff in particular.

Understandably it hit morale, with recruitment and retention being seriously impacted, but it also increased sensitivities, which may go some way to explaining actions taken only a few months later. There is still a way to go, we need to further develop the culture from one of blame to one of learning and continuous improvement, something that the Chief Secretary has stated he is committed to doing, but we are now in a better place than at any time in recent years to focus on the future.

535 Last month saw the publication of a report entitled, 'An Independent Review into the Health and Social Care Need, Provision and Governance in Alderney', undertaken by Professor Wilson of Aberdeen University. The aim of this review was, as set out in the terms of reference, to, and I quote:

540 Deliver evidence-based practical information for cost-effective recommendations to improve the health and wellbeing outcomes of the Alderney public.

However, the primary recommendation of the report was to provide a full apology to Dr Lyons and support him back into practice. I can confirm that I have written to Dr Lyons to reiterate the apology made by my predecessor for the shortcomings in the investigation, as identified in the Good Governance Institute Report into the affair, but also to apologise for the impact that events had had on Dr Lyons and the wider Alderney community. As I have already said publicly, many years ago someone close to me was accused of something they did not do, was subjected to an investigation and eventually exonerated. I know this was a very difficult time for those involved, and therefore when I give my apology, I do so with sincerity.

550 In relation to the second part of the recommendation, to supporting Dr Lyons back into practice, I can advise that, whilst little was made of this in the report, Health & Social Care has reached out to Dr Lyons, on more than one occasion, with our Medical Director offering his support in person, and the Chief Secretary having also offered to meet him last year. The Chief Secretary wrote to Dr Lyons last week, reaffirming Health & Social Care's commitment to do all we reasonably can to re-establish his practice. I have also expressed my hope to Dr Lyons that he is willing to enter into mediation, and I would be happy to meet him should that assist the process. I do hope that we receive a positive response to our genuine requests.

560 Sir, in my speech on taking this office, I stated my commitment to building bridges with Alderney. I am pleased to advise that since then, again, whilst not acknowledged within the Wilson Report, significant work has been undertaken by Health & Social Care, and ESS for that matter, in supporting health and social care provision in Alderney. I can provide a list to Members separately but it is worth highlighting the following: proactively establishing a VTC link; supporting the new dentist; providing financial support to the pharmacy; improving the digital connection at the Mignot Memorial Hospital for X-rays; installation of a renal dialysis machine; a maternity services support action plan; close discussion with Alderney GPs to improve blood testing facilities and work with them to improve massive blood haemorrhage procedures. All recommendations of the GGI Report have been actioned, and all but three have been completed. There is considerably more that has been done, and that is not even including the work being undertaken as part of our overall transformation programme.

570 With regard to those recommendations of the Wilson Report that have not already been actioned, we are developing a comprehensive action plan that we will present to Alderney States' Members next month. We have also requested that there be an oversight group headed by the Chief Executive of the States of Alderney to ensure drive and delivery. And as actions are completed we will announce them publicly. However, the work required does not fall only into the lap of the Committee for Health & Social Care. The assumption that it is only for the Committee for Health & Social Care to action the recommendations is a mistaken one, and the need to establish responsibilities for health and social care in Alderney needs to be established as part of this process.

580 Sir, sadly, the events of two years ago cannot be undone, and I know there are those who will struggle to achieve closure. I understand that. However, there is a need to move on. The Buddha said, 'Do not dwell in the past, do not dream of the future, concentrate the mind on the present moment. You can never plan the future by the past.'

My message to the States of Alderney, and the people of Alderney as a whole, is that we are
585 committed to truly transforming health and social care on the Island for the future, and we ask that you work with us today to make that commitment a reality.

Now, away from the headlines, the Committee has met with the Committee for Home Affairs around progressing the recommendations of the February 2016 policy letter on proposals regarding Guernsey's future ambulance service, specifically the transfer of the budgetary and non-
590 clinical oversight role for the Emergency Ambulance Service from Health & Social Care to Home Affairs. It has become apparent from those meetings, and other discussions, that whilst there were sound reasons for this recommendation, both Committees believe that, at least at present, the ambulance service is a better fit with Health & Social Care. Consequently, it was agreed at our last joint meeting to return to the States in June to seek to rescind that recommendation.

The Committee has also met with the Committee for Employment & Social Security over the last few months, with the principal discussion being around the MSG contract. I can advise that at a joint meeting held on 7th February, both Committees agreed the terms of the contract presented to them, and have authorised both myself and the Chief Secretary to sign it on behalf
595 of the States of Guernsey, subject to the agreement of one outstanding clause.

There has naturally been a lot of interest around why it has taken so long to get to this point. However, it should be understood that at a cumulative cost of £100 million, this is the largest contract for the States of Guernsey, and it was not something that should be rushed unnecessarily. Throughout the negotiation process, great care has been taken to address the needs of the States of Guernsey, to put in place effective control mechanisms and drive best
600 value. Consequently, the new contract bears no relationship with the one in place today.

Key points of the contract include:

Greater cost control. Costs have been contained through an agreed decrease in the total contract value in the first three years of 3%, 2% and 1% respectively.

There will be clear performance metrics, which will be baselined this year and monitored
610 throughout the contract term.

We have the ability to review services and engage MSG with the ongoing transformation programme.

A single governance framework will be in force. This is designed to ensure that Health & Social Care, MSG and eventually all health care providers across the Bailiwick, work to a recognised
615 single standard and assurance process in respect of clinical governance.

Finally, there will be a single complaints policy. All complaints that arise are to be triaged through a single contact point. The whole process will be overseen by the Chief Secretary of Health & Social Care, and the Chairman of MSG. The resulting service user experience will be based on the provision of cohesive, joined-up services, controls and user communication; the 'one
620 voice' approach to customer service.

These are significant improvements to the current contract that have taken time to develop, and I am quite happy to let it be known that the Committee for Health & Social Care has made it clear the red lines which we would not cross to ensure we got a contract in the best interests of the people of the Bailiwick. Time will tell, but I am hopeful that the contract will enable more
625 joined-up working, and make the transformation of health and social care possible. I would like to thank the Chief Executive as head of the Programme Board, and States' Treasurer as head of the Internal Negotiating team, in particular, for their work in enabling us to get to this place. I would also like to thank the MSG for their publicly voiced commitment to transformation. Health & Social Care hope the new contract will facilitate a true partnership with MSG, where we seek to work together to transform the services we collectively provide for the changing needs and
630 benefit of the community.

The last quarter has seen the transformation programme get real traction.

635 An autism framework has been approved and passed to the Disability & Inclusion Strategy Working Group, a dementia care framework has been drafted and will be reviewed by the Committee in the coming weeks.

A care and support framework is currently in development which will improve care pathways and help people get the care they need, where they need it.

640 The Clinical Reference Group established as part of our new single governance structure, comprising professionals across the sector, has redesigned the hip and knee pathway, and the most recent figures show that this has resulted in a reduction in the length of hospital stays for hips from 7.07 nights to 5.29 and for knees from 8.07 to 5.68. This is good for patients as stays over five days lead to an increased likelihood of acquiring an infection and loss of muscle mass.

645 November also saw the launch by the Chief Nurse of the care values framework for health and social care professionals, with various work streams now in progress, including the implementation of the findings of the skills mix review.

Health & Social Care has invested £500,000 to replace all 771 PCs running Windows XP. These are being deployed at a rate of 90 a week, and the project is due to be completed on time, and budget, by the end of next month. This hardware refresh has also enabled us to upgrade various core applications.

650 The project that will truly enable transformational change though is the replacement of the current dated network infrastructure. The opportunities to improve the way we deliver health and social care, particularly through mobile technology, are all too clear. From telehealth and telecare, to allowing staff access to records in the community we could do far more. The project is in its design phase, with a complete audit of the existing network having been undertaken, and we are
655 on track to achieve contract signature for the work by the end of the year.

Elsewhere, we have continued to have dialogue with our Jersey counterparts on areas of mutual interest. This includes work on developing a pan-Island regulatory framework, and preliminary discussions on a joint review of the role of the Medical Officer of Health. It is also hoped that we can work together on a review of the medicinal use of cannabinoids.

660 Finally, in terms of transformation, we were delighted to be able launch CareWatch at the beginning of this month. CareWatch goes to the heart of our belief that we can only transform through listening to, and working with, the wider community. This is something that I know our non-States member Mr Roger Allsopp OBE has wanted to see for a long time, and I am delighted that he has agreed to be its Chair. CareWatch will be a community partnership forum drawn from
665 interested organisations and individuals. It will have an advisory and consultative role, helping to set priorities for improving provision and to design services.

Last, but no means least, I turn to finances. No update on health and social care would be complete without that, of course. Back in May, the Committee for Health & Social Care was confronted with a predicted overspend of between £4.5 million and £7.9 million. Something the
670 previous Board was unaware of, I have to say. A couple of months ago, following an enquiry by our esteemed printed media, I advised that, given the position we were in eight months previously I would be pleased if we could get our overspend below £1 million. I thought the comments on the article online were very interesting, ranging from the fact we had a third world health service, through to 'only £1 million overspend' to 'she's been duped by the civil servants'. Well, you know,
675 what do women know about finances? (*Laughter*)

Well sir, we have not managed to get our overspend under £1 million. That is because we do not have an overspend. Health & Social Care has come in approximately £700,000 under budget. This is an incredible achievement. In fact the reality is even better than that. Remember, that HSSD set itself a £1.9 million stretched savings target against the 2016 budget. Given HSSD's financial
680 track record, T&R did not believe this could be achieved, and I have to say I thought it would be a bit of a challenge at the time, and £1.15 million was set aside as a contingency. The truth is, we did not think we would either, earlier in the year, and requested the funding to cover the

overspend at that time. However, the year-end outturn means that Health & Social Care has effectively made £1.45 million worth of savings in 2016.

685 This has not been achieved by cuts. It has been achieved through stronger financial controls, reporting, challenge and ownership across the organisation. It is the physical proof of what the NMC have said, and which I referred to earlier and, indeed what Professor Wilson said in his presentations last month, and that is the development of leadership at all levels, and teamwork across the organisation. Huge credit for this goes to the Chief Secretary and Senior Operating
690 Officer, in particular, for getting us to where we are today.

However, be under no illusions, the current model of health and social care is unsustainable. The 2016 outcome has only been possible through the exceptional efforts of staff throughout health and social care. It will be impossible to continue on this track without changing our model of care.

695 Now, Members cannot fail but be aware of the crisis that has hit the NHS. We hear daily about delays to see GPs, long waiting times at A&E, and people having to wait on trolleys for hours in corridors waiting for a bed. Whilst, thankfully, we have not seen anything like that here, winter pressures have resulted in fluctuating bed capacity, which has put stress on staff at the PEH. The truth is that the impact of our ageing population is becoming increasingly evident year on year
700 throughout the service. From the hospital and ambulance services to nursing and residential care homes and wider community care.

This is why transformation is essential. This is why the Committee for Health & Social Care is committed to transformation. It is our top priority. Prioritisation is a key word here. As would be expected in an organisation with 2,000 people that runs 24 hours a day, seven days a week, stuff
705 happens. We have to balance all that with the need to focus on medium to long term strategic change. It is big task which we cannot, and should not, do alone. I hope I have made it clear throughout my statement how we are actively working together with other Committees, staff, partner organisations, and the wider community, to design a health and social care service that meets the needs of the population, now and in the future. I also hope Members will believe me
710 when I say that we have started as we mean to go on and that with focus, drive and commitment to working together we can make good things happen.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

715 **Deputy Roffey:** Thank you, sir.

In the report on health care in Alderney one of the main forward-looking proposals is that primary care should stay in private hands but with financial support from the States of Guernsey. I wondered whether the Committee for Health & Social Care agreed with that and, if so, what implications it has for primary care in Guernsey, where, beyond doubt, the cost of access to that
720 care is one of the main issues facing Guernsey people and their health care.

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

725 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, taking the last point Deputy Roffey makes first, yes, I think primary care is a key part, we need to review that in terms of access to primary care, because I think that is where it will unlock all the potential in terms of prevention and early intervention. In terms of the recommendations from the Wilson Report, yes, it is one of four recommendations. I believe Professor Wilson said these were his suggestions, that far more work needed to be done. He is absolutely correct. This is something that we need to work with the States of Alderney on, because
730 they are private practices. The Health & Social Care is not involved in the running of those private practices. So this is a clear example of where we need to work together to come up with a solution that works for Alderney.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

735 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, I was pleased to hear Deputy Soulsby focus on *future*, and also on the overall transformation programme. But can I ask, can we expect to see in the near future a return of the £8 million public investment in transformation, and a return to Health working consistently within budget, even in concert, and joining joined-up working with 3-5-5 in future?

740 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: If only I had a crystal ball, Deputy De Lisle! I think we have started really well, but as I said in my speech, our current model is unsustainable. We are going to have to change it if we are going to be able to make, year on year, returns within budget, and that is what, as I have
745 said in my speech, the current Committee is absolutely committed to. That is our top priority for this term.

The Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel.

750 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, in her speech the President focused on transforming the health service, and I have every confidence in the President, and her Committee, but I do have a question that focuses on the issue of off-Island placements. Can the President tell me, please, are we making any progress in our efforts to bring some of our fellow Islanders back to the Island to be cared for closer to their family and friends?

755 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I am pleased to advise Deputy Queripel that yes, we are. We know this will unlock huge potential. We have brought people back, Islanders back from the UK to
760 Guernsey, and this is something that started back at the very end of the last term, we brought Islanders across and we continue to do that. It is very much our ethos, we are not sending people away unless the situation is such that we will be totally unable to look after those people on Island.

765 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, thank you.

I acknowledge and give credit to the President and her Committee for the £700,000 underspend, admittedly, on the uplifted budget that Deputy De Lisle referred to. The question is
770 can the President assure us that the drive for continuing budgetary control in her department has not resulted hitherto in any detrimental effects to service delivery, against the backdrop of that underspend?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

775 **Deputy Soulsby:** It is my understanding that that is not the case, Deputy Green. What we have done has been about financial controls, financial reporting, greater discipline, that is something that was reported back by previous Public Accounts Committee a few years ago now, about what was required. Improving our financial acumen within the Committee, I think, has made a lot of
780 difference.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

785 I too congratulate the Committee on its performance, and perhaps the performance is also testament to the personnel and structure at a senior staff level, which now appears to be in a

much better position (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) than it was. But, would the President of the Committee agree that the underlying financial challenges that face the Committee, and face health and social care in general, can be seen much more in the difference in revenue expenditure between 2015 and 2016 than in the underspend which Deputy Soulsby has reported in her statement this morning?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, no, I think what we can say is that actually having greater control and getting buy-in throughout the organisation that financials are important for everybody within the organisation who holds a budget. I can say now, from having visited various parts of the organisation, both last year and this year, the different mind-set, the thought process behind the importance of understanding of finances and being within budget has completely changed.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, the President in her statement and in response to questions has quite rightly highlighted the importance of transformation to the delivery of a sustainable service. She has also highlighted the improved contract with the MSG. Does she agree with me that the delivery of that transformation is going to be dependent on the Medical Specialist Group, and in particular, the importance of the management of that contract, and we will need to devote appropriate resources to ensure that that contract is properly managed?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, in answer to the first part, yes, I am very delighted that the MSG have expressed their commitment to transformation.

In terms of the latter, the Committee for Health & Social Care has made it very clear to the Programme Board the need to ensure that we have the appropriate resources so we can properly manage this contract. This is about commissioning; it is not just about getting someone to sign on the dotted line and everybody running away. We have to manage and control it, and it is going to be especially important if we are going to change our model of health and social care.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Jean.

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you, sir.

I rise to thank Deputy Soulsby, particularly for her kind apology to Dr Lyons, I am very grateful for that, and also for the offer of assistance to get him back to work, and the fact that Dr Rabey, who I have met and is a very nice man, is looking to meet in Alderney with Dr Lyons, and I hope that happens soon.

I would also like to add my congratulations to Deputy Soulsby, and her Committee who are, in my opinion, a very good Committee. She is surrounded by a very good Committee, that is very obvious, and they are taking the steps in Alderney and many of those steps she has explained to us today.

The Bailiff: You are running out of time, have you got a question to ask?

Alderney Representative Jean: No, I have not, it is basically – *(Laughter)* I'm going to get into trouble for this. Okay I just want to really say thank you very much, you are very aware, and as far as I am concerned, you are doing a great job. Thank you. *(Interjections and laughter)*

I apologise for that, sir.

840 **Deputy Lowe:** Sir, I very much agree with him on all counts.
Thank you. (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop and then Deputy Brehaut.

845 **Deputy Gollop:** I was very heartened to hear today...

The Bailiff: Can you put your microphone on.

850 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes. I have been very heartened to listen to Deputy Soulsby's statement today, following on various rumours, really, that the Autism Strategy, and the Dementia Strategy are close to completion, with drafts being circulated to the relevant charities, as both are close to my heart. But will the next stage include Health & Social Care discussing with other Committees, including the ESS and P&R the need for additional resources in those areas, as I personally would like to see a business care plan as to what improvements could be made?

855 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

860 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes, within the framework there are recommendations in terms for the need for various resources. What we need to do – it is all part of transformation again, it is making sure we are placing resources where they are needed. Yes, it is all about collaborative working, Employment & Social Security hold the Disability and Inclusion Strategy and we work very closely with them in developing that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

865 **Deputy Brehaut:** Thank you, sir.

First, I want to commend Deputy Soulsby on an extremely thorough and comprehensive statement. When I asked questions to the Chair of the States' Assembly & Constitution Committee, that is exactly the sort of statement I was looking for, and I appreciate that.

870 Can I just ask the President with regard to recruitment and retention, and I will declare an interest, my wife is a nurse. Have we got to a situation because of the national global shortage of nurses, that agency staff may become the norm, and that the Committee may just have to budget accordingly in the future?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

875 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I have made clear in the past, I do believe we need to look at the whole of recruitment and retention of nursing. Yes, we do have agency staff, and I know various nurses running various wards try and keep those to a minimum. Whether it will become the norm, I think agency are a necessary requirement in any hospital to maintain safe staffing numbers. We are such a small Island compared with other jurisdictions in the world and very much affected by decisions that they make, so like the UK getting rid of bursaries is not a great idea, which is why what we want to do is extend training on Island, and possibly extend bursaries elsewhere so we can build and grow our own.

885 **The Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

890 **Deputy St Pier:** Sir, does the President agree with me that notwithstanding the number of opportunities she identified in her statement of joint working with Jersey that actually there remains still a considerable amount to play for in terms of that opportunity around joint working and the savings that could come as a result?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

895 **Deputy Soulsby:** Absolutely, I totally agree with the P&R President. Indeed, I will be having a telephone conference with my counterpart in Jersey on Friday to discuss further areas of mutual benefit.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

900 **Deputy De Lisle:** Sir, there have been concerns with respect to resources in cardiology, and also resources in order to get people off the Island quickly for treatment in the UK. I would like to ask the President whether, in fact, those issues have been dealt with, with new resourcing?

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

905 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir,
We are in constant dialogue with our partners at MSG about the resourcing required and where we can improve clinical pathways. That is very much at the heart of what the Clinical Reference Group is about in reference to the whole single governance framework. So, yes, we are aware, whatever they are. I cannot comment about those individual circumstances Deputy De Lisle refers to, but I can say is that that core Clinical Reference Group is going to make lot of difference to what we do in health and social care.

The Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

915 **Deputy Merrett:** Thank you sir.
I would like to ask the President, please, this greater working with Jersey will be beneficial to Islands but will it also be considering the disparity in pay between the nurses in Jersey and the nurses in Guernsey?
Thank you, sir.

920

The Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

925 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, I think we need to look at not how we compare with other jurisdictions but whether we are providing a fair rate of pay and conditions for people on this Island, and that is why I have said previously, we need to look at this in the round, in terms of, are we giving nurses the pay that they should have for the work that they do now, in the 21st century, which is a job that is very different from what it was 10 or 20 years ago.

The Bailiff: I see no-one else rising.

**Code of Conduct complaints –
Personal Statement by Deputy Trott**

930

The Bailiff: Now, in a departure from the circulated agenda, Deputy Trott has asked for permission to make a personal statement, and I have given him permission to do so under Rule 10(1). Deputy Trott.

935 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, last evening I received notification that two Code of Conduct complaints had been made against me by Mr Wayne Bulpitt and Mr Robin Le Prevost. Their complaints concern disability

940 matters and alleged discrimination. Neither has had any contact with me regarding any of the details pertaining to their complaints, and correspondingly neither has chosen to ascertain any facts from me prior to these totally unwarranted, vexatious and malevolent complaints being lodged.

I wish to be unequivocally clear that I have nothing to hide as a result of this complaint, and I will tell the public now exactly what I will tell the Code Panel when they ask.

945 I was approached by the President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, who sought my advice on whether the Committee should re-nominate Deputy Leadbeater, following his resignation. I was clear in the guidance I offered, which was that if I was in the President's position, I would not seek to have Deputy Leadbeater back on my Committee, for the simple reason that he had chosen to break away from the Committee's agreed position when he resigned. Committees work best when there is trust, and as far as I was concerned, Deputy
950 Leadbeater had burnt those political bridges when he publicly distanced himself from his fellow Committee members.

Let me be absolutely clear about this. I was asked for political advice and that is what I offered. Some will no doubt agree with my stance, while others will disagree – such is the nature of politics, but at *no* point did Deputy Leadbeater's personal circumstances either enter into our
955 conversation or my mind. In fact, I had no idea of Deputy Leadbeater's family circumstances, until I read about them in the *Guernsey Press*.

Let me be clear, here, sir. I take *great* exception to an accusation that I would behave in a discriminatory manner.

960 If I am found by the Code Panel, in any way, to have behaved without integrity, then I will step down from the Policy & Resources Committee with immediate effect. In the interim I will, at my own instigation, play no part in the business of P&R, and will accordingly accept no compensation.

However, those who have made these baseless accusations about me, and which they have not asked me about, are also members of Policy & Resources Committee-sponsored bodies, such as
965 the Children's Executive, the Social Policy Partnership Forum and the Third Sector Development Group. I expect *them* to resign from their roles on those bodies if *their* integrity is shown to have been compromised (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) by making these accusations about me in this way.

970 Sir, there will be many that will now wish a full public inquiry into this matter, and such requests will not be without merit. Should such an inquiry materialise, I look forward to participating in a full and proper manner.

Thank you, sir.

Several Members: Hear, hear. (*Applause*)

975 **The Bailiff:** Before we move on, I have had a request that those who wish to do so be permitted to remove their jackets. They may do so and we will move on, please, Greffier.

Questions for Oral Answer

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Forthcoming bank closure in Alderney – Policy & Resources Committee response

The Bailiff: We move on to Question Time. The first question is to be asked by Deputy Gollop and will be answered by Deputy Brouard in his capacity as a member of the Policy & Resources Committee.

980

Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, Mr Bailiff.

The recent shock news that a key banking branch is closing this summer on Alderney – not to mention in a rural part of the Island – has already brought logistical problems to Alderney business, third sector organisations, and maybe, as far as I know, even the States of Alderney. Will the Policy & Resources Committee be working with local banking organisations to ensure that the Island of Alderney suffers no economic repercussions and disadvantages, as the need to physically deposit cash, for example, must be retained?

985

990

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard will reply.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

Mr Bailiff, I thank Deputy Gollop for his question.

995

This matter was actually discussed by attendees of the Alderney Liaison Group in Alderney last Friday, when it was raised as a potential area of concern for small businesses and community organisations in Alderney. The representatives of the States of Alderney advised the meeting that they are involved in discussions to ensure minimum disruption to their community, and as the Guernsey representative I was able to advise that the States of Guernsey would do all it could to assist, as appropriate, and support them in their efforts. We agreed to keep a watching brief on this matter.

1000

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Any supplementaries Deputy Gollop?

1005

Deputy Gollop: Well my supplementary, really, is to request that the Policy & Resources Committee look to the advisability of maintaining at least one viable clearing bank branch in rural parts of this Bailiwick, especially Alderney.

1010

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

There are two clearing banks, I understand, left in Alderney, or there will be after the summer. We will keep a watching brief on this, and work with our colleagues in Alderney to ensure that the community is served. There is, however, a general trend in banking for less branches, more work is now being conducted online than it used to be, but we do need to be cognisant of those people who still use cash and cheques, to ensure community survival, so yes.

1015

Thank you.

1020

The Bailiff: Yes. Alderney Representative Jean.

Alderney Representative Jean: Thank you for those words of reassurance.

What I would ask, if it was possible, if the bank could be talked to, through your Committee, and asked if perhaps one member of staff – there was a suggestion this might be taking place – could be placed in one of the other banks.

1025 The reason I ask this is because as regards the businesses in Alderney, they are not able to set up business accounts with the other banks. They have actually said they do not want that custom, and it is going to make it very difficult if they have to deal with the bank over here.

1030 Now, moving on as well, we are all aware of the demographic time bomb, and there are many elderly people in Alderney who cannot use internet service banking and want to continue to bank by cheque, or to go and draw their various allowances out through and at a bank, so I think it is actually really quite important to avoid damage for Alderney if some arrangement like that could be made even one member of staff alongside the cashiers in another bank. I do not know if that is possible, but if it was, I wonder if you could assist.

Thank you.

1035

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

1040 I think that goes slightly beyond the original question, but what I am mindful of is that although Alderney and Guernsey are linked, I want to help you in the journey, not step where you should be stepping. So, if you want support from me I will be happy to support you in those discussions with the local clearing banks.

Thank you, sir.

1045 **Alderney Representative Jean:** If I may, sir, that will do me nicely, Thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Thank you, Alderney Representative Jean. I see no-one else rising.

STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

Airport landing charges – Discounts for sporting clubs

1050 **The Bailiff:** The next question is also from Deputy Gollop and to be asked of the President of the States' Trading Supervisory Board.

Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir.

1055 Question, recently some members of the sporting community have suggested that air landing charges should be reduced, waived or eliminated for team planes, inter-Island flights carrying sporting clubs or sports tourism. Will the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the Guernsey Airport be looking into the feasibility of these ideas?

1060 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson will reply.

Deputy Parkinson: Yes, sir.

1065 In a word, no. Discounts of this nature would effectively represent direct subsidies for subsets of passengers, who could be travelling on flights to and from the Island. As a result, the management of these rebates would be both time consuming and almost impossible to audit.

More generally, the income lost as a result of these rebates would invariably need to be recovered from somewhere, including potentially through increases in the rates charged to passengers who are travelling for reasons other than sport.

1070 The very clear expectation from my Board is that the Airport will at least recover its costs, and in order to do that, the Airport has to apply its charges appropriately.

The Bailiff: Is there a supplementary, Deputy Gollop?

1075 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, will the Board be evaluating whether, as has happened in some other places, a reduction in air passenger rates for all carriers, as I am certainly not biased to anyone in any shape or form, could lead to increased income for the Airport, and increased revenue for the Island generally, because of an increase in the volume of passengers, as we for example have seen at Dublin Airport?

1080 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

1085 **Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, I think any subsidies to air transport, whether in the form of reduced landing fees, or any other mechanism, would fall within the province of the Committee for Economic Development. Our job is to run an airport. While we are aware of the importance of the Airport to the wider economy, we are not mandated to lose money to sporting groups, or anyone else, in order to encourage their activities.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

1090 **Deputy De Lisle:** Supplementary on that, sir.

I think we have got to look at this in the round, and some communities are increasing traffic, and the number of airlines using their airports, by cutting landing charges and, in fact, eliminating them altogether. To stimulate tourism and economic development here should not Guernsey consider doing the same, sir?

1095 I would ask that to Deputy Parkinson.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1100 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, my answer is much the same as the answer to the last question. It may be that the Committee for Economic Development will see merit in stimulating the tourism industry, or any other sector of the Guernsey economy, by asking us to reduce landing charges at the Airport, or by direct subsidies to airlines that offer to fly here. But that is a matter for that Committee. My Committee is not mandated to deliberately lose money at the Airport for those purposes.

1105 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Interesting.

1110 In relation to this new summer service, which is due to start between Guernsey and Cardiff, run by Blue Islands-cum-Flybe, have any charges been reduced to them for this initial period as regards the charges they pay at Guernsey?

The Bailiff: I do not know if that arises from the previous answer.

1115 **Deputy Parkinson:** I do not think it does, sir, and since I have had no advance notice of the question I cannot furnish an answer.

The Bailiff: Your second question then, Deputy Gollop.

1120 **Deputy Gollop:** I have a supplementary that has just come to me really.

Would the States' Trading Supervisory Board meet with Economic Development, the Committee, to find ways of reducing airport landing charges for social, sporting, shopping, retail, or tourism purposes which might include, either a subsidy, or greater managerial and commercial freedom for the Airport team to increase its marketing, catering and retail offering to, indeed, provide additional income streams to cross subsidise the necessary air landing taxes?

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Mr Bailiff.

1130 The Committee for Economic Development is not responsible for either airport landing charges or management of the Airport.

The States Trading Supervisory Board is responsible for such matters and does not constrain the reasonable commercial freedoms of the Airport. The Airport seeks to maximise revenues from 'non-aeronautical' charges and has made progress in recent years, with now nearly 30% of its annual income derived from car parking, advertising and retail opportunities.

1135 Any direction to reduce landing charges for certain groups of travellers has to be backed by an appropriate funding mechanism to operate that subsidy. In that respect, the sporting groups may consider a direct approach for support to either the Committee for Economic Development or the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, whichever is more appropriate.

1140

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: My supplementary, speculation in the media and in aviation circles, that there may be one or more Uber-style, demand-responsive, air taxi kind of services that could fulfil a travelling need. Is the STSB aware that such services might have a different impact upon landing charges and the current tariff structure?

1145

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1150 **Deputy Parkinson:** Well, sir, I had the pleasure of meeting the principals behind the proposed new Waves air taxi service very recently. At the moment they do not have an air operator's certificate, so they will not be operating before the summer, at the earliest, and when they have their business plans more developed, I am sure we will be considering the impact they may have on the Airport's revenues.

1155

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, it is all a matter of maintaining competitive advantage, and my information indicates that we are not competitive with Jersey in the airline area, in terms of costs and fares and so on. Part and parcel of that is, in fact, the Airport landing charges. Can I ask Deputy Parkinson whether, in fact, we are competitive in the industry with regard to landing charges that are currently in vogue?

1160

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1165

Deputy Parkinson: Well, sir, I understand that the Committee for Economic Development are looking at the Island's air links and are no doubt taking full account of the charges levied by other airports, as well as other potential benefits that airlines may receive for operating into those airports. I have not taken part in those deliberations, so I do not know where they have got to.

1170 **The Bailiff:** I see no-one else. So that concludes Question Time.
We move on to elections, Greffier.

Billet d'État V

I. Development & Planning Authority – Election of New Member – Deputy Marc Leadbeater elected

Article I

The States are asked:

To elect a member of the Development & Planning Authority to complete the unexpired term of office (that is to the 30th June 2020) of Deputy J. C. S. F. Smithies who has resigned that office, and whose letter of resignation is appended hereto, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation.

The Greffier: Article I – Development & Planning Authority – Election of new member.

1175 **The Bailiff:** Members, can I just remind you that the constitution of the Development &
Planning Authority states that neither the President nor any member of the Development
Planning Authority shall be the President or a member of the Policy & Resources Committee or
the President or a member of the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure. So, if somebody
1180 who is the President or member of one of those Committees were to be elected they would have
to resign from their present position. It would not stop them holding the position as a member of
the Planning & Development Authority, they would just have to resign from the Policy &
Resources Committee or the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure.

So are there any nomination for a member of the Development & Planning Authority? Any
nominations? Deputy Gollop.

1185 **Deputy Gollop:** Yes, we do have a nomination. We are very pleased to put forward the name
of Deputy Mark Leadbeater.

The Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

1190 **Deputy Gollop:** Seconded by either Deputy Tindall or Deputy Oliver. They both put
themselves forward. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Which one of you? Deputy Oliver.

1195 **Deputy Oliver:** I will second it.

The Bailiff: Any other nominations? No. In that case, I put to you that Deputy Leadbeater be
elected as a member of the Development & Planning Authority, proposed by Deputy Gollop,
seconded by Deputy Oliver. Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

1200 **The Bailiff:** I declare him elected.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS LAID BEFORE THE STATES

- The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Legal Professionals, Accountants and Estate Agents) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016;**
The Financial Services Commission (Fees) Regulations, 2016;
The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees for Insurers) Regulations, 2016;
The Registration of Non-Regulated Financial Services Businesses (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Fees) Regulations, 2016;
The Public Highways (Temporary Road Closures) (Fees and Penalties) Order, 2016;
The Public Highways (Al Fresco Licences) (Fees) Regulations, 2016;
The Amalgamation and Migration of Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016;
The Financial Services Commission (Limited Liability Partnerships) (Fees) Regulations, 2016
The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) Regulations, 2016;
The Guernsey Finance LBG (Levy) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016;
The Limited Partnerships (Fees, Annual Validations and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations, 2016;
The Income Tax (Approved International Agreements) (Implementation) (Country by Country Reporting) Regulations, 2016

1205 **The Greffier:** Statutory Instruments laid – The Criminal Justice (Proceeds of Crime) (Legal Professionals, Accountants and Estate Agents) (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Financial Services Commission (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees for Insurers) Regulations, 2016; The Registration of Non-Regulated Financial Services Businesses (Bailiwick of Guernsey) (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Public Highways (Temporary Road Closures) (Fees and Penalties) Order, 2016; The Public Highways (Al Fresco Licences) (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Amalgamation and Migration of Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Financial Services Commission (Limited Liability Partnerships) (Fees) Regulations, 2016; The Protected Cell Companies and Incorporated Cell Companies (Fees payable to the Guernsey Financial Services Commission) Regulations, 2016; The Guernsey Finance LBG (Levy) (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2016; The Limited Partnerships (Fees, Annual Validations and Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations, 2016; and The Income Tax (Approved International Agreements) (Implementation) (Country by Country Reporting) Regulations, 2016.

1215 **The Bailiff:** I have not received notice of any motion to annul any of those Statutory Instruments.

ORDINANCES

**II. Committee for Employment & Social Security –
The Supplementary Benefit (Residence Conditions) Ordinance, 2017 approved**

Article II

The States are asked to decide:

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Supplementary Benefit (Residence Conditions) Ordinance, 2017", and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

This proposition has been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

1220 **The Greffier:** Article II – Committee for Employment & Social Security – Supplementary Benefit (Residence Conditions) Ordinance.

The Bailiff: Is there any request for debate or clarification? No.

We go straight to the vote then on the Supplementary Benefit (Residence Conditions) Ordinance, 2017. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

1225 **The Bailiff:** I declare them carried.

**III. States' Trading Supervisory Board and
Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure –
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy –
Debate commenced**

Article III

The States are asked to decide:

Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy' of the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, they are of the opinion:

1. To rescind Resolution 2 of 1st February, 2007 on Billet d'État I of 2007, Resolution 2 of 30th November, 2007 on Article XII of Billet d'État XXIV of 2007, Resolution 4 of 9th December, 2010 on Article V of Billet d'État XXIV of 2010 and Resolution 1 of 22nd February, 2012 on Article VII of Billet d'État IV of 2012, and approve revised recycling targets to apply only to waste generated by households as follows:

- a. 60% by the end 2022; and*
- b. 70% by the end of 2030.*

2. To rescind the following resolutions of 12th February, 2014 on Article I of Billet d'État II of 2014 –

- a. Resolutions 4 and 5, in relation to tendering for the Transfer Station and the transportation and export of residual waste to an off-island energy from waste facility;*
- b. Resolution 6, in relation to the approval of recommended tenderers and the release of relevant funds for capital and operational costs for the Transfer Station and the transportation and export of residual waste to an off-island energy from waste facility;*
- c. Resolution 7, in relation to tendering for other on-Island infrastructure; and*
- d. Resolution 8, in relation to the approval of recommended tenderers and the release of relevant funds for capital costs up to a total sum not to exceed £29.5 million.*

3. To approve the change in the method of treatment of food waste from on-island In-Vessel Composting to the export and transportation of food waste and its subsequent treatment at a suitable off-island facility.

4. To authorise the States' Trading Supervisory Board:

- a. to tender for the export and transportation of food waste and its subsequent treatment at a suitable off-island facility;
- b. to continue the tender process for the export and transportation of residual waste and its subsequent treatment at an off-island energy from waste facility;
- c. to continue the tender process for the construction or operation or the construction and operation of –
 - i. a Transfer Station;
 - ii. a Materials Recovery Facility;
 - iii. a Household Waste Recycling Centre; and
 - iv. a Repair and Reuse Centre and any other general site infrastructure at Longue Hougue,and to direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board, on receipt of tenders, to submit a full business case or cases in relation to such infrastructure and services, to the Policy & Resources Committee, in accordance with any requirements of the Policy & Resources Committee.

5. To authorise the States' Trading Supervisory Board to approve tenderers for any of the facilities or services referred to in proposition 4, subject to prior approval of a full business case relating to the facilities or services in question by the Policy & Resources Committee and to direct the Policy & Resources Committee, upon its approval of such a full business case and the approval of the relevant tender by the States' Trading Supervisory Board, to make available a loan from the proceeds of the States of Guernsey Bond Issue (of December 2014) to fund the capital costs of such facilities or services; and to direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to fund the loan interest and capital repayments from the Solid Waste Trading Account.

6. If any of the costs of the Solid Waste Strategy exceed those indicated in the Policy Letter, to delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee to approve revisions to the relevant estimated capital and operational costs.

7. To note that all solid waste management costs of the States referred to in the Policy Letter are to be managed through the Solid Waste Trading Account in accordance with Resolution 2 of 12th February, 2014 on Article I of Billet d'État II of 2014 and to direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board to recover such costs fully through charges to householders, businesses and other users of waste management services.

The above propositions have been submitted to Her Majesty's Procureur for advice on any legal or constitutional implications in accordance with Rule 4(1) of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Greffier: Article III – States' Trading Supervisory Board and Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure – Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy.

1230 **The Bailiff:** Before I call upon one of the Presidents to open the debate, let me just explain how I have agreed this debate will proceed. Because the policy letter is presented by two Committees, or one Board and one Committee, I have agreed that both Presidents may make an opening speech, and both Presidents may make a speech in reply. It will be Deputy Brehaut first, followed by Deputy Parkinson.

1235 As you know there are four amendments before you. We will take first the amendment that is conveniently marked amendment 1, to be proposed by Deputy Kuttelwascher, and seconded by Deputy Mooney. So amendment 1 will be first. If that amendment is carried there will be no need for Deputy Roffey to lay his amendment 2. However, he wishes to proceed with amendment 4, although it may need some revision after amendment 1 has been passed, if it is passed, he would
1240 wish to proceed with amendment 4, and we would take that next. If amendment 1 is not carried we will then take amendments 2 and 4 together. The final amendment to be debated will be

amendment 3, which will be debated on its own before we move into general debate. So that is the procedure that we will follow.

1245 I call upon the President of the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure Deputy Brehaut, to make the first speech.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, very much, sir.

1250 As has been said, this is a joint policy letter the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure have the ownership of the Strategy, the policy, and the States have already, as we know, decided to resolve to export waste, and the doing bit sits with the States' Trading Supervisory Board.

Now, if I was former Bill Bell, because of the history of this subject, I would have probably stood up and said, 'I move', and sat down again, but I am sorry to bore you, but I will just say a little bit more than that. So, thank you, Mr Bailiff, and Members.

1255 From the moment I entered this Assembly back in 2004, one topic, one policy area, has dominated the agenda: our waste and what to do with it. As each and every perceived opportunity for a solution has come our way, we have paused, faltered, hesitated, reassessed, re-evaluated, re-tendered, and stubbornly, as is our trait, failed to come up with a solution.

1260 I well recall the former Chief Minister, Laurie Morgan, telling us all that procrastination was the art of keeping up with yesterday. The consequences of that are best illustrated in the similar quote that gets to the heart of the matter. Procrastination is like a credit card: it is a lot of fun until you get the bill, and boy, have we had some bills.

1265 We should, however, just look at what we have rejected before today. A 70,000 tonne incinerator, for those of you present in the Assembly at that time, you will well recall how the waste rising figures dominated that debate. They were set in stone, definitive, immovable, absolute, and we had to build a facility to cope with that known number. We all know the history, not content with refusing one incinerator we thought we would have a go at doing it all again, and as not doing anything had proved to be doable, we decided to do it again. The second time we rejected a 40,000 tonne incinerator. Well, we had time to do it then, didn't we? We had a Plan B, or usually it is a Plan B&Q and the Q is usually a quarry. Quarries have actually served us very well for decades, Bordeaux, St Germaine and Mont Cuet. It is not particularly environmentally friendly, the sites have to be managed, monitored for years for gas and leachates, so though pleasant, even picturesque, 10 years after their use as landfill sites, while in use they are probably the worst neighbour you can wish for.

1275 I would ask you to reflect for a moment on the quantity of waste we are now dealing with: 22,000 tonnes, of which household waste is approximately 11,000 tonnes. Who should take credit for that? Yes, we promoted the policy, the waste hierarchy, but it is the community who have embraced and delivered on it. I do not believe for one moment our community wants to replace, reuse, recycle, repair, with buy it, bin it and burn it.

1280 In previous debates, there has always been, or at least there appears to have been a Plan B on the horizon, there was always an emerging technology, smaller incinerators, pyrolysis, passive thermal treatments, and a salesman could always show you a system that worked in some remote community somewhere. We have seen working drawings of projects that the Magic Circle would give their collective eye teeth for. You place black bags in at one end and garden furniture pops out the other. (*Laughter*) They never stipulated whether each table came with a parasol, but then the devil is always in the detail.

1290 But now we are in a different place. There is no time, there is no Plan B. For newer Members who feel hemmed in by the collective voting record of those who have come before. I understand, and in fact, I think we all do. But I would implore you to get behind these proposals, for we are here today, because we have spent too much time, and other peoples' money, getting to this point. The solution, surely, cannot be to spend even more time and consequently more money.

We have already decided to export our waste. We will have a facility that will turn waste into products that there is clearly a market for. That product is fuel, refuse derived fuel (RDF). It is

1295 pretty uninspiring to look at, it is a grey-black mass of stuff. It is not easy to describe, because it
contains nothing, yet it contains everything. Its blandness, its ordinariness, hides its true value,
because its composition is actually very important. RDF does not have to be tinder dry, it should
be not of the highest calorific value, because incinerators need to run at an even temperature, too
hot then the throughput decreases, and demand reduces. If we are to add back in all of those
1300 elements suggested, all recyclables that we know are of a high calorific value, then we are
changing the spec of a product that we have gone to the market with. It would be a mistake to
change the composition of a product in the knowledge that in doing so you have reduced the
demand for it.

I just want to emphasise that point. I appreciate there will be amendments in play later, but I
need to emphasise this, that energy from waste plants have an acceptance criteria. RDF, refuse
1305 derived fuel is frequently tested and inspected and rejected. Why should a plant that has to meet
strict European or international standards choose a product that produces high levels of dioxin
and requires more scrupulous cleaning of flue gasses and produces more toxic fly ash? In
choosing to be responsible in dealing with our waste and seeking the best environmental option,
we should not then limit the facilities that are able to accept it.

1310 As I read it, some of you who cannot support these proposals will do so because you believe
there are options. No doubt we will hear how Jersey presents a real opportunity, and we can put
things on hold while Jersey takes some time out to introduce legislation to import waste; then
wait a while longer while the Jersey States debates the legislation, and maybe wait a little longer
still while the States becomes aware of how their community feel about burning Guernsey's waste.

1315 To introduce such uncertainty at this stage is a risk that we simply should not take. Let's not
forget, bearing in mind the restraints on Jersey when they tendered, because of the political
context, I believe they came either 18th out of 19 – or was it 17th out of 18? I cannot remember.

Incidentally, Jersey's waste problem has not disappeared, for the ash from their incinerator,
that is the bottom ash, is still stored at La Collette, waiting to be exported for disposal. If Guernsey
1320 is to add to that pile of ash, then they will be expecting us to pay a premium for Jersey having to
handle the export of both our toxic fly ash and the bottom ash too.

At some point in the future, Jersey may well be an option, and the contract with Geminor gives
us ample opportunity to review our options, or alternatives, as they emerge over time. But time,
not to labour the point, is something we simply do not have.

1325 Members, this path is well travelled, so I will not spend a great deal more time dealing with
matters that will clearly arise in debate regardless of my introduction.

But I would ask you to reflect on our own processes, the procurement process, overseen by
P&R and staff colleagues, because today marks not the end, but the beginning of another
process, and by way of illustration, I am sorry to be dull in reading out the letter of comment from
1330 P&R that is appended to the report, or published on the States' website anyway. If I could just
read it, because I think it is significant. This is the Committee, P&R:

The Committee recognises the urgency of the Propositions in order that new waste management facilities can be put
in place before Mont Cuet is, to all intents and purposes, effectively full. Even if contracts are signed imminently, the
timetable remains extremely tight, with no room for slippage. Ideally, there would be no such time pressure but it is
necessary to be pragmatic and deal with the reality of the situation that [faces us on Island] It is important, however, to
bear in mind that approval of the Propositions simply enable STSB to progress the procurement process. It does *not*
mean that all the projects outlined in the policy letter are approved, and there will be (and needs to be) further
scrutiny from Policy & Resources before any contracts can be signed. Such scrutiny will follow the well-established
procedures for preparing, reviewing and assessing business cases.

So that is the level of scrutiny that is there. Now, if we add to that the obligation that
Environment & Infrastructure and the States' Trading Supervisory Board have to constantly review
the policy, that is the second level of scrutiny, along with the role of STSB as the Waste Disposal
1335 Authority, and the cross-committee work carried out by the Waste Strategy Implementation
Programme Board, there are numerous layers of scrutiny yet to come before this decision today.

1340 Sir, I want to stress how acutely aware I am personally of the increase in charges to the consumer. The quarries I spoke of a moment ago provided a solution for decades. It was as convenient as it was cheap. Until this report was published I do not think I had met anyone who actually knew what their waste disposal was costing them either weekly, or monthly. It was that cheap that people did not actually pay much attention to what proportion it was of their rates. The average figure of £7 put back to back with the average existing figure of about £2.15 is stark. Yes, we are starting from a low base, but nevertheless, the increase is real. However, it is not the case that your black bag waste will cost you £28 a month, fixed, as some have presented it. As a consumer you do have control over what you choose to take out of your waste stream, or not. Bearing in mind 40% of black bag waste is food, it is quite possible that families will move to a bag a fortnight rather than a week. Arguably £3.50 or £7.00 but probably costed out at about £5 a fortnight for those who have bothered to do that.

1345 You do have to ask, don't you, how on earth do families from St Peter Port manage when they move to other parishes? Having been accustomed to two collections weekly, for some that would be four bags a week. Just how on earth do they manage with one weekly collection of just one bag? The answer is they adjust their behaviour to the means of disposal available to them. Families will do that when given numerous opportunities to reduce their weekly waste bill.

1355 Sir, in closing, it is usual for politicians to be pragmatic at this stage, to explain away a political cul-de-sac such as this as 'well, we are where we are'. The waste U-turn, or the no-through road, cannot be readily explained away in the same manner. It is more of a 'ow the heck did we get here?' What these proposals do is give us, however, a clear direction – not a way out, but more than that, a way forward.

1360 Finally, sir, I felt very uncomfortable listening to or reading, whether online, or in the actual *Press*, condemnation of Deputies who led this process before today. I have no doubt they were as committed and as focused then as we all are here today, and acted in good faith with the community at the very centre of their considerations.

Thank you, sir.

1365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Sir, the title of this States' Report is 'Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy'. In other words we are taking steps to put into effect the strategies decided by this Assembly in 2012 and 2014. To do so we are proposing some minor tweaks to the strategy in terms of the processing of food waste etc. but we are not revisiting the whole strategy, and neither should this Assembly. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1375 The States have spent long enough debating the options for dealing with the Island's solid waste, and have rejected an on-Island incinerator on at least three occasions. The solution that has eventually been agreed, the export of the Island's waste for energy recovery elsewhere, may not be Guernsey's policy for all time, but it is our policy for the time being.

1380 I want to quote some words to you: 'Waste disposal in Guernsey has been the subject of a number of States' debates over the last decade.' This would probably not be news to anyone, although these are not, in fact, my words; they are the opening line from a policy letter the Board of Administration brought to the States in September 2003. That letter referred to the urgent requirement for new putrescible waste facilities that had been identified nearly ten years previously, in 1994.

1385 So, we are here taking the next steps in the implementation of a solution that was finally agreed at least 20 years after the problem was identified, and still some Members seem to want to revisit that plan. Well, sir, the time for prevarication is well and truly behind us. Any visit to Mont Cuet today will show that the quarry is now full, and we are mounding up waste in a continual battle against the wind.

We are dealing with one of the most complex programmes the States has ever undertaken, with eight distinct projects. Each of these will be the subject of a separate business case appraisal,

1390 and each of these projects will only proceed if signed off by P&R. What this policy letter changes is that it seeks the approval of the States to marginally increase the delegated authority of P&R, in particular, to increase the amount of the capital investment that they may authorise.

1395 If all goes well in the implementation of this programme, we hope to have the new facilities in place, and operating, to enable us to achieve our recycling targets, and export the residue of our solid waste by the end of 2018, that is next year. But I have to say the programme is very tight, and Mont Cuët will be functionally full by the middle of that year. While we can store waste for a while, we certainly have no room for delay.

1400 We also have no spare resources to undertake any further reviews. The staff working on these projects may, in some cases, be working for the Environment & Infrastructure Committee, but they are all employed at the STSB or in the trading assets within the STSB portfolio. It will require 100% of their effort, and attention, to deliver the agreed strategy before the storage of waste on-Island becomes a serious problem.

1405 One of the strengths of the current strategy, which incidentally, I first proposed in my maiden speech in 2004, is that it will allow Guernsey a range of options in the future. By converting the residue of our solid waste into refuse derived fuel, we will retain the option to export it to any energy from waste plant that wants to take it. Or to dispose of the residue on-Island. Any plant, whether on-Island or off-Island will have waste acceptance criteria, and the definition of what is acceptable as fuel in terms of regulations and technology is likely to tighten rather than get looser. I do not know what Guernsey will be doing with its solid waste residue in 10 years' time, but I do know that we will have a wider range of options if we process the waste into RDF. 1410 Treating the waste to this extent on-Island, is therefore a sensible thing to do, and a step that future generations will thank us for. Just as they will be grateful that the States did not waste taxpayers' money on a 70,000 tonne incinerator. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

1415 To those Members calling for further reviews, some of whom supported the 70,000 tonne incinerator, I would say this, the States will inevitably have to review the new system, both in the post implementation review, that would follow any major capital project, and as the operating contracts come up for renewal. The proposed contract with Geminor has a maximum term of five years, and the proposed contract with Guernsey Recycling Group has a requirement for an independent review at five years. So the States will have to consider whether the strategy is working well over the coming years, whatever may be decided today. Asking our staff to conduct 1420 further reviews *now*, when they are fully committed to implementing the decisions the States has already taken would be a waste of time, and a distraction that we simply cannot afford.

1425 What we need from the Assembly is your full support, to enable us to get on with the vitally important work in hand. This work is essential to solving the Island's waste problem in the short to medium term, and will put the States in a better place to determine its policies in relation to solid waste after that. This is the sensible path forward, and indeed, at this stage the only practical path forward.

So, I will ask all Members to support the Propositions unamended.

The Bailiff: We move to the first amendment, to be proposed by Deputy Kuttelwascher.

1430

Amendment 1

To amend Proposition 1 concerning recycling targets, by –

a. inserting after "IV of 2012" the words "and Resolution 18 on Article I of Billet d'État II of 2014."; and

b. deleting all the words from and including "and approve revised recycling targets" to the end.

To insert a new Proposition 8 –

'8. To direct the States Trading Supervisory Board (as Waste Disposal Authority) and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, after consultation with other relevant committees of the States and the Douzaines, to determine what changes need to be made to

legislation, policy (including any statutory or non-statutory plans relating to waste), contractual, operational or other arrangements to –

a. cease kerbside collections of recyclates and provide instead for collection of recyclates through existing and improved bring bank or other similar facilities; and

b. require the Waste Disposal Authority and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure to cease the recycling of certain waste streams on the basis of cost considerations and provide instead for such waste streams to be recovered as part of residual waste for recovery, and that such determination must include consideration of any implications under international conventions and agreements related to waste extended to Guernsey; and also to direct that the States Trading Supervisory Board and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure shall report back with their conclusions to the States in propositions and a policy letter to be submitted to Her Majesty's Greffier by no later than March 2019.'

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Thank you, sir.

Members, my modest presentation on this amendment has a title – I do not like speeches, I gave that up years ago – and it is titled as follows: 'the facilitation of best value for money delivery of our waste management project', and I have very little that I disagree with ... I do not disagree with anything Deputy Parkinson said, or 99% of what Deputy Brehaut has said, because my amendment does not seek to delay anything. In fact, it could actually speed up events, and I can tell you why, in spite of the chuckles.

Sir I have not read, or asked to read the amendment, because I think it is better because there are cross references to various Propositions and things, it is better just to let people know what the essence of it is.

In the first Proposition I am suggesting we remove recycling targets. Why is that? It is the targets that drive the need for expensive waste separation streams, and the provision of kerbside collections. Now, at the present time I think that is a very honourable thing to be doing, because the main purpose has been to stop the rate at which we fill up Mont Cuet, because it is filling up. However, in the last quarter of 2018 and maybe a little sooner, we are going to have another facility available for the production of refuse derived fuel. So we can divert all sorts of things to that, and it will not be going in to Mont Cuet.

The Committees, or the Department and the Committee themselves, if you look at their policy letter, actually seek to rescind nine Resolutions – which is hardly a small change. On the second page, page 2, the change will change the method of treatment of food waste. There is a reason why food waste has not appeared on the horizon, is the massive cost of trying to deal with it, and there is a good argument, why bother? I mean, why bother? Most food will go into the black bag anyhow, and even if you have a recycling facility, there is no guarantee anybody will be storing food in their little plastic box in their flat for a week or whatever, and this has been the actual response in other places in the UK, where there is food recycling available, because of the inconvenience of it, and the fact that you have a container which after a few days starts to pong, people just do not do it. So there is no guarantee that even if you have a food waste recycling provision in place it would be taken up to any great extent.

The waste recycling targets are also being made, or being modified, by the two Committees, one of them is to extend the dates for these targets by five years, whereas the delivery of this process is only going to be three years, but does that tell a story that maybe they do not really feel they are ever going to achieve them. Why extend by five years when the process is only being extended by three.

The reason I looked at the whole issue of kerbside collections is the frightening capital cost of this. Pre-tendering, the forecast, and it is in one of the tables in the report, was £20 million – that doubled, £39.9 million over 20 years. That is £2 million a year. If we were to raise these sums for whatever reason, I would rather spend them somewhere else. My view is that recycling can continue, and should continue, for those waste streams where it is economical to do so. I am quite

1470 happy and content with keeping that with bring banks, which have in their time and still are very successful, and it is what I use most. I would expect paper and cardboard to continue.

1475 I mention two particular streams that we choose to recover, because recover is far more accurate than the word recycle, because believe me, not all that we recover is recycled. Let's take polystyrene, now in terms of tonnage, it is quite small, very high calorific value, but it has a high volume, so I can see the logic in keeping it out of Mont Cuet at the present time, but when we have a refuse derived waste stream why not include it in the refuse derived fuel stream? It has a calorific value and to me that affects the value of the fuel because you do not want a fuel with no calorific value, do you? A lot of polystyrene still goes that way anyhow. It goes in the black bag anyhow. At £5,000 a tonne, that sounds a lot and the tonnage is what, five tonnes? It is not a massive amount of money, but it just illustrates, why should we be doing it when there is an alternative, which would cost a whole lot less?

1480 I also brought up the issue of Tetra Paks, and the statement I made in the past is accurate. When I last checked it was £2,400 a tonne, that was modified recently by Deputy de Sausmarez who said now it is only about £1,000 a tonne. My, what a relief – £1,000 a tonne! It is just money isn't it?

1485 Now, the problem with Tetra Paks is, we recover them, or some of us do, but what happens to them? Is the word 'recycling' relevant any more? We recycle paper into paper and cardboard into cardboard and the one valuable recycling stream is aluminium. We should make money on that – if we are not, somebody is doing something wrong. But Tetra Paks, what actually happens to them? Why have we now gone to £1,000 a tonne, when it was more than double that? I am curious to know what happens. But, the other thing I know is no end of Tetra Paks that have been recovered as a waste stream are dumped, and the reason given when you ask, and I have been made aware of these situations, is that they are contaminated. That is even, I believe, more common for plastics, because what causes them to be dumped is people putting black plastic into the containers, and indeed various plastic films and whatever.

1495 So, what is changing now is that from 2018 we can continue with our current strategy, and that is export it, because what happens to all these other so-called recyclables, paper ... they are all exported. They are all exported. We do not keep them here.

1500 Which brings me on to that interesting one, glass. We do not really recycle glass, we collect it and smash it up and what happens to it? Well, when I last checked there is an almighty great mound at Longue Hougue, maybe 30 metres square, going up and up and up, and we are just looking at it. Now, why are we doing it? I believe that food waste is acceptable to go into the refuse derived fuel stream, and I have also been told that they do not really care about glass either. Now, glass is an odd one, but it is certainly not being recycled. You only recycle a glass bottle if you use it as a bottle. So recycling is a term which is a little misleading.

1505 When you look at the waste hierarchy, I am all for that, but the issue of recycling is something that needs to drilled down into. The top of it is reduce, and that is where we should be focusing our attention on food waste, because the biggest problem with food waste is you and me, we buy too much, and we chuck it away. Now, what is being done about that? What is being done about that? That is where we need to look at it. If you provide some sort of very expensive way of dealing with it, it will have the opposite effect.

1510 The second one, reuse: I am all in favour of that. That is brilliant, I like to mend things if they break, I have always done it, I have been up to Longue Hougue and delivered something that needed some attention and somebody else can use. No problem.

1515 But the recycling issue is one that now is going to change because the environment has changed, because there is a different way we can deal with some of the recyclates. Plastic is an interesting one, because the value of that dropped out, or the bottom dropped out of the market when the oil price dropped, and they were mothballing recycling, plastic recycling plants in England, because it was cheaper to buy the raw plastic. Now, this is a philosophical argument, for me: what is wrong with diverting those sort of waste streams into refuse derived fuel, which can produce electricity, can produce heat, they are no longer going into a waste tip, or a mound or a

Q, as Deputy Brehaut said, a quarry. They are going to be used. If you then, as it were, obviate the need to burn oil, or gas, or coal to produce the electricity, what is wrong with that? I do not have any problem with that as a philosophical argument. So I am not changing the waste hierarchy, but I am just saying look carefully at what you mean by recycling, and if we actually mean by it we are actually re-using in some other way, what is wrong with that? As long as there is some sort of positive outcome from the way we do that.

The kerbside collections are so horrendously expensive, and the biggest new expense will be food waste. If you look at the tables £8-and-a-bit million operationally, £2-and-a-bit million, over £10 million altogether on there. Take it out. We do not need it. Why do it? In this report, it actually says – and I have got it here somewhere, but I do not need to find it – that the food waste recycling is *required* to try and meet our targets. The targets are driving that. Remove the targets, remove the problem. We will still, if this amendment is passed, continue with what we are doing, there will be no delays, and what is more it would be of great assistance to P&R, because they are now being manoeuvred into a corner.

There are warnings in here. One of the Resolutions says we should give carte blanche to P&R to pay whatever is required as this progresses without coming back to us. That, to me, is a red light, and a warning, and it is Proposition 6. (**A Member:** hear, hear.) If this amendment is passed, I think that Proposition 6 will become almost irrelevant, because you could take maybe £50 million out of the projected costs over the next 20 years. Now, I know if you re-divert some of these things to the refuse derived waste fuel, there will be an additional cost there, but that will marginal compared to what you would save.

So, that is what it is all about. Do look at the cost of what you are doing, when there is an alternative which is acceptable. Do not bother with these targets, they are being massaged anyhow, because they are not attainable. How we can compare ourselves with Wales as a similar country I do not know, but that is another issue, and I am sure those who have read the report know what I am talking about.

I have got a bit to say in summary, but I will not give that until we have had the debate, but that is my point. No delays, lower costs, make life easier for P&R to be able to sign off all the costs as we go along, and let's just be pragmatic, and give our long suffering community some respite from this ever increasing onslaught of charges, taxes, duties, and whatever. You all remember the 'Enough is Enough' campaign: this falls squarely into that sort of category, be careful what you wish for.

Thank you, sir.

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

Deputy Mooney: I do.

The Bailiff: Deputies Brehaut and Parkinson, do either of you wish to speak at this stage?

1560

Deputy Brehaut: No, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson, do you wish to speak at this stage or later?

Deputy Parkinson: No, later on, if I may, sir.

1565

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I am going to speak at some length on this particular amendment, and as a result will be able to speak very briefly on my own amendments later on.

1570

I would also like, with your permission, to put my remarks on the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment into context by making a few general remarks and I fully accept that by doing that, I then forfeit my right to speak generally later on.

1575

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Roffey: So first, a few general remarks.

1580

In theory, as Deputy Parkinson has said, today's debate is really, simply about increasing the financial limits set for P&R to sign off the Waste Strategy. It is not about re-visiting the fundamentals of that strategy. However, anybody who expects Members not to take a fresh look at those fundamentals today is, I think, being very naïve – firstly, because the cost is one of the most controversial elements of the strategy; secondly, because many of us were not Members of either the last Assembly, or the one before that, where the strategy was first approved and then taken forward.

1585

Sir, a very brief history. The Assembly of 2008-12, by a hefty majority, approved a proposal from PSD under the leadership, for the sake of this project, of Deputy Scott Ogier, who was Vice-President but led on this project, for the purchase of an integrated waste disposal system from the French firm Suez. Now, was 'integrated waste disposal system' just a fancy way of saying an incinerator with a few added extras? I do not know, but it is what PSD and Deputy Ogier chose to call it. They signed that contract, but a few months later, seven years ago to this very month – seven years ago to the same month – the same Assembly by a majority of one supported a Proposition from Deputy Mary Lowe to renege on that contract, and to seek a new waste strategy instead. Incidentally, by doing so, they also incurred millions of pounds in penalties.

1590

1595

Since that time the Committees involved, both the current ones and their predecessors, have faithfully followed the low road to its inevitable conclusion. Sir, I do not blame them in any way for following the directions of this States, but, personally I think that that low road has brought us to a pretty rotten destination.

1600

Two years after dumping Suez in 2012, the States agreed a new strategy which, in essence, was to minimise waste arisings, maximise recycling, and to export our residual waste for somebody else to burn. I do not like that strategy. I do not like it in principle; I do not like the cost; I do not like the lack of control created by being dependent on third parties instead of dealing with our own problem on-Island. I am therefore philosophically against the currently approved Waste Strategy, but I do not blame either E&I or Trading Supervisory for carrying out the approved policies of this Assembly.

1605

1610

Is that what they have done? I think it is. As Deputy Kuttelwascher has said, many of the details have changed, a few larger elements, such as dealing with food waste on-Island have been abandoned, and one huge element, the cost, bears absolutely no relation to the figures used five years ago to tempt the States down this route. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) But the fundamentals – setting high, probably unrealistic, recycling targets and shipping our residual waste for somebody else to burn – remain faithful to that original strategy.

1615

So, if we had the luxury of time, would I be arguing for yet another U-turn? I think that is a tricky question. I think I would be between the rock of being asked to sign off on a strategy I did not agree with, and the hard place of knowing that yet another U-turn by this Assembly would probably bring the States into utter disrepute. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) 'Hear, hear', I hear from my left, but I have to confess that despite that dichotomy, I probably could not vote for a strategy which I fundamentally disagreed with, if we had the luxury of 10 more years' landfill at Mont Cuet. But we do not. As has been expressed by both of the opening presidential speeches, time has run out. Yes the landfill could be stretched a bit further, if we had somewhere else to dispose of hazardous waste and to compost green waste. Well, I cannot suggest any, so we have zero time.

1620

We have a gun to our heads. It was placed there by previous Assemblies, we may resent it, but that gun is all the real just for that. So, against all of my instincts, I find myself having to vote to send our residual waste off-Island for other people to burn for us. That is simple real politics, but

it does mean that I support that strategy in a way that totally disregards all of the costs involved.
1625 That brings me on to the Kuttelwascher amendment.

Mr Bailiff, I ask the question, what is it about waste that makes it so uniquely exempt from cost considerations? (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) We all want the best possible education system for Guernsey, but we accept that we are constrained with what we can provide by financial considerations. We want the best law and order provision for our precious Island, but once again
1630 the money available limits what we can do. We desperately want the best health care for our Islands, for ourselves and for our families, but even in this most important area of policy, in my view the most important area of policy, which impacts profoundly on Islanders' lives, what we do is trammelled by cost constraints.

Contrast that with waste disposal, we simply get told this is the best, the most environmental,
1635 the most efficient way of disposing of our waste, and whatever it costs, the cost seems to be almost incidental. We are told that the people of Guernsey simply must accept that in future waste disposal costs will be far higher than they used to be, that there is going to have to be a step change in our waste disposal charges. Actually, I think that the vast majority of Islanders accept that. They know there has to be a step change in waste charges, but what they really, really
1640 want is for that step to be as small as we can possibly make it. They want us to implement this strategy as cheaply as we can. Cheap is not a dirty word. Certainly it is not when you are one of the thousands of Islanders just about managing to live in our expensive Island now. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Sir, I will scream if I hear one more time that £7 a week only equates to the cost of a litre of
1645 milk a day. Has it not occurred to us that for many it may make the difference over whether they can actually afford that litre of milk per day? Not everybody is on £40,000 or £50,000. Many are struggling to support families on a fraction of that income. So cheap is not a dirty word.

Nor do we think that waste disposal is different to other Government costs, and is not going to
1650 be prioritised against it, simply because it is not coming out of General Revenue like education or health care. It is money we are taking from the same community, and you can only take so much money from that community. It does not matter what teat you are pulling, it is the same cash cow you are milking. Thank you, Deputy Inder, for that one. (*Laughter*) We are starting to milk that cow dry.

This £7 a week is not an isolated charge. TRP is going up 10% a year, compounded.
1655 (*Interjection*) Water bills: water bills used to be really modest, because liquid waste disposal was paid for separately out of taxation. Now, thanks to the waste water charge, they are about the same size as electricity bills. Straw after straw being put on Islanders' backs – many of which are quite strong, and will shrug it off without any problem, but many of which are not. To say that is a matter for Social Security to deal with is really beyond belief. There is a huge tranche of people
1660 that fall outside the care of Social Security but still struggle with all these extra charges. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Sir, I stand shoulder to shoulder with Deputy Kuttelwascher in trying to reduce the costs of this
1665 strategy, and I agree with much, but not all, of the content of his amendment. Certainly, I support the first part, scrapping recycling targets. Sir, 95% of time, government targets, of any sort, lead to rotten policy. Policies chasing targets which have been plucked out of the air rather than policies rooted in the realities on the ground. There is the odd exception, such as spending a percentage of government income on vital capital projects and infrastructural renewal, which we are failing to do, but it is a good target nevertheless, but those examples are few and far between.

Just let us imagine, once again, if we took this target-led approach to government, to other
1670 areas of States' policy. Now, I want as many pupils as possible to achieve five GCSEs grade A* to C including Maths and English. It is not something I achieved myself, but I want as many others to achieve it as possible. Imagine if we set as targets, say, that, I do not know, by 2022 x% of pupils must be achieving that benchmark. Come 2020, if we are falling well short of that, we would be faced with two options: either just abandoning our self-imposed targets or throwing money at it.
1675 (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) We could probably do it if cash was no object. Probably do it – smaller

class sizes, one to one tuition for those who were struggling and on the cusp. The only problem with that approach, it would not be a problem for education, it would mean that there would be no money left over for other things like health care and law and order.

1680 Exactly the same could be said of targets for five-year cancer survival rates or for crime reduction. The cash would have to follow the targets, and in so doing would starve other areas of policy and would skew priorities badly. Or else we would just have to shrug our shoulders and say when we failed to meet our own targets, 'Oh well, never mind, we tried.' Either way it will be very bad government. Target-led policies almost always are bad government. It is no different with recycling targets.

1685 I have to say so far we have been abject failures in meeting our own targets in this regard. Do not forget when we first set a target of 50%, that was set at a time when the methodology for calculating our recycling rates did not include green waste, and under that methodology the recycling rate at the time was about 36% – you remember it written on the back of all of those vehicles, 'Well done Guernsey, 36 point something percent.' Time went by and the rate stubbornly
1690 refused to increase to any great degree. We were clearly going to miss our target by a country mile. So the PSD had a wizard wheeze: they changed the methodology to include green waste and overnight Guernsey's recycling rate leapt from the mid 30's to the mid 40's. Now, I do not know which methodology is right. I do not whether green waste should be included or should not be. All I know is if you set a target under one and change it in order to get to the other, you are just
1695 cheating yourself, frankly, and it is trick that can only be played once.

Next time we will either have to admit defeat or throw cash at the problem. I can hear it now, it will be the latter, won't it? We will be told unless we do, and either a lot of draconian things for the people of Guernsey, or else spend a lot of their money, this Assembly will fail to reach the recycling targets that it itself has set. We cannot allow that to happen, the money will follow the
1700 targets, rather than being properly prioritised. The result: less cash for health, for education and for law and order.

So, I say let us recycle as much as we reasonably can, in a cost effective way. I am actually quite passionate about recycling. Before the States ever got involved in it, I used to get leaflets from the Guernsey Conservation Society, whatever, Mr Richard Collas used to hand them out, and go and
1705 recycle whenever I could. Please do not think I am against recycling, but for goodness' sake, let that process, and the policies underpinning it, be led by real considerations, not by targets! (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

What about the second part of the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment? Well, I partly agree with him. I agree that not absolutely everything which technically can be recycled should be recycled
1710 regardless of cost. I actually agree that the idea of an enhanced bring bank system should not be dismissed out of hand.

My understanding is there are three main objections to bring banks. Firstly, that they will not maximise recycling rates. Well actually, we do not know how much we can recycle using a bring bank system, because when we only had bring banks, before the *trial*, and remember at the
1715 moment it is nothing more than a *trial*, it has never been made permanent, before the trial of kerbside, people going to bring banks were motivated only by one thing, a sense of doing the right thing, and even on that basis we actually recycled quite an impressive amount. Under the new regime of charging per bag to dispose of your waste, people would be motivated by two things, the sense of doing the right thing, and the financial incentive of reducing the cost of
1720 disposing of their waste. Now, I am a Guernseyman and I have lived in this Island for nearly 60 years, I know that financial considerations in the Guernsey psyche can be quite a powerful stimulant. So, I think that we should not rule out what we could do in that way. So, is it not worth trying?

The next objection is there are not enough sites to put them on. Well, we are only 24 square miles, if we had one for every three square miles we are looking at about eight sites. Let's imagine
1725 it was, I do not know, four on public land and four on private land. Nobody wants it on their private land, we are told. I do not know how much money, at the moment, has been paid to

private land owners to put bring banks. But even if, we wanted four on private land, what about paying £25,000 a year for each? That would amount to £100,000 – an awful lot, but cheaper in the context of the £2 million a year for kerbside, and yet that would, on a 5% notional return, value peoples land at £½ million. Suddenly I think your problem might be that you had too many offers rather than people not being willing to do it.

Deputy Dorey is desperate for redundant greenhouse sites to be used for something more productive. I suspect a few owners who are letting them go derelict would suddenly be coming forward and saying, 'Well, how about my site then?' Let's at least try and be a bit inventive.

And as for four sites on public land, well, the one I tend to use when I go out that way is L'Eree and yet I accept what is being said it is not ideal, it is at the top of a beach, it is in a car park, it is not that offensive. I think it is actually a lack of will to find sites rather the fact that they have a problem with sites. (*Interjections*) I know the St Andrew's Douzaine when they were upset there were no more bring banks in St Andrew's wrote to the relevant authority and said, 'Well, what about Brick Field House, central in the Island, it is in St Andrew's on a main road, lots of people come past, there seems to be lots of space in there?' Turned down out of hand. I think what we are suffering from is not a lack of sites but a lack of will.

We are told, there are other objections, some people cannot drive, absolutely right, it is not a perfect system. Some people cannot drive, it is imperfect. It creates extra car journeys. Well, it does not have to. I use bring banks, I do it when I am going to go out in that direction anyway, and yes some pensioners probably would regard it as an outing and go out and do it as an extra journey, well so what? Haven't they got a right to get out around the Island?

Perhaps one of the biggest objections is it could not do food waste. Well, again there have been attempts to promote home composting, cannot be done for everybody, not people living in flats, but it is being done against a backdrop of there being no extra charge for putting your food waste in the black bags. You are paying your TRP, or your rates for rubbish, and it does not matter what you put in there, as long as it is within two bags a week you do not pay any more. I think if we could be really promoting home composting at a time when it would save people money, there might be more mileage in it. As Deputy Kuttelwascher has said if we have ... now we have dropped the idea of in-vessel composting in Guernsey and are just sending it off to an anaerobic digester somewhere else, would it really be the end of the world if some food waste went into the black bag stream?

Now, I accept, despite all my defences of bring banks, they are a worse system than kerbside, kerbside is the ideal. I am not trying to argue otherwise. All I am asking is, at what cost perfection? At what point in the cost scale do we start to question this holy cow? We did not at £1 million a year, it seems we are not at £2 million a year, at what point are we going to say, this is the best thing to do ideally, but it is too expensive? We would prefer to spend that money on the cancer drugs that Guernsey cannot sometimes afford for its own people. We would prefer to put it in to making sure that our education system is top notch. You cannot separate them. This is all money coming from one community.

So, what do I not like about the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment? Well, firstly that the consideration he is asking you for is only into ceasing kerbside. Actually, I think there are three different options that we should be considering. One is continuing with the present *trial*, and it is a trial, and making it permanent, which is what the two Committees want to do. At the other extreme there is not doing kerbside anymore and going to an enhanced bring bank, but in the middle, as identified in this policy letter, there is a half-way house of a more cost effective system of kerbside, by centralising it rather than doing it on a parochial basis. I know there are arguments whether that would be cheaper or would not, but I am naïve, I accept the things told to me in a policy letter as being founded in truth. So, I think that is a weakness that it does not actually ask for the three things to be considered.

I also do not like his time table of reporting back by 2019. I know Deputy Parkinson says there are no staff resources, at all, for doing a report, but let me point out, in their own policy letter they are telling us how much could be saved from a centralised scheme, so they must have looked at it

1780 already in some depth, because I am sure they are not making figures out of the air. Likewise in
the policy letter there are saying reverting simply to bring banks and not collecting food waste
would save, I think they say, *circa* £1 per week per household. So they have obviously looked at
that already in some depth. So I am not asking them to start from scratch, I am only asking them
to codify the work that they have already done. Surely, it is not too much for this Assembly to ask,
1785 when we are being asked to make a very expensive trial permanent, to ask for the data in order to
sign that off.

So, will I vote for this amendment? I am not sure, I think mine are far better to be honest, but
then I would say that, wouldn't I?

I give way, yes.

1790

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, I did not really want to interrupt Deputy Roffey, he is near the end,
but he mentioned the thing about the time, March 2019, mentioned in this amendment. Now that
1795 is on the advice from Law Officers, because there will be implications for various strategies and
rules and God knows what else, and that was suggested. But it is an ultimate date, it could happen
before, because it would all depend on how quickly we actually progress the matter and all this
information could come sooner.

So, I asked for advice on that, and the advice came from St James's Chamber, in fact HM
1800 Procureur, that particular date as being reasonable to meet in the extreme. That is all.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I accept that, but I think in Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment he is asking
1805 for all sorts of legal implications to be considered. I do not really see that discontinuing a
temporary trial, and enhancing our existing system of bring banks needs the legislative changes
that he actually perceives. But there we go, sir.

Will I vote for it? I am not sure, as I say, I think mine are better. But I will listen to debate before
finally deciding. If I do vote for the Kuttelwascher amendment, and it is passed, I will still plough
1810 on with most of with most of mine and try and amend his amended Propositions. But I think on
balance I would actually prefer the flexibility that my various proposals suggests, but for
goodness' sake ... My central message here is yes, we have to send our waste off-Island, we have
to start next year, we cannot allow waste piling up in the streets, we have no alternative, no Plan B.
Fine. Sign that off. But for goodness' sake, the people that we represent do not expect us to take
1815 the leap from that to say that the cost contained in the detail is of no significance! It is. It has to
be prioritised against other spending of public money.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

1820 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Deputy Kuttelwascher said at the beginning of his speech, this will not delay, it will speed up.
Well I hopefully will show you that, in fact, it will delay, and we are too late. Everything has been
designed around the strategy that was agreed in 2012. If you start undoing parts of it, you will
undo the strategy, and we will have to redesign it. That is a fact, and that is what I will try and
1825 show.

I would like to start by briefly explaining my history concerning this issue, so Members can
understand the journey that I have travelled on to get where I am now in support of the current
strategy. From December 2014 to April 2016 I was a member of the Public Services Department.
Since June 2016 I have been a member of the Waste Strategy Implementation Board, as a
1830 member of E&I, whose responsibility it is to oversee the implementation of the Waste Strategy,
that is the responsibility of the Implementation Board.

1835 Going back to 2003 I voted for the Lurgi incinerator, and when the decision was overturned in 2004, I again voted for it, but was on the losing side. In July 2009 only 17 Members, including Deputy Kuttelwascher and I, voted for the failed sursis to look at alternative solutions, including a report on waste. When there were no other proposals I then voted at that meeting for the Suez incinerator. Then in February 2010 Deputy Kuttelwascher brought a requête and that amended the requête by Deputy Lowe, which both of us supported, resulted in the Suez decision being overturned.

1840 After that debate in 2010 PSD carried out an extensive consultation. Part of the results of that consultation were that 63% acknowledged that cost was important, but only 20% felt that the Island should adopt the least cost solution. That was the direction given by the public, quite different to what Deputy Roffey has been saying, and that is the basis of where we are with the strategy. We went out to consultation, the public gave us a message, and the whole system has been designed from that message. 70% felt recycling should be compulsory, reflecting very strong support for higher targets. Again, that was crucial to the 2012 report and the proposals in front of the Assembly.

Kerbside collections were debated in February, May and September, by various Propositions in 2009, and Deputy Kuttelwascher, like me, supported kerbside in *each* debate.

1850 Sir, this emphasises that we have debated waste many times before, before deciding on the current strategy in 2012.

In 2012 when the outcome of the consultation was debated, I said, my preference was for Option D, which was to maximise recycling and to mechanically and biologically treat residual waste to stabilise it and then landfill it. This option was ranked fourth, and did not make the final three options, which were then subject to more detailed assessments in the report. In the debate I said we had to compromise in order to find a way forward, which would have the support of the majority, so I voted for the current strategy, which was proposed by PSD, and Deputy Kuttelwascher was a member of PSD at that time who proposed the strategy which we are following today. If he objected to it that was the time to change it, but he did not, he was a member who proposed it, and his voting record was he fully supported it.

1860 During the debate in 2012, the final three options were considered by the States, all involved high levels of recycling and kerbside collection. Deputy Spruce proposed an alternative, he wanted a maximum of 60% recycling, not the 70%, just stopping at 60%, and he said to note the 60% and he wanted a detailed report on kerbside collection of food, and to pursue the export of an on-Island solution, i.e. an incinerator, and also export, and wanted a report back on both of those options. This was rejected by the States, and they supported the current strategy. It is in line with those actions that we are where we are today.

1870 Deputy Ogier spoke in that debate and he commented on the lack of emails, the lack of noise. He actually stopped in debate, 'listen to the noise' and there was silence, opposing the proposals. The consultation that had clearly come out in favour of export and high recycling and kerbside collection, and all the evidence was that that was supported by the general public, by the total lack of objection to it. This was reinforced two months later, after that debate, when there was a General Election, there was no call for change to the strategy. There was no requête immediately after the Election as had happened in 2014. It was a strategy that was popular, supported in 2012 by 41 Members to 1, of the Assembly. So PSD started work on developing the proposals in line with the strategy agreed by the States.

1875 In 2013 after questions in the States, Deputy Luxon, as the then PSD Minister, then called a meeting of States' Members and he explained that the numbers in the 2012 report, just a year earlier, were significantly out, but there was no requête to reconsider the kerbside and export strategy.

1880 In 2014 there was a debate on further details, and there was a further increase in costs, and the report was supported by the whole States. There was not even a recorded vote, just a called vote. So, quite rightly, with the full support of the Assembly, knowing that the costs had increased, PSD continued to develop the strategy. That report explained from the work of consultants from

1885 expressed interests that Jersey was the 17th most expensive out of 18 for export, which Deputy Brehaut referred to.

1890 It is very unfortunate that due to Guernsey's reputation there has only been one tender for some of the work streams which we are looking at for our waste. That has resulted in extra work and delays, although the original timetable was hopelessly out, just like the costs. As we had to negotiate with a single tenderer in order to try and get value for money. If this amendment is supported it is not going to improve our reputation by changing direction, yet again. Do not expect reputable companies to be queuing up to tender or help us.

1895 I joined PSD in December 2014, I can assure you that the message from board members, the politicians, was very clear, in terms of trying to make progress and keep costs down. There were numerous challenges to the staff in that respect, because we wanted to keep the State operation cost and capital cost which was... the capital cost was £29.5 million by Resolution in 2014. Including that number in those Propositions was a mistake, and you should not have put a number in when you had no tenders to base it on. But we were absolutely focused on trying to keep the costs down, and we have been all the way through, as when I have been a member of PSD, in order to deliver value for money, changes were made. The proposal in 2014 for an on-
1900 Island in-vessel composter turned out to be far too expensive, and was not value for money, so a change was made to include the export of food to an anaerobic digester in the UK, as it was a far less expensive solution. That is an example of how we were focused on trying to save money.

1905 Progress was made on the export of black bag waste, tenders were received, and we actually had competitive tenders, and after an evaluation exercise which was not solely based on cost, Geminor was selected as the preferred tenderer.

1910 Since 2012 the States have spent £3.2 million in developing this strategy. If you include the kerbside scheme it comes to £6 million. This strategy is anchored on high recycling targets. They are the foundation of the strategy. Tenders have been received, contracts have been negotiated, all based on the strategy determined in 2012. If we now change the strategy, extensive work will have to be redone. Do not think of anything different.

1915 Let's look at an example the transfer station. It has been designed producing the bales for export based on waste that has food and recyclates removed because of kerbside collection. We know that if we do not do kerbside collection we will not remove so much of the recyclates, and we will not do food recycling. If we stop doing kerbside collection, and cease the recycling of certain waste streams, on the basis of cost considerations, as proposed by this amendment, that could change the plant that needs to go in the transfer station. We will not need space within the building for food processing, for separate food processing. We might not need space for glass recycling, according to whatever is the outcome of the report. The point I am trying to make is that P&R needs to approve the contracts for the transfer station. How can they say it is value for
1920 money if we do not know what the composition of the waste is going to be, will it contain food, will it include glass? So we do not know what plant needs to be in the transfer station, and we do not know what space the plant needs. We will not know what percentage of recycling we will be trying to achieve, so how can we judge the various contracts against that.

1925 I hope Member can see that if we vote for this amendment we would lose the foundation of the strategy, which has been supported by the Assembly, against which the various business cases should be judged.

1930 Let me give you another example. One of the reasons why kerbside recycling is currently expensive is because we have short term contracts, because there is no certainty that the existing trial scheme will continue. A lot of work has been done specifying and negotiating long-term contracts which will bring the cost down by allowing the contractor to invest in more efficient and appropriate equipment.

If we do not have kerbside recycling it will also affect the composition of our refuse derived fuel. If it could be called that as we will possibly fail to meet the criteria.

1935 In the report on page 11 it tells us that the strategy is consistent with the approach of other European countries, the proposed EU circular, I quote:

'The proposed EU Circular Economy Package proposes legally binding targets on Member States which include increasing municipal waste recycling to 65%...'

1940 And the latest information is that 65% target will increase to 70% by 2030, exactly in line with what we are doing. This shows our strategy is in line with what is happening in Europe. This is important because the waste acceptance criteria of most plants will be consistent with the waste being produced by other countries, and the vast majority are designed to take waste of a certain composition. The importance of waste being of the right composition was emphasised to Deputy Brehaut and I when we visited Pointes Lane. They were in a totally commercial operation. They were removing all the usual recyclates, like hard and soft plastics, metals, paper and cardboard from their waste. Their RDF is regularly tested to certify its composition, so it can be accepted at the plant it is being sent to.

1945 Voting for this amendment will result in a delay. If there is delay of up to six months, the cost as referred to in paragraph 8.3 is £75,000 per month, so six months' delay will be £450,000. Additionally, there will also be the cost of storing our waste at about 400K and that six months is probably about the maximum time we could do it. If the delay is beyond six months we will most likely have to use Mont Cuet for our black bag waste. This will start to make significant inroads into our critical strategic reserve, which Mont Cuet provides to dispose of hazardous waste for the next 20 years, and bring forward the need to find another site. Hazardous waste is asbestos, bottom ash from the incinerator at the Hospital, the animal incinerator, etc. It will also mean there will not be a flat area large enough to process our green waste.

1950
1955 In the risk register for the strategy the cost of purchase engineering infrastructure for new sites for hazard and green waste is estimated to be up to £9 million. That will be another cost of delay caused by this amendment.

1960 To conclude, though I would just like to take up a couple of points which have been made in other speeches. Deputy Kuttelwascher spoke about food: there will be an internal caddy and an external caddy, so that you will not store your food in your house beyond a small amount.

1965 He talked about extending the date for recycling. If you look at the original date, they were there to be a number of years after the plant was up and running, so we have maintained that, so that the 60% as it was then proposed was 2018 when, I think, it was due to be up and running in 2016. So we have left the delay so that it can be up and running before the new recycling targets kick in.

1970 He spoke about polystyrene: again it is the waste acceptance criteria of plants that we send our waste to. They limit the amount of polystyrene in those plants. We would most likely not be able to export our waste to the plants that we have got our tenders for, if we include our polystyrene in it. He mentioned about the glass stored at Longue Hougue. That has been stored up there because it is due to be used in the development of the new transfer station, so it is the logical place to store it. Actually, and it was only yesterday we had an Implementation Board meeting and we looked at the cost, because of the expense of running our crushing equipment, and the fact that it needs to be replaced, and the recommendation from the Implementation Board – and we have actually done trials – is that we would be exporting our glass, and that is a less expensive solution.

1975 Deputy Roffey spoke about green waste, well, obviously, our recycling levels are compared with other places in Europe and the UK, and they all include green waste, so it was logical to include green waste in it.

1980 Again, he talks about cancer drugs, this is not coming from income tax, this is coming from charges, just like the charges for waste water waste. It is separate. Okay, I accept it all comes from our community, but the message that we were given was that the cost was not the important thing, they wanted high levels of recycling. That was the result of 2012; the Assembly has backed that strategy since then.

1985 To conclude, leading up to this debate, and more recently, the debate on bonfires, we have had a lot of emails and letters in the *Press* and phone calls. For this debate there have not been

1990 the emails, phone calls and letters except from ex-politicians with incorrect information. Also on the Phone-In particularly when members of E&I were on the Phone-In you would have reasonably expected a whole lot of calls on waste strategy, there have been very few. The lack of lobbying, I think, reflects that the community as a large, as expressed in consultation, approved the strategy, based on high levels of recycling and kerbside collection. All the surveys have said that people like kerbside collections.

Deputy Kuttelwascher has always supported kerbside collections, and in the debates that led up to the debate on the strategy in 2012 and as a member of PSD he was one of the architects of the current strategy.

1995 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** Could I do a slight point of correction, because he is –

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

2000 **Deputy Kuttelwascher:** He said I have always supported kerbside collection. I said earlier on I did, until our refuse derived fuel capacity comes on stream. That is the difference. I said that earlier. I do not expect it to cease until that comes on stream, because there is an alternative. So what? I mean ...

2005 **Deputy Dorey:** Sir, that is not a correct point of correction, because the strategy in 2012 did not say, 'We do kerbside recycling until the RDF came on stream.' He was one of the five members of PSD who supported the strategy. There were no words that said it is only when the RDF comes on stream. The whole basis, and if you look at the report in 2012, was high levels of recycling. Those were the first words which described, 'maximise recycling' were the opening words of the short description of each strategy.

2010 When the high costs were known in 2013, and 2014, there was no attempt to change the strategy. £3.2 million has been spent since the 2012 debate developing the strategy. The increase in cost does not justify a change of strategy, as it has been said in the past, the States will only make a decision when Mont Cuét is full. It will be full in just 18 months. If we want to use it for green and hazardous waste.

2015 We must reject this amendment so P&R knows there is a definite strategy against which it has to consider the business cases, developed for the work streams, otherwise I fear it will result in considerable extra costs caused by the delay. I just cannot see, if we change the strategy, how P&R can approve the work streams against all the existing work which has been developed against the existing strategy if we are to change the strategy, and we will not know what the strategy is because we will have to report back in 2018. So we will just put in a massive delay. They cannot fulfil their job as value for money. All it will result in is massive extra costs caused by the delay.

2025 This amendment gives a clear instruction to cease kerbside collections. If Members support it I expect when this report is debated we will stick with the same strategy just as we did in 2012, and in 2014, because it is the right strategy, and in the meantime we will waste more money and further advance Guernsey's reputation as Nick Mann said in the *Press* of dilly-dallying on this issue. It will result in more difficulties of finding anyone to tender for waste services in the future.

2030 The issue of waste has preoccupied the previous three Assemblies. It has caused deep divisions, which is one of the reasons why we have taken so long to resolve it. The Assembly can equally be dominated by waste debate for the rest of this term if they approve this amendment and any other amendments that we are debating. That would be such a waste, wouldn't it?

Please reject this amendment.

Thank you.

2035 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you, sir.

2040 I do have some prepared notes I would like to refer to, but I would just like to, as Deputy Dorey did, make a few comments on some of the things we have already heard during debate.

2045 Now, I will start with Deputy Dorey, sir. He gave quite a thorough recounting of what has taken place over the last few years, but he conveniently forgot that in 2014 I brought a sursis to try and stop the strategy going ahead, and to try a cause a rethink. I also think he has conveniently forgotten than I have never voted for the strategy. I have always voted against it, because I was never convinced by what was being put forward.

I will give way to Deputy Dorey, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

2050 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you for giving way.

There have been so many different propositions, debates, I gave a limited recall of everything that happened. I very well know his amendment, but perhaps he would like to explain how many people supported it, because that would be the interesting thing.

2055 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I think four people supported it, sir. (*Laughter*) In the interest of transparency and honesty, sir, I am quite happy to admit that. They were wrong, of course, not to support it in greater numbers, but that is history. (*Interjection*) And, of course, it was seconded by Deputy Brehaut at the time, so that was quite interesting, and I thank him for that, sir. I thought that was a very courageous thing for him to do. (*Interjections*)

2060 But, also, sir, Deputy Dorey spoke about the consultation process that took place a number of years ago. I was part of that consultation process as a Vale Douzaine representative. He is right to say that people were very keen to see high recycling targets and efforts being made, but, of course, at that time the high cost of recycling was never brought out during that consultation process. So, of course, if you say to people would you like to see, ideally, great efforts and high targets, and high numbers in regard to recycling, people are going to say yes. But, of course, they were not made aware of the great cost of recycling at the time, and I think as Deputy Roffey has said –

I will give way to Deputy de Sausmarez.

2070 **The Bailiff:** Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir, and thank you Deputy Laurie Queripel for giving way.

2075 I too was at the consultation process, in fact, I think we found ourselves in the same group every now and then. I think the important point to note is that is that we were not dealing at that time with specific figures. We were talking about relative values, and the message came through, consistently across all groups, and all workshops, that actually *relative* to the cost people valued the more sustainable solution. Cost was identified as a key consideration, but it was not considered *relatively* higher than other considerations that were discussed. So I think the fact that there were not finite figures is irrelevant. It was a relative judgment.

2080 Thank you.

2085 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** I disagree, sir. I think Deputy de Sausmarez has made my point for me, really, at the time, from an idealistic point of view, people wanted to see high recycling, but actually, when the costs became known, and I think that has become apparent in regard to the feedback from our community, people have then decided they needed to think again about that. So, it was a very valuable intervention, but actually I think it backed up my argument rather than spoke against it.

Also sir, Deputy Dorey said in his remarks that recycling, and high numbers in regard to recycling, was a foundation of the strategy. I actually think, actually that cannot be right, surely,

2090 because this strategy is meant to be based on the waste hierarchy, and the waste hierarchy says
that minimisation, and reduction, and reuse are the highest principles that we should be aiming
for. Recycling is about halfway down the list of principles. So, that straight away, immediately, tells
me that actually this strategy in a sense is based ... if it is truly based on or hinges or the
2095 foundation is high recycling, prioritising recycling, that immediately calls into question the
philosophy behind the strategy.

Now, sir, I would like to move on to a couple of remarks made by Deputy Roffey. Deputy
Roffey is right. He is right. Setting targets in regard to government policy is never a good thing. It
most often is the case that those targets fail, and there is a high price, in many ways, to pay for
the failure of those targets. Actually, Members might recall that just a few years ago there was a
2100 documentary on television called 'The Trap', and it spoke about how over the years targets have
been set in order to try and address some of the problems within the NHS. Well, we all know how
that has turned out. The NHS really, it is a wonderful service, but it is a basket case financially,
because targets were set, had been set for many, many years, and they failed to be met, and there
have been detrimental consequences because of that. So, Deputy Roffey is right about that.

2105 I will not say he is wrong, but he is less right about something else. He spoke about if we
returned to bring banks rather than had kerbside recycling, that it would perhaps mean an extra
car journey for some people, and pensioners quite look forward to making the extra car journey.
But actually it would not mean that at all, because I know when I use the bring bank I try and time
it so that I will use it when I am making a journey anyway. So I will go to the supermarket or the
2110 shop and I will take my recycling material with me. So it does not necessarily have to mean an
extra journey at all. It can be made as part of another journey.

Also he spoke about bring banks on private land, what about obligating the supermarkets to
have an area for bring banks. They are the ones that help to produce the material in the first place
that needs to be disposed of. So what about saying to, I will not name them, of course, but we all
2115 know who they are, saying to the big shops, the supermarkets, perhaps you should put an area
aside in your car parks for some bring banks. That would help in regard to private facilitation of
bring banks.

Now, I just want to refer to some of the remarks that Deputy Parkinson made. Only on Monday
I had a meeting, I attended a meeting at The Vale Douzaine room and the group that met are
2120 called the Mont Cuet Liaison Group, and members of the Douzaine – (*Laughter*) Some great
liaising takes place there, I can ... a meeting of minds. (*Laughter*) So, that is attended by some
members of the Douzaine. I am no longer a member of the Douzaine but I attended as a Parish
Deputy and I have been a member of that group for many, many years, and I have sat on the Vale
Douzaine. But, we were told quite clearly that, actually, if managed in the right way, there is space
2125 at the Mont Cuet tip until 2021 – and I think that has been said in the past anyway by Deputy
Ogier in the last term – if it is managed in the right way, there is space until 2021 for our waste to
be deposited.

Also, sir, Deputy Parkinson referred to, and I think somebody else did as well, the food waste
receptacles, the food waste caddies. We were told on Monday that these food waste caddies
2130 would quite naturally have a lid on them, but they would also have some sort of locking
mechanism. Now, I do not know if it has been thought about yet, how the collectors of the waste
are going to deal with every caddy with a locking mechanism on them. That is going to be, I
would have thought, quite time consuming to start unlocking those caddies and depositing the
food waste into the lorry or the truck. So that is something else that I think will cause a practical
2135 problem and, I think, will have also have cost implications as well.

Deputy Kuttelwascher, just a couple of things that he said. He is quite right about milk cartons,
I have heard reports that they end up in somebody's, in some cases, they end up in a landfill or in
an incinerator in other jurisdictions.

2140 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, thank you.

2145 I think it is important this has been repeated twice, and it is quite wrong. Our Tetra Paks do get recycled, and the recycling process is actually incredibly productive. It breaks it down into about eight different constituent parts, including sort of various polymers, and aluminium, and cardboard and things like that, and it does get very effectively recycled.

2150 I think the rumour started that Tetra Paks get landfilled because there was one incident where a load was contaminated by hydraulic fuel, and it was a contaminated load, and I think that sparked a lot of rumours.

But I have to say, I think that as far as I am aware that was a one-off, and Tetra Paks are recycled, and they are recycled very effectively.

2155 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Just another question, sir. In regard to the material that we produce for recycling, can we be 100% sure, absolutely guarantee that all that material ends up as being properly recycled? Because there was a documentary, again, on Channel 4, I think, a couple of years ago, that showed that material that was collected for recycling, once again, actually ended up in incinerators, and in landfill. That was, I think it was a Channel 4, or BBC 2, documentary. So,
2160 can we be absolutely sure, and I will be looking for the members of STSB and Environment & Infrastructure to assure me that all the material that we recycle actually ends up being recycled and not going to landfill or to an incinerator.

2165 So, I will get to my notes now, sir. I have to consider voting for any amendment that has the intention of improving the strategy in regard to affordability, both for the States and households. But I really can understand the desire to adopt and work to the principles of the waste hierarchy. There are all sorts of reasons why that is a good objective. But, the reality is has to be balanced against cost effectiveness and value for money.

2170 We are a tiny Island community, we cannot simply adopt the approaches and the methods that much larger jurisdictions have in place, or wish to adopt. Jurisdictions with much more resource to draw on, much more scope, and a far greater ability to be self-sufficient. Economies of scale have to come into play. As an Island we rely enormously on imported goods. I think roughly 90% of the perishable produce we consume is imported. So there are implications and offshoots there in regard to packaging etc.

2175 Sir, whenever we consider and decide upon policies and strategies, they have to be put into a Guernsey context, they have to be Guernsey appropriate. They have to take into consideration what is possible for Guernsey to do, and what is possible for Guernsey to afford. Now I do not think the extra millions that it has cost, and will cost, to try and substantially push up the Island's recycling figures, can be justified. That really does bear some proper objective analysis.

2180 Sir, before kerbside recycling was introduced, the recycling figure that had been reached, and Deputy Roffey alluded to it, purely based on the efforts of Islanders and the facilities, of course, provided to them was, I think, about 46%. Kerbside recycling and the millions it has cost has increased that figure by just a few percent. That cannot be cost effective. I think 46% in the Guernsey context was a pretty good showing, and that could have been sustained and therefore cost wise reasonable justifiable.

2185 But this is where I struggle with the amendment somewhat, the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment, because I do accept that recycling comes at a cost, that there will not always be a positive return on that investment. But that element, nonetheless, needs to be contained and controlled as much as possible. Now, I think the balance is about right in regard to the trade-off. In regard to recycling before kerbside was introduced.

2190 My concern with this amendment is that the consequence might be recycling being reduced to perhaps 20% or 30% and that will probably come with detrimental consequences, costs wise, and otherwise. So that is a concern for me.

2195 I have always thought that facilitating and encouraging recycling in a way that costs can, or
Blank cheques are just as wasteful as thoughtless, unnecessary and careless consumerism. At the
end of the day we are talking about public finances. We are talking about Islanders' money.

2200 The strategy itself, sir, as I have just alluded to in regard to the Deputy Dorey's comments, the
strategy itself appears to be imbalanced, in that it seems to put more emphasis on recycling at
any cost, rather the principles that rank higher in the waste hierarchy, i.e. minimising, reducing,
reusing, etc. Thus, to some extent, moving away from the need to process material for recycling,
which is a very expensive process as we know.

2205 In my view, sir, greater efforts should be made to educate and educate on and encourage
minimisations and reduction, but not necessarily by the use of targets, because it seems to me, if
we look at the recycling figures before kerbside was introduced, that the people of Guernsey will
respond to opportunities and facilitation, not the heavy hand and not the expensive hand.

2210 So, I would like to support this amendment, I really, really, would, but I do have some
misgivings about it because of, perhaps, unintended consequences. Anyway, that is a dilemma for
me, but I am looking forward to other speeches during this debate on this amendment, sir, and
hopefully, Deputy Kuttelwascher can address my concerns when he sums up at the end.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: We will rise now and resume at 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy – Debate continued

2215 **The Bailiff:** We continue with the debate on the Policy Letter from the States' Trading
Supervisory Board and the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure on the
Implementation of the Solid Waste Strategy and amendment 1.

Does anybody else wish to speak in debate? Deputy Paint.

2220 **Deputy Paint:** I will just be very short, sir. *(Laughter)*

I completely agree with the Kuttelwascher amendment and will vote in that way. Surprisingly, I
also agree very much – sorry, I amended that – with some of what Deputy Roffey said. It was, I
think, the last part of his speech that I did not agree with.

There is no point in saying any more, but I will vote the way I have said and thank you, sir.

2225 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, here we go again.

2230 How many pages of old speeches have been sent to recycling? How many speeches will be
recycled or re-used today, for that matter? I might be guilty of a bit of that, to be honest. What
really annoys me is that we have spent so much time on what we are doing about our waste,
though little in stopping the production of the waste in the first place. (**Several Members:** Hear,
hear.) I have more to say on that in general debate.

2235 I feel that I am in a difficult place on all this. I believe strongly in reducing, re-using and
recycling our waste. Indeed, I have run a business that has made money from helping people to
do just that and set up the battery recycling scheme 10 years ago, known as Bag a Battery.

2240 However, I look at the history of the Waste Strategy and what we are presented with in this Policy Letter and even I can see some merits in the amendments that have been drawn up. It has been five years since the last-but-one States passed a Resolution to have PSD report back with full costings to and, I quote, 'give maximum effect to waste prevention and minimisation measures'.

2245 Still, several significant costs are just estimates. Indeed, back in 2014, the Department sought to assure Members that it was confident costs would not exceed £29.5 million. But, I expressed my concerns that the estimates contained so many contingencies that the actual figures did not reflect realistically achievable costings from a value for money perspective. Since then, the costs have gone up.

However, does that mean I shall support this amendment? Well, let us look at targets, or more specifically at let us look at having no targets. What does it really mean?

2250 Targets make sense. A means of helping you know where you going and letting you focus on getting there. There is no problem having a target if you understand the impact that that will have. Not just on what your goal is, but also on the possible unintended consequences on what it will take to reach your target.

In the business world, the classic example of where goals can undermine a company is where you seek too aggressive a growth target, as customer retention may well suffer as you focus on the new customer, not keeping the ones you have attracted.

2255 At the same time, you can have all the targets in the world, but if you do not set the appropriate environment for it, they are never going to be reached. A balance is required.

The problem we are faced with is that the targets have come out of nowhere. There is no consideration of marginal cost. This is particularly important when the costs are going to be borne directly by users where they have no ability to do anything about it, such as buy a product wrapped in black plastic.

2260 We cannot recycle at all costs. At the same time, we cannot charge the earth if there are not the opportunities to recycle. But, I guess a question is, are the targets forcing the costs? How do we know that the structure being put in place will lead to the recycling target rates? I see nothing, anywhere, that demonstrates that at all. Only that recycling rates will go up if we introduce food waste and glass kerbside recycling. But where is the scientific analysis?

2270 I was strongly in favour of the kerbside recycling trial. I thought it was a trial. I think most people thought it was a trial. Indeed, Deputy Roffey called it a trial in his speech. I do not see how it could not have been a trial, if it was being done for free. But we now hear, it was an interim scheme. Whatever you call it, the increased recycling rates have not been spectacular, but then they have not included food and glass.

However, as we see from the Report, there are even more costs to include food and glass. I believe food waste will make a difference to recycling, but there is nothing in the Report that indicates what that will be and the average likely cost per consumer.

2275 We hear kerbside recycling is likely to work here as Wales, but what does that actually mean? I suppose, in the end, I do believe we should have a target, if only to demonstrate Government's commitment to recycling. By not doing so, we are putting out the wrong message, that we just do not care.

2280 I do, because about how we, as human beings, impact our environment. However, my real concerns with this amendment actually relate to cost. We are told that kerbside collection should – and I quote – 'cease on the basis of cost considerations'. What cost considerations? Cost is not just financial. I think that is the crux of the whole issue.

I am happy for a review to be undertaken if it looks at costs in total and quantifies the impact, not only of financial cost, but also environmental and, indeed, health. Because that is what we should be looking at, but that is not being considered here.

2285 On the subject of cost, there is no note on any of the amendments actually, today, for that matter, on the cost of undertaking this work, as required under section 4.3 of the Rules of Procedure.

2290 Who is going to do all this work? I do not see that there is a massive staff structure at the States' Trading Supervisory Board. Perhaps it is not considered material and there is capacity to do it, but I find it difficult to understand how, at a time when business cases are having to be put together for P&R to approve various facets of what is a complex Waste Strategy.

2295 Ultimately, though, when I read the amendment, I thought surely this is something that could be addressed through a post-implementation review or reviews? The value for that will already be included in the cost estimates, or at least it should, so such reviews should, incidentally, be made public.

Looking at the amendment, as a whole, I have some sympathy with what the proposer is trying to do, but I cannot support it. At this stage, I still have an open mind on the other amendments, should we get that far.

2300 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Just a point of correction.

2305 On page 22, there are scenarios one, two and three, which talk about the costs per household of kerbside recycling, introducing food waste and glass collections. So, there are the costs there, for it, per household.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

2310 Sorry, Deputy Soulsby, I think that was really an interruption during the course of your speech, although you had sat down. So, if you wish to respond to that, you may do.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I would just say it was cost per consumer, but it did not actually say what that marginal cost would be per individual.

2315 Yes, it sets an average for anybody. I think part of the problem we have here is that consideration of average. But I bear in mind Deputy Dorey's point.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, sir.

2320 I am going to speak, narrowly, on the amendment. There is a remarkable play by Samuel Beckett, called *Waiting for Godot*. It is remarkable because, apart from the fact that it is splendidly written, in French originally, it has got nothing else going for it. There is no plot, there is no narrative. It does not even change scene. We are sitting on the side of a country road. Basically, two old boys sit down on the side of the road, chatting about this and that, for an hour and a half, I seem to remember, waiting for this chap Godot to turn up. Of course, he never does, and we do not even know who Godot is.

2325 You can see where I am going. Compared with the paralysis by process that we have had over the last few years, it is a pacey bit of racy drama, is *Waiting for Godot*. (Laughter)

2330 But, help is at hand, sir, because Godot, in the form of Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Barry Brehaut, is at hand. He is about to appear on the scene. But, enter stage right, Deputy Kuttelwascher and lurking in the wings, stage left, Deputy Roffey. What have they got to say to the plot? I cannot decide whether they are villains or heroes in this particular drama and whether they are or not really depends on the answer to one or two questions.

2335 I think I am in the same position as, certainly, Deputy Roffey was and one or two others, in that we are obliged to do a sort of *mea culpa* here. We are sort of apologising, really, for having to support something that we do not necessarily wholeheartedly believe in, because we would rather not be where we are.

I share Deputy Roffey's reservations. I think the scheme that we have in front of us ... I do not like the cost of it. Not only the raw cost of it, but also what seems to be the inherent lack of control of cost that has been with it right from the beginning.

2340 I do not like its complexity, either. We are talking about an awful lot of waste streams, here, and adjacent to that is the fact that, for the user, I think the user-friendliness has not necessarily been at the forefront of the process right from the beginning.

But I am keeping an open mind on this. Like a soldier, I have got an instinct, really, to make things work rather than to gripe about how bad they are and how they cannot work. So, I am actually going to put my full weight behind the Strategy as brought to us by the Committee and the Board.

2345 But there are some serious questions, I think, to be asked and I reserve my judgement as to whether hero or villain really on the answer to some fairly fundamental questions which I think are really at the core of this amendment from Deputy Kuttelwascher. That is, first of all, can things like food waste be included in RDF? Can polystyrene? Can Tetra Pak, can plastic? What can and what cannot be? If they can, why not?

2350 If the answer why not is because we want to meet some recycling targets that previous States have settled on, I do not think, personally, that is good enough. Nothing is beyond challenge.

2355 But, I would be very interested to know, for example, what the impact on the future contract might be if our food waste were included in RDF if it were able to be. What effect would inclusion of otherwise, previously unthought of materials, what would be the price of including them in RDF? Would it have an impact, for example, on the ability of the limited number of staff that are available to implement the new strategy, would it in any way divert them from the task in hand? Would it affect, basically, the design of the transfer station itself?

2360 Against that context, what is the role of kerbside recycling in all this? What is the essentiality or otherwise of kerbside and the role that it would play? My Castel colleague, Deputy Mark Dorey has begun to address that and I am half-persuaded, but I really think I need some pretty hard facts and figures and some rather heftier persuasion, perhaps, from Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Brehaut when they sum up, really, to take me all the way to opposing this amendment.

2365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Like the last two speakers, I am in somewhat concord with them.

2370 I do not know whether to sit on my fence or recycle it or re-use it. Certainly, there are questions to be raised, because the use of recyclables for an alternative use that benefits our carbon contribution to the globe, which might be finding reduction of energy, is surely to be merited in its own right?

2375 The problem has been that we have dragged our feet on recycling of glass and even more so the recycling of food. I would not mind recycling people's food, but I do not think they are thinking in terms of what they do in America, which is collecting pizzas and giving them to the needy, or whatever.

2380 We have been extremely slow in getting to grips with that. I have always felt that, although the recycling team at what used to Public Services have been excellent in motivating, dare I say, middle class Islanders, I think they have still got a way to go with other, more diverse elements in our community and especially the commercial sector. I think if you include them within our rates, you come to a less rosy scenario.

2385 We used to hear inspiring talks from global ecological ambassadors a few years ago, that Deputy De Lisle and others brought to our shores, who would claim that certain communities in Italy or Switzerland or America are recycling 75%, 80%, 85%. That was a dream, but we have not quite got there.

2390 The question we are posed is what is the cost? We will have other amendments which, I think, are probably more moderate than the phraseology of this one. The phraseology of this one virtually calls for a blanket end, as soon as possible, to many components of the current policy and I think that is a rather brave step to take, especially as it is clearly in our interest, from a policy planning point of view, to be as environmentally minded as we can, within the waste hierarchy.

Of course, as Deputy Laurie Queripel points out, there are issues that maybe Deputy Kuttelwascher will pick up on how far you can go with that before it becomes a self-fulfilling problem.

2395 But what I would say, too, about these policies, is we heard earlier the view Deputy Dorey made, for example, that only 20% of the population were concerned about the cost. Now, I cannot remember the specifics of that. I would say on the doorstep and from voxpop, the figure is higher than that and there are many people who follow the issues who will not like the increase in costs.

2400 In fact, if I am fair, I have been appalled at ratepayers' meetings, how many people who turn up and the kind of people who turn up to parish meetings are not entirely representative of society, because they tend to be property owners and lobbyists, but they are usually pretty appalled at the spiralling cost of rubbish and we have heard that, too, on the wireless.

So, I think we have reasons to be concerned about the cost implications.

2405 But Deputy Roffey and others who raise that, miss the essential point that I said way back when the two incinerators were dumped, especially the second one, that it was inevitable that if you went for an ideological, ecological commitment to a more environmental approach, it brought you cost-savings in the short-term of a capital nature, but it brought you greater revenue expenditure.

2410 If you have a motivational viewpoint as we do, certainly, with tobacco smoking and, some might say, with motoring, that you want to dis-incentivise excessive use, then, by definition, a consumer-based philosophy does tend to target those most vulnerable in society who have lots of children and lots of rubbish and, less so, more sensible – perhaps, that is the wrong word – but people who are more affluent and maybe have more time in semi-retirement to cope with the pressures of recycling.

2415 We do need to find a more coherent strategy that works together with both our anti-poverty approach and also a communication approach that really hits the targets with younger families and people who are just about making it and struggling, rather than those who, perhaps, have been the cornerstone of bring banks.

2420 Where I am going with this is to say I probably will not support his amendment, but I support some of its underlying thinking. One or two of Deputy Roffey's may be more palatable and I would also point out that I do support the arguments Deputy Mooney and Deputy Kuttelwascher have made in recent weeks on two other areas. The first is that we have somehow had a less than robust cost profile to this destination. We were talking in another context, earlier, about inquiries and scrutiny. I would say the escalating costs of our waste programme over the past eight years would merit quite a substantial inquiry by politicians and professionals, as to how we got the figures wrong in the past and what we can do to improve.

2425 The other area where I do support them, it is pretty obvious that we hear almost every week one or other senior politician or Channel Islander saying the two Channel Islands should work together, especially in the post-Brexit climate, and I do think that with a little bit of work on financial, economic, logistical and legislative grounds, we could find common ground with our fellow Channel Islanders and really make a solution work by, say, 2020.

I have spoken a little bit generally, I must admit.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

2435 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you, sir.

Sorry, my technology is not working. (**A Member:** It is on.) It is on? It is not the right way around!

2440 I have given due consideration to the Policy Letter, as requested by the Committee for Environment & Infrastructure and the States' Trading Supervisory Board and, as well as making some general observations, I am speaking today about the Kuttelwascher/Mooney amendment, so I may be forfeiting my right to speak in general debate?

The Bailiff: Yes.

2445 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Okay, good.

Given that these are new Committees, with notable attributes, academic capability to research, financial acumen, previous experience of the States and excellent knowledge of the history of the Strategy, my expectations were quite high for the proposals which have been put forward.

2450 Fundamentally, the plan on which this Policy Letter is based, has some merit and I do agree with many of the points made earlier by both Deputies Kuttelwascher and Roffey. I am, however, disappointed with the lack of creativity applied to certain issues we are facing and which are tackled within the Proposition.

2455 Given that there has been nine months to look at this matter, with input from seven politicians, one non-voting member and supporting officers, not to mention the preceding 14 years or so to build up to this point, I think that on the whole this is a lacklustre and uninspiring proposal which, for me, has raised far more questions than it has answered.

2460 There is a lack of detail and background information, which has meant that I have had to spend quite a lot of time asking for answers to my questions from officers, speaking for a long time to a very helpful chap, the senior waste officer from Stornoway in the Outer Hebrides – no, not Wales – which is another island jurisdiction of comparative size to us in terms of tonnage of waste output. I have also had to do lots of unnecessary ferreting around for the Resolutions referred to in the Policy Letter, when extracts could easily have been appended.

2465 This is yet another example of a Policy Letter coming to the States, which, on format and substance, fails a 'let us make it easy for everyone' test. As a Member of the Forest Douzaine and, having spoken recently to the St Saviour's Douzaine, I know that the parishes are very concerned about the Waste Strategy, in general, the increase in costs for parishioners and the complexity of the policies.

They are confused about what is expected of them in the future and the communities they represent and serve.

2470 The only one thing that is very clear is that it will be very expensive.

One more point regarding the parish involvement in the Strategy is raised in the Policy Letter and I query how the centralisation of collection can save a suggested £250,000 when the parishes do the work for free.

2475 I fail to see how the replacement of gratis, no strings attached work could save £250,000. Where does that figure come from? Maybe this point can be explained, please, for me by one of the Presidents of either Committee.

2480 Since the publication of the Policy Letter, I have spoken to many people and have received representations from concerned Islanders who are also worried about the impracticalities of separating and collecting all waste streams, along with the added financial burden that this brings on their households.

2485 Personally, I am a keen recycler. I watch my buying habits, would prefer to buy second-hand rather than new if I can get better value, or fixed rather than throw-away. My husband loves renovating bicycles, so my last birthday present was a refurbished pushang retrieved from the skip. As a family, we try wherever we can to re-use and reduce our food waste. I have three hungry children, two dogs, lots of chickens and a field to use with a large compost bin. I am very lucky and also keen to do my bit.

2490 Not everyone follows the same rigours that I do, or has the access to the same space that I do. It is this point that makes me very worried about this policy. Those people who, unlike me, do not have the space to sort and store all these recyclers, to sort food waste, meat, fish, veg, plate-scrappings all rotting together in the caddies, in the summer, in their kitchens and bins outside their back doors, if they have a back door, that is. This is only possible if you have the space.

One more thing that I would like to hear from the Presidents of the respective Committees is what will be done in the case of non-compliance? In the situation that people refuse to sort their food waste and clog up the MRF, what action will be taken to prevent this from happening? Any

2495 action will surely increase costs yet again? I envisage that there will be many households who will not sort their food waste, as required.

As you may gather, I am not supportive of separating out the food waste, with its additional cost, when it is not a requirement by Geminor. Neither am I supportive of the universal kerbside collection of glass. I would like to see the reintroduction of more bring banks, enhanced bring banks. Give people the choice.

2500 I do see the point in kerbside collection and believe it has merit. But, if it has to go because it becomes unaffordable for us here in Guernsey, I could with live with this. The recycling target figures, I think, are unrealistic and, as I am ultimately driven by pragmatism, I can only see that we will be hemmed into letting costs increase in order to achieve these.

2505 One thing that jumps out at me, from this Policy Letter, the joint presentation from the Committees and the message that has come from many of the Members, is that they are close-focused to sticking with EU legislation, adhering strictly to waste management best practice.

The EU Waste Policy has evolved over the last 30 years, through a series of environmental action plans and a framework of legislation, which aims to reduce negative environmental and health impacts and create an energy and resource-efficient economy,

2510 Now that, alongside the easy-to-understand and common-sense waste hierarchy is all very laudable and, on the face of it, one will find oneself nodding one's head to agree with this, because it sounds very sensible. But, delve into the huge complex mire that is the EU legislation on waste and you will start to see that this was designed and created around the geographies of the Member States and the cultural habits of their peoples.

2515 Therefore, for Guernsey to adhere unnecessarily to the regulations, with the resulting cost, shows to me that the Policy Letter has been coloured by ideology and, in my view, unachievable aims rather than pragmatic solutions which suit our Island home.

2520 I am a pragmatist and I am only interested in finding pragmatic solutions to our problems. We should be looking at policies through a lens of austerity and sustainability, with the recognition that gold-plated policies adhering to the non-binding guidelines from the Basel Convention for Waste Disposal, or best practice following EU regulations which are designed for different demographics, cultures and geographies, are not for us.

2525 One very relevant gem of advice from the EU that I absolutely agree with is that good waste management begins with preventing waste from being produced in the first place. After all, what is not produced need not be disposed of.

There is no silver bullet. No one size fits all. No, Deputy Dorey, I am afraid. (*Laughter*)

We should be allowing for a flexible system which suits Guernsey and focuses on education of the community and negotiation with business to reduce waste at source.

2530 I will be supporting the Kuttelwascher amendment today.

The Bailiff: Deputy Green.

Deputy Green: Sir, I will just speak on the amendment.

2535 I do sympathise to some extent with the Deputy Kuttelwascher/Deputy Mooney amendment. To some extent, anyway. I certainly sympathise with the intent behind it and the general attempt to reduce the cost of the strategy.

2540 I think Deputy Kuttelwascher is probably on his strongest ground, really, when he talks about the economics of recycling certain materials and the fact that that does not always necessarily make much sense, financially or economically. Indeed, the Policy Letter that we have in front of us does not really help us that far in describing what the true costs of recycling materials, generally, and certain materials, in particular, actually are.

2545 I think that is probably the strongest point behind this amendment. But I think I do have two problems with the amendment, which are, firstly, I do not think we should be scrapping recycling targets *per se*. I do agree that we should be trying to ensure that this Strategy generally does properly balance environmental considerations with realistic cost factors, if people are going to

have proper confidence in this. But, I think, really, what we should be aiming to do is to have realistic recycling targets, rather than the ones we have at the moment. I do not think the solution is to simply disregard them and to abolish them.

2550 I think, probably, what we ideally need is to have a proper cost benefit analysis of recycling targets themselves and to see a proper business case for how much it would actually cost for a 70% target, how much it would actually cost for a 60% target. All of these targets are arbitrary, but I just think the emphasis should be on more realistic targets, rather than the targets that we have got. And, indeed, rather than abolishing the targets.

2555 Ultimately, the political question in all of this is, as a community, we have to ask how much money are we actually prepared to spend on obtaining and realising certain recycling rates and to achieve those certain environmental aims. I am not convinced that the targets we have got are right, but I do think they have to be moderated to be made more realistic.

2560 The other problem I have with the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment and, like others, perhaps, have more sympathy with some of the amendments coming up later on, is the abolition of kerbside recycling. I think there is a reason why kerbside recycling has been pursued as a policy and it is on the principle of least effort. It is easier, actually, to stick your recycling in a bag and a lorry then comes to your front door and takes it away, rather than having to go to a bring bank; notwithstanding the fact that some people are happy to do that.

2565 There are lots and lots of busy people, families and households who prefer the ease and the convenience of kerbside recycling. On the basis of the principle of least effort, I think, if we are going to continue with any kind of policy on recycling, then kerbside does make sense.

I am a supporter of kerbside in principle. Not at any cost, but I do support it and I am open to new ways of trying to alleviate the cost.

2570 So, I do actually sympathise with this amendment. I think it has been a useful debate on this, because the economics of recycling is not something that there has been a great deal of analysis on in this Chamber hitherto, and I think, for that reason alone, this has been useful. But I cannot support this particular amendment, for the reasons I have given.

2575 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.

Deputy Yerby: Sir, I am in a slightly difficult position, because I find myself agreeing with what Deputy Roffey said, that target-based policy making is risky and tends to incentivise perverse behaviours.

2580 That, as a principle, is not untrue.

2585 Nevertheless, they translate an objective into something measurable and, if we do not want to talk about this being an environmental objective, because somehow being too green is not acceptable in Guernsey, then let us call it a resourceful objective, because previous generations of pragmatic Guernsey people would certainly have understood the imperative to minimise and re-use and recycle and recover and, above all, not to waste.

I will not be supporting this amendment. I will not be supporting Deputy Roffey's and, in a sense, I am standing to throw down the gauntlet to Environment & Infrastructure and the Trading Supervisory Board, because I am not even inclined to support the Propositions in the Policy Letter that will change the targets as they are written.

2590 That is because targets give us something to measure progress against. I do not mind falling short of the targets, but if we change the targets so that they just reflect what we are doing, then we do not see whether that has happened or not. We cannot explain. We cannot justify. We cannot correct course.

2595 So, if we are going to bother having targets in the first place, there is a lot of value in keeping them constant.

If Deputy Roffey thinks that this Assembly will drag Guernsey inexorably towards recycling at any cost, especially at the cost of education or medication, then I think he has been observing a different Assembly to the one that I have over the past months and years.

2600 We have always held many different objectives in tension and we will always will. I am saying
let us keep the targets, because they keep us accountable and, more than that, I am saying right
now that accountability is very important, because the sub-text among a number of the speeches
in support of the amendment has been that we must move towards less recycling and that will
suffocate the delivery of this Strategy. It will be costly and damaging in the long-term and I
strongly believe, sir, that we should neither stride nor sleepwalk towards that.

2605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

2610 I will vote against the amendment because I think this is a matter of managing risk. We are not
here, as Deputy Brehaut and Deputy Parkinson said, to debate Waste Strategy or waste policy.
Well, we are, as an Assembly, but we are not here today to do it. That has been done.

Now, I know it is not easy when policies are agreed by a previous Assembly and then various
components of their implementation come to a future Assembly, most States' Members who have
served more than one term find themselves in that difficult position at some point. But that is just
the way life is and it has to be accepted.

2615 There is a challenge, if anybody who does not want this Strategy, anybody who does not like it,
should propose an alternative. We are well beyond the eleventh hour. We cannot simply fall back
and say, 'Look, Mont Cuet has another 10 years, another five years, or even another two or three
years and, therefore, there must be another way. There must be some kind of option out there so
it is worth taking the time.'

2620 Perhaps, in the past, the States have been in that position, but the States are no longer in that
position.

Deputy Laurie Queripel says you can extend the life of Mont Cuet, it is not that bad, and it
could last beyond 2020. If he wants to go into an election in our parish in 2020 proposing that
Mont Cuet is not that bad and that we could extend the life of it ... I hear people who represent
the northern part of the Island speaking in a way that would extend the life of Mont Cuet as a
place for putrescible waste, I find it extraordinary.

2625 Of course, Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment might result in cost reductions over a 20-year
period. Of course, that is true. But, there is no certainty about that. It is possible, it may even be
likely. He cannot quantify what the savings are though.

2630 If his amendment is accepted, the likely outcome is that the composition of the RDF is
changed. We do not know. Deputy Kuttelwascher says that does not have any effect, but there is
no evidence to suggest that changing the composition of the RDF would not change the product,
which was being exported, to the extent that some of the facilities which have already been
tendered for may no longer be necessary.

2635 The point that Deputy Dorey made, how on earth can the Policy & Resources Committee make
value judgements about business cases when the component parts of the business case may be
changing in the future, surely, is a good point?

That is the first problem. The first risk.

2640 The second risk there is the issue of the distraction, the time it would take. Already, we are in a
position where, if all these proposals are approved today, Mont Cuet's functional life ends before
it is going to be possible to get this Waste Strategy up and running, even if everything works to
plan. As Deputy Parkinson said in a media interview, there is the risk that you turn the key on and
the thing does not work. I am sure it does not quite work in that way, but I get the idea. Even if
everything works absolutely to plan, there are still a few months between the end of Mont Cuet's
functional life and the start of this new Strategy.

2645 I do not think that we have so many resources, in terms of staff time, that we can potentially
take staff away from getting the Strategy up and running and deploy them, instead, onto the
various investigations that Deputy Kuttelwascher wants to carry out in his amendment.

2650 The third problem is that he talks about cost reductions, and I accept that it is possible, or even likely, that his amendment could save some money. But, there is going to be some cost of adding to the residual waste stream the recyclables, or recyclates, whichever word, that he wants to take out. But he has no idea what that cost is. There is no evidence. In his speech there is nothing. In the amendment there is nothing. It is easy to say, through a very simple calculation, you can save
2655 £20 million over the course of the Strategy by knocking kerbside recycling on the head, but you cannot get rid of that rubbish completely. It is not going to just vanish into thin air. It is going to have to be dealt with as residual waste.

2660 Deputy Kuttelwascher did say, yes, that would have to be dealt with in residual waste, but he does not know what the number is and, yet, his amendment is based on the idea that it will save money.

We also do not know what the cost might be of delay. We do know that the States have racked up bills of millions of pounds by delaying previous waste strategies. It is not impossible that, by supporting this amendment, there will be some saving in cost by knocking kerbside recycling on the head over the 20-year lifetime of the Strategy, but that that saving will pale into insignificance compared to the added cost of delay.

2665 Unless that can be quantified, I do not think we are any long in the sort of place where we can take a chance on this. In my view, on balance, the risk is more on the side of Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment than it is on the side of the proposals.

2670 I am not an apologist for the proposals. The Waste Strategy that the States embarked upon in 2012 was not my preferred strategy. I have voted for amendments which would have taken us in a different direction, along with Deputy Laurie Queripel and others, but the fact is we are in the situation that we are and it is so easy, when something comes to the States just to criticise it, because nothing is perfect, there are always imperfections, without saying, 'This is what I want to do instead. This is the cost. These are the consequences.'

2675 Unless there is something before us that is quite concrete – an alternative proposal, an alternative strategy – I do not think there is any realistic choice but to adopt the proposals that are before the States. Some of the other amendments that are coming may be slightly more palatable, although I think they also, potentially create the risk of delay, or at least the distraction of staff resources being deployed in areas where they are not essential. This particular amendment, it does actually try and take the States in a different direction.

2680 It is not consistent with the Strategy that was agreed in 2012 and taking the Strategy in a different direction from this point is very risky, because it may incur additional delays and additional costs which, at the moment, are unquantifiable.

2685 We are in the problematic position we are in because there has already been too much delay and the costs have already been too high and I do not want to take any action today which may exacerbate those problems.

For that reason, I think the amendment should be rejected.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

2690

Deputy De Lisle: Sir, I am a strong proponent of targets and, of course, of kerbside.

I speak only in terms of the amendment on the table, which is essentially the call by Deputy Kuttelwascher for scrapping recycling targets and putting an end to kerbside recycling.

2695 Sir, targets drive the strategy and that is the one thing that some of the criticism is afraid of. The fact that they drive the strategy. In business, if you do not have a strategy and targets, then you are missing something. In fact, business needs them and government needs them even more.

2700 The important thing with targets, and I make no apology for bringing in the 50% recycling target into the States, because we have just got to look at what it has done. It has kept the States' eye on the ball. The Departments have had to consider all the time, 'We have got a 50% target, we have got to work towards that.'

2705 What has it done? Well, the targets have helped drive down the waste stream from 70,000 tonnes when I started on all this to 22,000 tonnes today. That is a phenomenal reduction and it is something that we can be proud of, because it has reduced our problem phenomenally. It has got rid of all those incinerators that were discussed earlier on, Suez and so on. Now, we are down to a very small volume of residual waste that we have to deal with.

In terms of kerbside and, also, bring banks, we have got to the stage where we realised that the bring banks were not going to move recycling forward and we needed something more. We only had to look at what others were doing to realise that their kerbside recycling was having a major impact.

2710 However, we knew, by studies, by Integral Skills, for example, those studies made it very clear to us, that kerbside recycling without food waste collection was only going to very marginally increase our recycling rates. So, it is a package. Food waste and the whole wet recycling to come in with the dry recycling, was going to have that momentum to push us into the 60% area of recycling.

2715 Now, the other point, of course, is to realise that, in terms of the capital expenditure, we are only looking at about a third of what we were looking at in terms of incineration for the third of the capital expenditure: 30-odd, compared with 90-odd, with respect to the investment, front end, with the incinerator.

2720 I think it is interesting, also, in terms of targets, to note that others are using targets and that the EU, for example, defines a 70% recycling target for 2030 along the same lines as has been promoted here. They believe it will boost recycling, it will create jobs in the green industries, tackle food waste in order to transform the current linear economy they talk about into a circular economy and promote sustainable growth; something that we need and we need to invest in the circular economy and promote sustainable growth in our community.

2725 In fact, they go as far as to say that recyclable waste will be banned from landfills by 2025. But, they also say that the new targets mean a fundamental transition from a linear to a more circular economy, where re-use, repair and recycling become the norm and waste would become a thing of the past.

2730 They also say, in terms of new job and new growth opportunities that they expect, through this, that 580,000 new jobs could be created and yearly greenhouse gas emissions might be reduced by 62 million tonnes around the year 2030. That, again, is a key objective and we have a part to play in that, because we know that 25% of our carbon problem here in Guernsey is through our waste.

2735 So, in all, I think we have to realise that we have come a long way, just in a few years, really, since 2007/2008. We have got a lot further to go, but sticking by the targets that have been put forward and sticking by kerbside, with food waste collected at the doorstep, will move us further forward into a more sustainable growth cycle in the future and will be supporting job creation, also, in the Island.

Thank you, sir.

2740

The Bailiff: Does anyone else wish to speak? Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

2745 I know a lot of people have talked about the context in which this Strategy and the implementation and this amendment is being laid today and I would like to reiterate Deputy Parkinson's opening comment that this is entitled 'The Implementation ...' of the Strategy. We are not here to debate the Strategy itself. It is a really important point.

2750 Finally, finally, finally, I say with great excitement, as someone who has watched this over decades, we are at the point where we can start to implement it, if we can just keep it moving on. I accept Deputy Roffey's point that that does not exclude it from scrutiny, but I hope that I am able to provide some of the answers to the questions that have been raised today.

It is important to remember that this Strategy, itself, has been approved twice and the core strategy is unchanged. The reason we are bringing it back to the States now is, basically, because of a change in the details of delivering those outcomes. I also think, this is something that a number of people have raised, it is important that we are all clear on what the Strategy actually is. I think, actually, Deputy Laurie Queripel summed it up very well. He is absolutely right. First and foremost, it is to minimise waste. Secondly, it is to encourage more re-use and recycling and repair. Then, and only then; thirdly, to export any residual waste as RDF for energy recovery.

So, our Waste Strategy is not export. Our Waste Strategy is waste minimisation. It is based on waste hierarchy and I can understand, I have huge sympathies with Deputy Laurie Queripel, actually, because I do not think the connection comes across strongly enough in our Policy Letter, to be honest. It is something I tried to get in there a bit more, as you can imagine, but there was a decision taken to keep the Policy Letter short and to the point and punchy, in the hope that, actually, all Members would read it.

I do accept Deputy Dudley Owen's concerns, as well, that it is, as a result of that, lacking in detail. I think in hindsight, I would have preferred to have seen more detail in that Policy Letter to answer some of those questions and fill out some of the details, because I think many of these questions would not need to have been to have been asked. I apologise, certainly, on my behalf, for not pushing that point a little bit more strongly, with regard to the Policy Letter itself.

This amendment does seek to fundamentally alter our Waste Strategy. That is just a key point and that is why I will not be supporting it and I would urge everyone else to not support it, either.

I was quite interested at the latest version of the P&R Plan and some of the comments that came back from the community consultation. One of the messages that came out loud and clear from that was: just make a decision and stick to it and get on with it. I agree.

We have heard a lot about the need for a bespoke Guernsey solution and a pragmatic Guernsey solution and, I think, it cannot be stressed enough that this really is. Anyone who has followed the history of the development of the Waste Strategy and its various cul-de-sacs, will know that, actually, the days of the 'decide and defend' policies that PSD brought forward did not work. It did not work, it did not engage with the community. It did not take the community with it.

So, when they were effectively faced with a blank piece of paper to start again and directed to start again, they decided not to make that mistake again. They decided they were not going to take a top-down approach, they were not going to sit in a room and decide what was best for the Island and then tell everyone about it and then defend it to the hilt and spend loads of money in the process. They were going to engage with the community and ask the community what they wanted and it is that consultation process which, I think, was one of their most comprehensive consultation processes that has really been undertaken. It was quite unique. That is what Deputy Laurie Queripel was talking about. He and I were both there in different guises, I suppose.

It really was a very good cross-section of the community. I actually came across the list of stakeholders the other day, of people that were there. It covered a huge section of the business community. All the usual suspects, finance, but also industry and retail and hospitality. All the major areas were covered and professional organisations, community groups, unions, States' representatives, the Douzaines, of course, everyone. A lot of the minority nationalities as well. I remember one group, I think, possibly included Deputy Queripel. I remember there was a Soroptimist, there was someone from a motorcycle club, and there were people from the parish.

It really was not a tree-huggers' convention, it was a proper cross-section of the Guernsey community and that is the origin of this Waste Strategy. This Waste Strategy arose directly from the community. The Public Services Department at the time listened to what the community wanted and devised the Waste Strategy directly from that. Even the weightings that were applied to the various criteria were taken directly from the community consultation, which was vast, it was not just a survey, by the way, it was a whole series of workshops and homework and all sorts and engagement with schools and everything. It was huge and not just a survey. Those weightings did tell us loud and clear, there was a very clear and consistent message, that the people of Guernsey wanted a sustainable solution to the Waste Strategy. They did not want a silver bullet solution.

2805 They wanted a sustainable solution and they really cared about things like recycling. That was loud and clear and consistent across all the different groups, I have to say.

This really does arise from the community. Like Deputy Laurie Queripel, Deputy Fallaize, this probably would not have been my preferred option, but it is the one we have got and we have got to make it work to the best of its ability and its efficiency.

2810 It is a complex and complicated policy and Deputy Fallaize is absolutely right that you cannot just look at the costs of one particular element of the Strategy and assume that, by taking that element out, those costs will just disappear. The waste does not disappear. We have not yet found a magic wand that will make us do that.

2815 So, not only are we dealing with transferred costs, in other words the costs of dealing with that waste in the residual waste stream, for example, but we are also dealing with an increase of waste because taking out these recycling targets and taking away things like kerbside that actually improve our waste reduction, that will cost us more at the end of the day.

2820 Deputy Soulsby was quite right to point out other costs that are not just financial. I would add a really significant one to that and that is reputational risk. If we change our Strategy at this point, I do not think there will be any point in tendering for anything in future. Our reputation is not great to begin with and it costs us dear in the financial sense, it really does.

Onto recycling targets. I have to confess I am not a big fan of targets. I do not really like them, but I like what they do. As has been pointed out, the recycling targets in this policy underpin the very fabric of our Waste Strategy, which, let us not forget, is first and foremost focused on reducing waste and encouraging more re-use and recycling.

2825 So, having recycling targets ensures that policy decisions are geared towards achieving those two key priorities of the Strategy, which was the point Deputy Roffey was making. He does not like that but, actually, unless we are to ignore those very two primary elements of the Strategy, the waste reduction and encouraging more re-use and recycling, then we have to have them. We absolutely have to have them.

2830 Now, this is the bit where Deputy Laurie Queripel was struggling and, I have to say, struggling in the sense that I, too, struggled with it for a long time, actually, and I did an awful lot of research on it. The connection between high recycling and waste reduction and it is a really key point.

2835 There is a direct correlation between high rates of recycling and waste reduction. I am not just talking about taking recyclates out of one waste stream and ending up with exactly the same amount left in your residual waste. Studies into the behavioural drivers of recycling, waste minimisation, conclude that the key driver for waste minimisation is awareness. Something that we will achieve, primarily, through the pay as you throw element of the policy. Obviously, something we have never had before. Islanders will, for the first time, have a financial incentive to reduce the amount of waste they put into black bags.

2840 We need to support this. I think it was Deputy Soulsby, again, we need to support this not just be encouraging a reduction in the waste households generate, but also by making the alternatives to putting things in black bags as easy and convenient as possible. Deputy Green alluded to that, too.

2845 So, one of these studies that looked into the behavioural drivers of waste minimisation summarised its conclusion by saying 'recycling attitudes are the major determinant of recycling behaviour' and that these attitudes are influenced firstly, by having the appropriate opportunities, facilities and knowledge to recycle and, secondly, by not being deterred by the issues of physically recycling. So, for our Strategy to succeed, we need to gear policy decisions towards achieving it and achieving those recycling targets are a fundamental mechanism in achieving what our Strategy sets out to do.

2850 Another point that I am really keen to clear up here is that kerbside collections work. We have heard disparaging remarks from Deputy Roffey about, 'Oh well, it has only had a very limited effect. It does not do very much.' But that is just not true. The overall figure is misleading because of a 30% reduction in paper use, globally, as well as in the Island, for example and natural variations in the green waste figures. But, when we look at the effect it has on households'

recycling, there has been a 10% increase in recycling from households and, specifically in terms of the blue bag waste, for the mixed recycling collections, a 30% increase. It really does work. Kerbside works.

2860 This reflects good levels of engagement. We know from continual feedback and surveys that the public really like kerbside and I actually dread to think what they would think if we took that away, having given them the interim scheme, or trial, or whatever you want to call it.

2865 Ultimately, the less waste we create, the less we will have to pay to dispose of it. These targets have not come out of nowhere. As Deputy Dorey pointed out, these targets have been carefully worked out and firmly within the Guernsey context. As it happens, they are exactly in line with the rest of Europe and we are better placed than most of Europe, I would argue, to achieve these. So, I do not think they are unrealistic and unpragmatic. Personally, I would like to be more ambitious than that.

Messing around with our recycling targets is really not a trivial issue and moving them would fundamentally undermine our Waste Strategy and negatively affect its efficiency.

2870 Now, although I am a little bit wary of targets-led policy making, by nature, I would like to also draw attention to the opposite. I think it is equally dangerous to adopt a lowest cost at all costs method of policy making. I do not think our job as Government is to spend as little money as is humanly possible, I think it is to deliver the service that our community needs and wants at the best possible value for money. The word 'value' is just as important as the term 'money'. Deputy
2875 Kuttelwascher was referring to value for money, but the definition of value for money is not just lowest cost, it is a comment on the quality and what it means to do.

I think the main lesson that we need to take out of this is, no one likes it when the costs go up. It was a real kick in the teeth for everyone involved. It is horrible. Deputy Dorey explained the lengths that the Waste Disposal Authority went to, to minimise the cost and to keep everything
2880 really tightly screwed down, but I think it would be naïve and probably wishful thinking to assume that, actually, of any of the options we had gone with that they, too, would not have risen in the exactly the same way.

I think the lesson to be learned is that, until you have put your option through a proper, rigorous tendering process, you cannot be sure of what that cost is. I think we have learned the
2885 lesson from that. It is regrettable that it is more expensive but ultimately it shows that we need to be very wary of any costs that have not been through that tendering process and I include the cost that would arise as a result of this amendment being passed.

Changing the composition of our residual waste stream means that we limit our options. Deputy Graham raised some very good questions about RDF and that is one of the things that I
2890 would like to just spend a little bit of time clarifying. Deputy Dorey referred to the waste acceptance criteria, so this is the criteria used to accept or reject waste at plants everywhere and Deputy Graham is absolutely right to ask these questions.

Food waste. Can food waste be accepted in RDF? Well, the answer is yes, but. And the but is interesting. It can be accepted into food waste, but it changes the composition of the food waste
2895 and more importantly it limits our options. Because the EU directive clearly states, and the whole of Europe is working to the same targets that we are proposing, that food waste should be taken out, the number of plants which would accept a high level of food waste as part of their RDF are going to become increasingly fewer and further between, as time goes on. So, we really are limiting our options and, of course, when we limit our options, we increase our risk to costs
2900 beyond our control.

Polystyrene? No, we cannot ban it. So, if we do not recycle it, I do not know what we are going to do. It is not a great thing to landfill, it is just so huge. We cannot recycle the levels of polystyrene that we generate in this Island.

2905 Glass is another one. About 5% of glass is acceptable but actually with Guernsey's waste stream, we find levels at about 10%. So, we need to take glass and polystyrene, to name a couple of examples, out of the RDF.

There are plenty of other waste streams that we really must keep out, but those are the main ones that I think have come up, maybe Deputy Parkinson might want to fill in the gaps that I have left there.

2910 So, food waste, specifically. Food waste is the really pernicious element of black bags at the moment. It is what smells. It is what attracts vermin and vermin that rip the bags open and cause mess. It is what emits methane. It is what makes waste grotty. It is putrescible.

Deputy Kuttelwascher tells us that people will not separate food waste and they do not elsewhere. Well, we are not asking them to separate it. This is another thing that came up. We are just asking them not to mix it in the first place. There is a big difference. We are not asking people to go through their black bags, picking out individual baked beans; we are just asking them to pop the baked beans into a separate caddy, and the caddy is really good.

2920 Actually, it gives me an opportunity to answer another question. Do not worry, no keys involved. The locking mechanism on the caddy is quite simply handle down, locked; handle up, unlocked. They are really great at keeping smells out of the home and they are secure and they are good. All those details have been really well thought through.

Anyway, back to whether or not people will separate food waste. They certainly do, elsewhere. The most recent DEFA report for England says that the amount of separately collected food waste has continued to increase, from 290,000 tonnes in 2014 to 307,000 tonnes in 2015 and that represents an annual increase of 5.8% for England. In research carried out locally in 2011, more than 73% of respondents said they would be willing to separate food waste. So, all the evidence points to the fact that it will work.

2930 Actually, if you think that food waste comprises 40% of the average black bag and you are paying for that black bag, you have got a really good incentive right there to not chuck it in your black bag and to just pop it in the caddy.

Deputy Kuttelwascher is also quite right that food waste is a problem in terms of our cultural attitude to it. This is something that has got my goat for some time. Like Deputy Gollop, I too, like the human version of recycling. I think the figures show that the average Guernsey expenditure per household is about £100 per week on food and, yet, the evidence shows that a huge amount of that food is wasted. At least a third. The official figure is about £50 per month on food waste, but I think, personally, having looked at the figures, I suspect that in Guernsey our number is a little higher than that.

2940 So, if we were to completely remove food waste and just ignoring, for a second, all the problems that that would create, we could potentially achieve a saving of 50p per week per household, which is not necessarily to be sniffed at, obviously. But, I think if we look at it in the context of what Islanders stand to save by that increased awareness and all the rest of it, Islanders could actually be quids in by the end of this. We know that awareness is the key behavioural driver for waste minimisation.

2945 Actually, by saying 'do not put your food waste in your black bag, just put it somewhere else' that raises awareness. It combines with a whole bunch of other initiatives, which we did not go into enough detail in our policy paper about it: things like the Love Food Hate Waste campaign, which has got absolutely loads of different strands of action, some of which are already in play. That actually potentially will be a far greater service to Islanders because they will actually be able to reduce the amount of money they currently waste on food each week.

2950 I have talked about the potential financial implications of including food waste in RDF. It would require additional processing, of course, increasing operational costs at the transfer station and increased maintenance costs as well. By having a high proportion of food in RDF, it would actually create additional costs, in addition to the straight transfer costs. Waste arisings will also rise if we remove the recycling targets.

2955 Bring banks. We have had a lot of love for bring banks, today. I just want to bust a couple of myths on that front, as well. Yes, bring banks do work for many people and, in the days when we had bring banks alone, we did have admirable rates of recycling. I think we were one of the

jurisdictions that had one of the highest rates of recycling without kerbside. So, testament to the strong feeling for recycling within the community. It is great.

2960 However, it is disingenuous to suggest that we could get by on bring banks alone. They do not work for everyone and we need a strategy that is inclusive and does work for everyone and bring banks just do not.

2965 I have to say I was a little surprised to hear this argument from Deputy Roffey, who is normally a champion of social inclusivity. Well, I was surprised. Bring banks do not work for the 8,000 adults that do not drive. They do not work for people on low incomes who cannot afford a car. They do not work for people with mobility problems or some disabilities. As a political representative for Ageing Well in the Bailiwick, I have to add that I am all too aware of how difficult making journeys can be for the older people in our community.

2970 So, bring banks actually do not work for the many people in Guernsey who just have very busy lives. This is not speculation or rhetoric. It is worth reminding Members that, before the introduction of the interim kerbside collection scheme, there were not one, but two businesses that collected waste from the homes of people who were prepared to pay for that service, because bring banks did not work for them.

2975 There is an actual, quantifiable demand for kerbside and I would like to reiterate that our Strategy needs to be in line with our values of inclusion. We do need to have a Strategy that will work for everyone, including the people that are, in some respects, marginalised by the very specific issues that I mentioned.

2980 There are many more problems with bring banks. It is not just about an unwillingness to find suitable sites. Finding suitable sites in itself is a really gnarly issue. There are all sorts of issues around land use and planning and infrastructure, legal considerations, before we even get into the aesthetic and visual and amenity impact. But, more to the point, they are really inefficient. Managing them is really tricky. You get these huge spikes at the weekend, when everyone charges down to the bring banks to do their recycling and it is then that we realise that capacity is a real issue.

2985 I am trying to understand what this amazing system of enhanced bring banks would look like and no one has quite managed to describe it for me. So, yet again, that is another uncertainty that I would rather just not have. We are not suggesting obliterating all bring banks overnight. We are suggesting – sorry? As far as I am aware there is definitely a view to reduce them and make the ones we keep more effective, but I do not know if there is an explicit view to get rid of them altogether. (**A Member:** There will be.)

2990 Well, anyway. It is certainly not about to happen. By that time, all the kerbside collections will be working so brilliantly, anyway.

In summary, I think you have probably heard about enough from me. (**A Member:** And more!)

2995 In summary, I think this amendment is a fundamental change of strategy that we do not have time to do. It has so many inherent risks, it really does. I am just really keen to get on and implement the Strategy as smoothly and effectively as possible and really throw my weight behind all those waste minimisation, waste prevention – I would start at waste prevention, actually – measures that are so integral to it and I would ask for this Assembly's support in that by rejecting this amendment and letting us get on with implementing the Strategy.

3000 Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

3005 I would thank Deputy de Sausmarez for dealing with many of what I would call peripheral issues which have arisen during the course of this debate, the alleged benefits of bring banks and the alleged reluctance of the public to use kerbside, and so on.

I want to focus on what, essentially, are the core issues in this amendment, which are the cost and delay.

3010 Now, Deputy Kuttelwascher has asserted, right at the beginning, that there would be no cost associated with passing his amendment and it would produce no delay. I want to examine those assertions in some detail.

3015 Leaving food waste in the residue of our waste would alter the character of the RDF that we produce and, although many energy from waste plants can deal with RDF that includes food waste, Amec Foster Wheeler, who have been our advisers on this, have indicated that the processing equipment would require a higher specification if high volumes of food waste are left in the residue.

3020 More plant cleaning and maintenance would also be required. Conversely, of course, if we did not require space up at Longue Hougue for processing food waste, we would not need the machinery to do that and we would not need the corresponding space in which to put the machinery.

3025 But the estimated cost of the equipment to do the food processing is about £200,000 out of the total capital cost of about £2 million, estimated in this Report. The rest of that cost is the cost of the building in which the equipment sits and the control system.

3030 So actually eliminating the machinery to deal with the food waste would save about £200,000, but at a cost of increasing the material going into the residual RDF system, which is unquantifiable, or unquantified at this point. We do not know. We are advised by Amec Foster Wheeler that the equipment would have to be specified higher than the equipment currently planned and, of course, that has not been tested in the market to see where we could get that equipment or how much it might cost to buy it.

3035 So, we do not know if leaving food waste in the residue would actually save any money and we have not been considering this option, because that is not the stated waste management policy of the States. Our job is to implement the agreed Solid Waste Strategy and that is predicated on high rates of recycling.

3040 Indeed, if Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment is passed, we will not know the answer to his question, the question of whether it is actually cheaper to leave the food waste in the RDF, or to separately process it, until a further report to the Assembly is made, he says, by March 2019. After which, presumably, the States' Trading Supervisory Board would be expected to go out to a further tender process for the revised specification of the equipment and revised design of the buildings. That is to say if we could get anyone to tender at all, given our woeful history in this area.

3045 Even if we were able to get somebody to tender, starting a process again in March 2019, let us have a guess at when we might get that equipment up and operational. Shall we say 2021, I do not know? But, certainly, long after the available capacity at Mont Cuet has been completely exhausted.

Unless Deputy Kuttelwascher comes up with a plan as to what we should be doing with the waste while we are preparing his report and acting on it, then I would suggest it would be highly dangerous for anyone to support it.

3050 Other points that have arisen in the debate, I will just pick up some. Deputy de Sausmarez has ably answered many of them already, but in chronological order Deputy Laurie Queripel asked specifically about the lockable caddies and, as Deputy de Sausmarez has explained, this does not involve combination locks or padlocks or any other form of security. We are dealing here with the threat of sea gulls and rats and dogs, not with burglars! (*Laughter*)

3055 Simply put, on the caddies we have seen, if the handle is up, it is locked; if the handle is down, it is unlocked.

3060 He also asked if recyclates are being dumped into landfill or incinerators. Well, the answer in Guernsey is, certainly, no, and clearly, we cannot speak for the whole of the rest of the world. There was one incident, which has already been referred to, where milk cartons were dumped in Mont Cuet because they had been contaminated by hydraulic fluid.

Deputy Inder: I am sorry, sir, I live in the north and, on very regular occasions, I see the small compactor, with milk cartons in the back of it, heading towards Mont Cuet and it looks like, to me, they are going through the gate and getting dumped.

3065 So I do not know where you are getting your information from, but I am seeing small compactors being dumped in landfill. Sorry, not the small compactors; the milk cartons! (*Laughter*) I was thinking of Lagan dumping cars around the airport!

Deputy Parkinson: I do not know where these compactors were heading –

3070 **Deputy Inder:** They were heading to the –

The Bailiff: Through the chair, please, Deputy Inder.

3075 **Deputy Parkinson:** Deputy Inder, I presume, did not follow them to the gates of Mont Cuet?

Deputy Inder: I followed them to the gates of Mont Cuet and that is where they were going.

Deputy Parkinson: I have no information on those events and I cannot comment further.

3080 **Deputy Inder:** I have.

The Bailiff: Is this a point of order or is it a give way point?

3085 **Deputy Inder:** I have no idea.

The Bailiff: You are allowed to raise a point of order and a give way point, if Deputy Parkinson gives way.

3090 **Deputy Parkinson:** Sir, as far as we are aware, the milk cartons are being sent off for recycling, Deputy Dudley Owen criticised the report for being driven by a green agenda, I think she put it. Of course, the point is we are not revisiting, fundamentally, the States' solid waste policy. We are in the business of trying to implement it.

We did not revisit things like recycling targets, because that is not our job. The States has already agreed to a waste policy which is based on high rates of recycling.

3095 She asked where the £250,000 saving from central management of the kerbside system might come from, if it is not from the Douzaines, the parishes themselves. That is an estimate, based on the benefits of rationalising the collection of kerbside, the rounds.

3100 We have a situation, at the moment, where in certain roads on the Island, waste is collected on one side of the road by one contractor, but on the other side of the road by a different contractor because it is in a different parish. We have a situation, as Deputy Dudley Owen will know, in the western parishes where the three parishes use the same contractor but, because the contractor has to get a separate receipt for the waste collected in each of the parishes, they collect the waste from Torteval in one trip, take it up to Mont Cuet and dump it and bring back a receipt for the Douzaine and then go and collect the waste from the other parishes, and so on.

3105 Basically, it is a very inefficient system. If you were organising it centrally, you would reorganise the collection rounds to make more sense. You would give the contract to one or two large firms, perhaps, who would then be motivated and financially rewarded to acquire the proper equipment to do the job.

3110 But, I have not got any more specifics on that and, if Deputy Dudley Owen wants to get more information from my board, we can endeavour to break that £250,000 figure down for her.

She asked what will happen with non-compliance with food separation. Will there be some kind of penalty, presumably, for not doing it? No. The policy is a stick-and-carrot approach and, of

course, the financial penalty for not separating is that you will put more waste in black bags, which will cost you more money.

3115 You can save yourself that money by putting your food waste in a separate food waste caddy, which will be collected from you for free.

Now, Deputy Graham asked whether food and plastics can be included in RDF and Deputy de Sausmarez has explained that, yes, they can, but of course it changes the nature of the RDF, or the specification of it. She reminds us, as Deputy Brehaut said at the start of this debate, that the waste needs to meet the acceptance criteria of the plants that will accept it. Being more combustibile, or having a higher calorific value, for example, does not necessarily make it more attractive to the plants. What they want is waste that will burn at a steady temperature, at a steady rate, rather than waste which could burn too hot or too cold.

3125 Now, if the food waste is left in the residual waste stream, the acceptance criteria of the plants to which the RDF is ultimately sent may mean that we have to take additional steps to screen out certain food wastes, or other products, which are unacceptable to the recipient plant.

That would involve more processing at the waste transfer station, rather than the processing being done where it is most efficient to do it, which is actually in the household, in the kitchen.

3130 Deputy Graham asked what the role of kerbside is. Well, the answer is it is there to make recycling easier and, as Deputy de Sausmarez has said, there are many people on this Island who actually find bring banks, practically, very difficult to use. As a Deputy for St Peter Port, for example, I know that there are many residents of St Peter Port who do not have cars and, for whom, there is no convenient local bring bank. If you live around Trinity Square, for example, you have got to take the waste a long way to find a bring bank and, if you do not have a car, that just basically means you are not going to do it.

3135 The reality is, if we are going to introduce a system which encourages people to segregate waste, which rewards them for doing separation at source, effectively by making it more expensive to dump the unsorted residue, then we have to give them a fair chance of co-operating with the system.

3140 If it is impractical for them to separate the recyclables out so that they are, in effect, forced to put it all in a black bag, we are forcing them to incur extra expense which other members of the community will not have to bear. I think Deputy de Sausmarez made the very valid point that this is partly about social equality.

3145 I think all the other points have been addressed in other answers. I have delayed making my speech until what I hope is two thirds of the way through the debate, so as to have an opportunity to answer some of the questions that may have arisen. If any further questions arise in the remainder of the debate, I will have to leave it to Deputy Brehaut to pick all of those up at the end.

But, thank you for your attention so far.

3150

The Bailiff: Perhaps it is closer to the end of the debate than you thought, Deputy Parkinson. Oh. Yes. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

3155

The Bailiff: Can you switch your microphone on?

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

3160 I started off writing my speech and I started off with similar sentiments to Deputy Soulsby. It is happening again. How many times do we have to get a strategy through the States and, when it comes back, we cannot resist the temptation of unpicking it, just a little bit? Because then, it will still be the same. But it will not.

3165 A strategy is a strategy. It is built holistically. All the parts are built together. You take one bit out, it does not mean that the strategy is the same. It does not mean the strategy will work the same. We will end up with something that is fundamentally different.

I call this the pick-and-mix amendment. Anyone for a lemon sherbet, or Werther's Original?

I would have hoped that we would have learned a lesson about the cries of it being cheaper and better. Like others have said before, the escalating costs are due to there not being a proper, tendered amount given when we made the decision to go with the Strategy.

3170 Now, we are sitting with something that clearly, the public and ourselves, we have all expressed it, it does not feel like we are getting the value for money because, when the Strategy was agreed, there were certain costs involved and those have escalated. But simply taking the targets out and taking out little bits of the Strategy is not going to get us that much cheaper.

3175 Recycling targets are not a goal on their own. They are part of the bigger picture. As Deputy Soulsby said, and I take on board what Deputy Laurie Queripel was saying, but, as Deputy Soulsby pointed out, by having the recycling targets and separating at source, people become aware of how much waste they are producing and, therefore, that starts the process to reduce the amount of waste they are producing, because that is ultimately what we are trying to achieve with this. Reducing the waste.

3180 We have chosen a Strategy that is exporting the waste and, therefore, if we reduce the waste, we will be exporting less. The bigger picture is that on the Island we are re-thinking our whole waste cycle in ways that are environmentally and economically better for the Island. This is part of a shift that is happening across the world.

3185 In the UK and Europe, companies are looking at the whole life-cycle of their products and designing packaging with those life-cycles in mind. We have seen this. If you had been at the Scrutiny review of the Waste Strategy, one of the lessons learned is how waste management is changing throughout the world and that is part of the problem. When civil servants started looking at this, they had to up-skill themselves in all these different areas. They did not have the expertise to begin with. Not only that, because the entire waste management idea and principle is changing all the time.

3190 Simply cutting recycling targets out of the strategy would fundamentally alter its effectiveness and, most certainly, cost more to the taxpayer and users. Why? Because we would not be achieving what we set out to do, which is reducing all forms of waste.

3195 This would not only be an environmental backward step, but a step backward, economically, as well.

There has been a lot of talk about idealists in this Assembly and we should all be more pragmatic. But, I say, we need to be both. We need to be able to look at the big picture and understand how the whole Strategy works, but we must never forget how this affects the day-to-day life of the taxpayer.

3200 This is something Deputy Roffey brought up. But this amendment, while purporting to do so, does not.

The second part of this amendment is asking STSB and E&I to cease kerbside collections. It has been hailed as a money saver. However, it completely ignores the best thing about the Strategy, which is the user-pays principle. This gives people the power to pay less.

3205 If you take out kerbside, then you lose full access to the user-pays principle. User-pays gives people the power to control how much they are charged, unlike our current TRP system. As you know, it is not all linked into how much waste you produce, with TRP, it is just the size of your house.

3210 In the paper, on page 23, point 7.17, it says by taking out food waste and kerbside, you can save a possible saving per household of £1.

If the average price is £7 charge, then that would mean you would be paying £6 instead of £7. A saving of £1.

3215 Like Deputy Roffey said, £1 does not sound like a lot, but to some people it is a great deal. I agree with Deputy Roffey there. But the £7 is not a flat rate. It is made up of various components. Importantly, not all of those are fixed. The make-up and ratio of this is not fixed in stone.

3220 On average, a household would end up paying a standing charge of roughly, or a fixed charge, about £4 per week. That is made up roughly of a parish charge for collection of approximately £2.20, depending on the parish this may vary, or if others get their way, it might be something different, and the Waste Disposal Authority standing charge of roughly about £1.90. That would be a fixed charge, but then there is a charge of that bag of £2.50.

The boffins have calculated that the average household puts out about one and a half bags per week. Personally, I put out one bag per week.

3225 We know that households will, by necessity, be paying more, because we are moving from a very cheap form of waste disposal that we put in a hole to a much more sustainable method. Currently, households have no way of bringing their waste costs down.

3230 Given, it is cheap; that works for some people. In the new system, we are looking to empower people to bring down their bills. If this amendment passes, households will lose that control. So, for example, Mrs Le Page, she is often cited as an example, is currently one of the TRP losers. She pays a high collection charge because she lives in a big house on her own and only puts out half a black bag and half a bag of recyclables, currently, because there is kerbside.

Under the new scheme, she will be paying a £4 fixed charge. She still recycles half a bag and her half a bag of waste now becomes half a bag every two weeks, because she is able to take out the food waste, which makes up roughly 40% of the black bag waste. That works out about 75p a week. So, she is going to be paying £4.75 per week.

3235 Under a potential Kuttelwascher scheme, Mrs Le Page possibly pays slightly less standing charge, because the recyclables no longer collect at a kerbside, she will still have to pay for the bring banks. Maybe the standing charge might be slightly less? We will say £3.50. I do not know, we have not done the calculations.

3240 Mrs Le Page may not be able to get to the bring banks and, so, she puts more of the recyclables in the black bag. Why wouldn't she? The Government has also abandoned the idea of recycling targets and recycling has shrunk to glass and tin only. Again, less control over how much she pays.

So, she now puts one black bag out a week. That is £2.50. Mrs Le Page's bill will now be £6 per week, instead of a controlled £4.75.

3245 Or, how about a single mother with three children, no car? Let us call her Lizzie. Currently, Lizzie does not recycle and she puts out a maximum of two black bags a week. Under the new scheme, there is £4 fixed charge. The switch has meant she now recycles one bag per week, because she is incentivised to take out the recyclables, because she is paying for the black bag. That works out at £6.50 a week, but she can reduce even further if she separates the food waste out. So, she could be potentially paying £5.75 a week.

Do you see that there is control given?

If we did go to bring banks only, again, those who already have a garden, so they could compost, can actually get to the bring banks, or pay for kerbside recycling, would be the winners.

3255 Has this amendment even bothered to think about those who could not access a bring bank? In terms of social inclusion, kerbside collection is far more accessible to many Islanders, particularly the elderly, infirm or disabled.

Don't they have a right to be included? They do not need to ask favours to get them to the bring bank or have a special system just for them. Kerbside recycling means that they can participate just like everybody else.

3260 Yes, there will be an increase in householders' waste bills. That will be the case, no matter what we do. But keeping kerbside recycling gives flexibility and gives power to the public to reduce their bills. This Assembly has been kicking that can down the road for too long. It is time to put this in place, this integrated Waste Strategy, that we are paying for and not passing the buck, again, to the next generation to clean up the mess.

3265 We are responsible to the next generation for passing on a responsible, sustainable, inclusive waste programme. Do not be tempted by the siren song of Deputy Kuttelwascher. Help Mrs Le Page have control over her bills.

Please vote against this amendment.

3270 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: Thank you, sir.

I had a speech, but it has already been said, so I am not going to make the speech. What I will do is just respond to an interruption, if I may?

3275 States Works collects cartons from the bring banks. These are subsequently delivered for processing at Mayside. Mayside does not have a weighbridge so, before delivery, the vehicle goes for weighing at one of the States Works' weighbridges. That is likely to be the closest weighbridge to where they finish their collection round. If someone has seen cartons heading towards Mont Cuet, the vehicle is either heading to the Chouet headland, to the bring bank site to empty cartons from there, or to weigh its load.

Deputy Inder: Sir, my apologies to Deputy Parkinson.

Thank you for that correction, Deputy Smithies. I have to take that all back.

3285 **The Bailiff:** I can see no one else rising, so I now invite Deputy Brehaut to speak, immediately before Deputy Kuttelwascher replies.

Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

3290 So it is Deputy Inder, not Deputy Maigret, we can conclude on that!

In reverse order, perhaps, just to touch on what people have said during the debate and I appreciate Deputy Parkinson, Deputy de Sausmarez and, more recently, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel have touched on a great deal on this, but there is this attraction to bring banks, there is no doubt about that.

3295 I think, the half-way house, as far as STSB and E&I need to address, is will we have the facility at Longue Hougue? We know there will be a recycling facility there. The scavenging yard that really was not up to much. If people do have cardboard or something by volume, there could be a facility where people can drop something off.

3300 When I speak to people, people say, 'We had something by volume that we could not dispose of.' Maybe that could possibly be some type of compromise.

I strongly agree with Deputy Yerby about targets and I know it is ironic, because I am involved in this States' Report, because I am amending a target. But the point is, the target itself is something, but it is the composition of the materials that make the target. If we are saying that we have got to have 55% of recycling, it is what makes up the recycling. It is the focus of a community, the collective materials that make up that 50%.

3305 If you have a number that people can aim for, people will continue to do something that they actually enjoy doing. We know that people have embraced recycling and we know that people feel very positive about recycling and we need to tap into that.

3310 This is the confusing thing, with this amendment. If we all recall the confusion over what goes into a clear bag, what goes into a blue bag, what evening do you leave it out. For some people, I know, that still creates quite a problem. If you then add to that, we are taking out plastics, we are taking out materials, you do not recycle that any more, you will lose the buy-in of the community. You will lose people's willingness to participate, because they have been supportive, you have tinkered with it, you do not believe there are targets, you do not have faith in the Strategy that you are presenting and there is a risk that the public will opt out.

3315 So, I think targets are important, because people respond to them.

3320 Deputy Dudley Owen, I am glad that she managed to get hold of the officers and they gave her the information she wanted. I was going to say Deputy Lindsay "de Summary", because her summaries have been quite informative, but Deputy de Sausmarez did touch on that. This policy letter could have been voluminous, but there is so much information that is there, from previous debates, and there is so much online, that we felt that the policy letter need not intimidate people, bearing in mind there is such a huge amount of information there. Brief that it is, I think it is very clearly written and certainly understandable.

3325 She also said, I think the language she used, was whether everyone followed the rigours. It should not be presented that it is exceptional for people to opt into recycling and doing the responsible thing, because people do that. Sometimes that is presented as, 'I have got a busy lifestyle, but I manage to do it.' Actually, the majority of people manage to do it and that is what we should not forget. There is mass participation in recycling and we should not do anything that puts that at risk.

3330 Again, touching on bring banks. It was mentioned by Deputy Dudley Owen. Bring banks are more tolerated than they are accepted by near neighbours. When people talk about impairment of bring banks, that would mean presumably removing them, certainly the coastal ones, resurfacing the paths that they are on. It would mean in certain cases, certainly, minor planning permissions because they will look very different. We know that the vast number of people are not using them and cannot get to them because of issues other people have already touched on; mobility issues, etc.

3340 I make no apologies. Guernsey likes to see itself, on one hand, as being remote, fiercely independent, stubbornly Guernsey, but we cannot disregard European legislation with regard to best environmental practice. I make no apologies at all for approving a scheme that does meet best practice European-wide.

3345 This idea, and this is where debates like this do get a little bit operational, that we do not demonstrate what punitive sanctions against people who leave food waste in, if we think about the blue and the clear bags, actually it was very successful. If people left out the wrong thing, the bag was not collected and there was a label on it, until people understood exactly what they needed to do.

Now, it was Deputy Graham who posed, just who are the heroes and who are the villains? Well, villains place amendments and heroes never vote for them! (*Laughter*) Never, under no circumstances would a hero vote for an amendment such as that.

3350 He raised a serious point regarding the composition of RDF and that is crucial. It is a fuel, it is a commodity, and it has a market place. If you change the make-up of that commodity, it becomes a different thing and you run the risk of limiting the market, which is what, if you take the recyclates out, sorry, add them in, rather, is exactly what you will be doing and I agree also with Deputy Soulsby about the cost of recycling, how environmentally responsible it is and the cost of not being environmentally responsible.

3355 Now, Deputy Queripel said something and he was right. The last waste debate, people felt – I am in a quarry, please, I'm trying to get out! – that we should take one more look, one more glance at a quarry, at a landfill, and it was at the eleventh hour and I personally wanted to, once and for all, ensure that we did not go down that route and we did not take that option.

3360 We placed an amendment and Deputy Queripel is right. It received four votes. The quarry option was out, once and for all.

He spoke of a complex mechanism in St Martin's. We call them lids. As I understand it, it is like a picnic box. When the lid is down, it is locked; when you lift the handle, it is open.

3365 He did also say, in interpretation of the Strategy, we should not behave in a heavy-handed way and I keep getting back to this. It is the public that are delivering this for us. We can set the target and that is why it is in. We can talk about the hierarchy, we can promote it, but it is the public, ultimately that deliver this Strategy for us.

Deputy Roffey said cheap is not a dirty word, but cheap is actually a dirty process. When you want to do the right thing with your waste, when you are doing the responsible thing, both as an

3370 Island and for a broader, international community, it will cost more. We have been doing the cheap and dirty thing for a very, very long time and any change in the way we set the bar in charging is bound to meet some resistance.

Where I do not agree, strongly, is this idea, if Guernsey manufactured something, if Guernsey was an industry and we produced things and there was a by-product and we had to deal with, I think that is managing your own waste. But, the fact that we import pretty much everything here, why not? It is going from the shop to your fridge, to the table, to the bin and we are re-packaging most of that up and sending it out as a residual fuel.

I think that is dealing with our waste responsibly, rather than holding that waste stream on-Island, with the leachates and the gases and everything else that goes with it. I just wanted to make, because Deputy Kuttelwascher placed the amendment, obviously, and spoke first, this is not an amendment, and it is more than that. This is a fundamental change in strategy. It is a fundamental change in direction and it is an extremely dangerous amendment and I have been in this Assembly, I have seen them before and they are expensive. Extremely expensive.

If we are to change the commodity that we are going to export, to make it a different thing and try and market it, how can we do that, when people have tendered to deal with a certain type of specified waste? Do we have to change the equipment that deals with this revised product?

The fundamental to this is that, Deputy Kuttelwascher spoke about the price of oil. I do not know if this was the intention but I do not know whether his intention is you flick on and off aspects of recycling when the oil price is up or down. We know there are plants mothballed in the UK. We know the plastic prices go up and down. But any investor is not there for the year or the five years. It is a 10-year game. People will stockpile plastic. People will wait until the market goes up.

We need to take the longer-term view and act responsibly, in that regard, rather than simply add all of that recycling back into what is a fuel and, sorry for the repetition, add the calorific value and then change the marketplace.

I can only, Members, implore you, if you are going to vote for this amendment, you need an appreciation of cost and you have not got that. You are aware that it effectively dismisses, takes apart the Strategy and we are unaware what the Strategy will look like if this amendment, if the work is done and we return to the Assembly with a fundamentally different model.

I would implore you not to support this amendment, thank you.

3400

The Bailiff: Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: So soon. Thank you, sir.

Something I agree with Deputy Brehaut and something that he has said which a lot of people have said the opposite, is that, basically, refuse derived fuel is a perfectly good waste of processing some of our waste. I do not consider refuse derived fuel as a waste stream, which it has been described as by many. It is a useful fuel, it can be used in power plants, incinerator-type. It is also used quite a lot in cement factories for firing up their boilers to make cement. So, refuse derived fuel is ... The only real waste stream is at the bottom, where you get to dispose and there is some confusion between waste and residual waste. But, there we go.

He mentioned the tendered product. The problem is, about the tendered product, RDF, we do not know what it is going to be now. We can only make estimates of how much plastic might be in there, how much polystyrene will be in there. People can still put it in their bags, how much?

We do not know what it is going to be. All you will know on the day is that when the plant starts running, someone will measure the calorific value and see what it is.

As for villains and heroes, then we are all villains and all heroes, depending on what we are discussing, but I suppose, villain. I do not mind. I was always a naughty boy at school, anyhow.

I do not agree that what I am proposing is a fundamental change, but I am highlighting an issue and I am going to just focus, at the moment, on, to me, a critical issue is food waste. What is top of the waste hierarchy? Reduce. Now, food waste is one area where we could actually be very,

3420

very effective. Now, it has been said, I think somebody said, I cannot remember, I think it was Deputy de Sausmarez, there is 40% of what is in the plastic bag is food waste. Well, it is not in mine, but it might be in some.

3425 It is interesting that that is exactly the same figure that was recently produced in America as how much volume of their food production is trashed and it is 40%. That is not quite the same, it is just a different figure.

So, what we should be doing is reducing the waste, and that is all about education. It is about you and me, stop buying too much.

3430 Now, not everybody does, I know, but a lot of people do. How many times do you have a clear out because things are out of date? Bin it, bin it, bin it. Because we are an affluent society.

3435 What is interesting, if we really focused on the top of the hierarchy, which is the number one priority, we might eliminate it, as near as dammit. There will always be food waste in the waste stream, because you have packaging for certain foodstuffs, which you could not remove. All they do is contaminate the packaging. Spaghetti Bolognese in a packet and everything else. There will always been food waste-contaminated containers, especially from takeaways. It will never leave.

So, at the present time, we do not know how much food waste will be going through, or all these other recyclables, the day the plant opens.

3440 What are we basing our calculations on? We have just been told by Deputy Parkinson that their whole process might need to be changed if we have high volume. What is a high volume? Is it 1%, 5%? I do not know.

3445 It may be, and this is a high-risk situation, it is whatever is specified at the present time, with a view to trying to take food waste out of the waste stream. It may not work. Now, there will be contingencies in the plans and, if you are going to have to spend another £200,000 to bring somebody on board to deal with it, fine. But, let us face facts, people want certainty, they want numbers, they want estimates.

We do not know and will not know in the third and fourth quarters of 2018 what will be the calorific value of whatever refuse derived fuel we produce and it will change time. Refuse derived calorific values are regularly monitored and checked. It is a big uncertainty and it is a big risk.

I loved Deputy Smithies' answer. I thought that was really good.

3450 User-pays principle. Deputy Hansmann Rouxel mentioned it. The trouble is, she forgot to mention we would only have control over one part of the cost. There will be two further charges made by the parish and via the Waste Disposal Authority, most probably through TRP. We will only have control over a modest part of the actual cost. Even if you produce no waste, you would still be paying, which is fine.

3455 This £1 possible saving if you take away kerbside recycling, that is roughly a 14% saving. In how many discussions will we just dismiss it? Policy & Resources are looking for savings of 3%, 5% and 5% over the next three years in expenditure. That adds up to 13, although the actual saving is a bit different. It is that sort of magnitude and we are taking that very seriously.

I think a 14% saving is worth considering.

3460 The other thing is we do not have a Strategy that just exports waste. I do not think we will be exporting any waste. RDF is not waste. We export Tetra Paks, we export everything now, except glass. So, I am not quite sure what that argument is. Do not call RDF waste. It is not.

3465 Deputy Parkinson mentioned what savings there might be in the capital expenditure, but he did not mention at all the revenue expenditure, which is forecast to be £8.4 million over the 20 years. I am saying, if people take to heart the first thing on top of the waste hierarchy, which is reduce, the food waste could virtually vanish from the system. We could do that. We could do it next week, if everybody else did. We could do it. Will we? Don't know.

3470 Bring banks. Social inclusivity. Well, I was chairman of Age Concern, Bailiwick of Guernsey, as it is called now, for five years. Bring banks were in then and we dealt with it. We had single pensioners who had no transport; most of them had families, not all of them, but believe it or not there was an amazing willingness on the part of volunteers to assist in regularly recycling things,

waste things were taken by other people. So, it is something the community can deal with and has dealt with and, I presume, still may be.

3475 I do not think that is something that cannot be overcome just by people being a good neighbour. If I am going down somewhere with a car-load of stuff, the next-door neighbour has got a bag, I will take it. It is not the end of the world, just because someone has not got a car. It does not mean to say they cannot do it. It can be done, with some assistance.

3480 Value for money, I know what value for money is. In fact, I define it as function over cost. Or you could call it benefit over cost. It sounds more reasonable. I know full well that the way you increase that number is either reduce costs or increase the benefit. Sometimes, you can double the benefit for a 10% increase in cost and that is good value for money, although costs go up. I am aware of that.

3485 But with the proposals we have, most of the potential has gone to cost and the reason for that is the rapidly escalating costs, which were never envisaged at the time that this was all considered and thought about. It is becoming a concern.

The Enough is Enough campaign, that massive protest that was held on North Beach had three things that they were concerned about. They did not like the minority transport report and the costs that that was going to put on. They did not like the inexorable march of charges and taxes and duties and they also thought that Government were wasting money.

3490 Well, this falls into two of those categories. Are we going to waste money having what I would call a gold-plated system, or should we be a bit more realistic? We can still deliver treatment of our waste. It will get exported, but we can do it, for a lesser cost, and that would translate to value for money, because if you reduce costs, value for money increases.

3495 Messing about with recycling targets. My goodness, the Committee and the Board are doing just that! Although you can think that changing the dates, moving them is fine, but do not forget the major thing they are doing is they are taking out commercial waste and that is the biggest producer of waste. If that is not messing about with targets, I do not know what is. So, it is alright for someone else to mess about – well, enough is enough.

No, I have not quite finished.

3500 Most of what I have said actually covers what Deputy de Sausmarez brought up. Deputy De Lisle was interesting. He again focused on food waste. Now, in the Report, food waste is required to be collected and separated to meet targets and I am saying, if you do this Strategy properly, there should not really be any. But nobody is focusing on reducing it in the first place and that is top of the hierarchy, which is a shame.

3505 Although he mentions the capital costs, he misses out the operational costs and one of the reasons I was concerned about kerbside collections is, pre-tender it was £20 million; post-tender, it doubled. This is outrageous and when will it stop? We are not at the end of the road, yet. We need to get a handle on costs.

3510 Deputy Yerby's speech, I agreed with that. One thing I can suggest is, there may be some tactical value, voting for the amendment and then voting against the substantive Propositions at the end and I know one or two people saying that.

Are the current Propositions, as amended, a better deal than un-amended? Now, I would say they are a lot better deal than un-amended, but if you do not like the whole thing, just vote against the whole lot, or abstain if you feel uncomfortable with it.

3515 I might say the same to a few other people, but I will not.

3520 Deputy Graham: well, the first question was answered. You could include these various recyclates in the refuse derived fuel frame, but you would have to assess the implications. I understand that. Now, I never actually said there would be no cost. I identified savings, but it is kind of obvious that if you divert from a recycling stream which may cost you, overall, over the period £50 million, it may cost you an extra few million to deal with it as a refuse derived fuel.

There will be a substantial net saving, I can guarantee it. Because the volumes of these are so small. Polystyrene, what is it, a few tonnes? Five tonnes? (**A Member:** Fifty.) Is it? Depends which report you read.

3525 Even plastics, they are very light. They may represent, overall, 10% of the total waste, so there will be a cost, but it is not going to double the amount of waste we are going to do.

I do not know at this stage ... We do not know how many Tetra Paks come into the Island, because they come in as fruit juices and whatever. What percentage of it is actually recycled? I have got no idea. We have got no way of measuring it.

3530 You do not know what is in the bin bags. We do not know. And I suspect, when the refuse derived fuel plant starts up, you will find there is a mass of these things in there, because I know people still, a lot of people, just do not bother to put it in the bag. If it costs them whatever, and I do not know what it is going to cost them per bag, because in here it says that another report is on the way. For the avoidance of doubt: 'Details of the new charging regime, including the time limit, will be set out in a further Policy Letter at a later date.'

3535 Now, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel was mentioning some sums. I think she mentioned £2.50 a black bag. I presume that is a guess, is it, or is that something we know about?

I know that there is a presentation, but it is not in the Report. Why are we saying this will be brought in another report? Is that set in stone? I am afraid presentations are not what we vote on. Incidentally, I did not go to any of the presentations, as somebody brought up the issue, because I happened to be in England for the week and it was not really convenient.

3540 Deputy Dorey's comments were as expected. This is not a least-cost solution. I have supported it. All I am trying to do is minimise the cost of this solution. It was never going to be a least-cost solution. I supported it when it first started but, like the rest of you, I did not expect these massive increases, which are becoming a concern.

3545 I do not think it is a change in direction, really. The only change in direction might be there if people actually started to apply the waste hierarchy as it is written, not start focussing half-way down. To me, diverting, shall we say, recyclables into the recover stream is perfectly acceptable if it is going to save a load of money. Whatever we produce, it will all go out, exporting one way or another, except for, maybe, glass at the moment.

3550 A lot of mention of the EU. Has anybody heard of Brexit? We have never been in it. We can refer to these things. There are plenty of places outside the EU, including Jersey, where this sort of stuff can go.

3555 I am just going to finish with a couple of notes and just to reiterate my points. The recycling targets are driving the recycling effort with no regard to costs. This can only be addressed by removing the targets and introducing the consideration of costs. Best value for money is delivered if we only recover and recycle. Those streams which can be processed at a lower cost than diverting to the RDF, the refuse derived fuel stream.

3560 This amendment does not preclude recycling, it facilitates economically viable recovery and recycling. From quarter four, 2018, we should have the opportunity to divert waste to the recovery waste stream for production of refuse derived fuel and subsequent export. Producing RDF, which would replace oil, gas and coal in the production of electricity or heat is, in my view, an acceptable option, providing much better value for money.

3565 Food waste can be included in the mix of RFD, we have had that confirmed. The high cost of collection, processing and separate export does not represent value for money. We do not do it now and we should not do it in the future.

The estimated capital cost, as I say, is £2.4 million, and the operating costs are estimated £8.4 million. That is over £10 million, which I think could substantially fall out of the equation.

3570 The provision of kerbside collection is driven by recycling targets. It should be terminated once the refuse derived production plant is operational. Bring banks would continue. The operating expenditure for kerbside collection is £39.9 million. It is a doubling of the pre-tender estimate. That is outrageous.

3575 Somebody was not doing their homework properly before considering that first figure. Here is an important thing. The cost of this Strategy falls outside our normal budgeting process and that I really do not like. Charges will be introduced and we have yet to see the magnitude of these. This will be the next shock.

The charges will be what they need to be to pay all the bills. No control. They will be recovered from who? The hard-pressed residents of this Island, with no cap. Along with all the other charges that keep marching on.

3580 If you have got young kids, you are losing some of your family allowance. The TRP, which we have agreed because we need the money, is going up by 7.5% plus inflation every year and there are plenty more. Suddenly, the real cost of petrol is coming to the pumps, because the pound has dropped in value. It is never-ending and I personally believe it is becoming an issue for a whole section of our population.

3585 It will not bother me to pay £7 a week for waste collection or disposal. Most of us, it will not mean a thing, but there are an awful lot of people to whom it will.

3590 One of the things I remember when I was at the St Peter Port Douzaine was the Procureur of the Poor, who one said, and he used to do an annual report, 'Do you know, I am amazed at how many people there are in our community where the last £5 they have at the end of the week is critical. They decide, do they eat it, do they pay for a bit of this.' There are a substantial number of our population in that situation, so referring to average family income as a way to try and minimise the impact of this, to me, is totally misleading.

3595 We should minimise the possible increase in workload which will be created. This has not been mentioned before. The Committee, I think Deputy Le Clerc is listening, for Employment & Social Security, because this particular Report acknowledges that it is going to cause a problem for some people and is inviting them already to look at how they could address any possible issues through the Supplementary Benefit Scheme.

We had some good news earlier that Supplementary Benefit claims had gone down. For how long?

We do not want to see waste poverty following hot on the heels of fuel poverty.

3600 We should assist Policy & Resources in their value for money scrutiny by reducing the costs now. They must not be manoeuvred into a corner and they admit, in their letter, that they are being manoeuvred in that way. I think Proposition 6 may become redundant if this amendment were passed, because they would not be in a position where they would be in a corner, because I do not think they would be required to spend more than is being asked for already. The chances of that happening will diminish.

3605 We will have room for another amendment after this.

Sir, I ask for a recorded vote, thank you.

3610 **The Bailiff:** Members, the request is for a recorded vote, on amendment 1, proposed by Deputy Kuttelwascher and seconded by Deputy Mooney.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 11, Contre 28, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 1

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Paint	Deputy Graham	None	Deputy Stephens
Deputy Dudley Owen	Deputy Green		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Dorey		
Alderney Rep. Jean	Deputy Le Tocq		
Alderney Rep. McKinley	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Yerby		
Deputy Kuttelwascher	Deputy De Lisle		
Deputy Mooney	Deputy Langlois		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Soulsby		
Deputy Lowe	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Laurie Queripel	Deputy Roffey		
	Deputy Oliver		
	Deputy Tindall		
	Deputy Brehaut		
	Deputy Tooley		

Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Depute Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

The Bailiff: Members, the result of the voting on amendment 1, when everyone is ready, was 11 votes in favour, with 28 against. I declare the amendment lost.

3615 We move on to amendments 2 and 4, to be proposed by Deputy Roffey.

Amendment 2

To amend Proposition 1 concerning recycling targets, by –

a. inserting after 'IV of 2012 the words 'and Resolution 18 on Article I of Billet d'État II of 2014.';
and

b. deleting all the words after the full stop from and including 'and approve revised recycling targets' to the end.

Amendment 4

To insert a new Proposition 9 –

'9. To instruct the Committee for the Environment & Infrastructure, in liaison with the States' Trading Supervisory Board and any other relevant party, to investigate the most cost effective way to collect recyclables and to report back to the States with their conclusions before the end of 2017. Such investigation must consider, inter alia, a kerbside scheme run by individual parishes, an Island wide kerbside scheme and an enhanced system of bring banks.'

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

I do not think there is a great deal to say on amendment 2, proposed by me and seconded by Deputy Meerveld, because it is the first part of the defeated Kuttelwascher amendment, about removing recycling targets. But it, of course, does not carry what I regard as the Achilles heel of some of the things that came on afterwards.

3620 Having said I am not going to say very much, I do have to, I think, respond to a remark by Deputy Yerby. She actually got ahead of herself and made a remark about my amendments, as well. She said both of the amendments that removed recycling targets had a subtext of wanting less recycling.

Deputy Yerby: Point of correction, sir. (**The Bailiff:** Deputy Yerby.)

I did not say that. I said the speeches made in favour of the amendments often carried a subtext, not the amendments themselves.

3630

Deputy Roffey: I am sorry, I misheard.

Let me make clear, that that is certainly not the subtext of my amendment. I support, fully, every part of the waste hierarchy. With another hat on, I have tried my best to reduce the amount of waste coming into this Island, although it is difficult. Mr Procter, Mr Gamble, Mr Heinz do not tend to turn around and say, 'A Channel Island supermarket chain wants less packaging, let's do that.' But, I have tried my best.

3635

I know re-use, I am more committed to than the President of Environment & Infrastructure, because the coat that I use to come in through the rain this morning is one he discarded about 12 years ago. I have been using it ever since! (*Laughter*)

3640

Deputy Brehaut: I just assumed it was lost! (*Laughter*)

Deputy Roffey: And I will use it to death for the next 20 years, at least. And I certainly want to see more recycling. I certainly want to see our recycling rates go up. In fact, I have argued for donkeys' years that we should have payment per bag for rubbish disposal, for two reasons. One on the grounds of fairness and one on the grounds of incentivising greater recycling.

3645

But I do not support academic targets. Deputy Parkinson described our Waste Strategy as a carrot and stick strategy. I tell you what, if you set these targets today, and at what date is it, for 60%, I cannot remember off the top of my head, but if in a year we are short of that, we are only on 55%, what two levers will you have to meet your own targets? It will either be greater carrot, which means pouring more public money into it, to get people to recycle more, yet more money that could be better used elsewhere. Or it will be the stick of draconian laws, absolutely enforcing people's behaviour, which yes, they are things they probably should be doing.

3650

I do not actually support recycling targets, or targets in most of Government. But, it is a philosophical question, if I am in the minority there, then, fine, I will lose it. But, I warn you, those targets will come back to bite you and you will be forced to do things you do not want to do, in order to make sure that those targets become a reality.

3655

Moving on to the other amendment, the one seconded by Deputy Merrett. Now, I think I am probably batting on a sticky wicket over bring banks, although I have to say that I am pleased that bring banks are mentioned in the report that I am requesting. I actually believe they can be part of the solution. For many Islanders, there are a better option than kerbside.

3660

I hear things like, from Deputy de Sausmarez, 'There are real problems with bring banks. Sometimes when people use them they are too full. What is the answer? Let us have fewer bring banks.' That really makes a great deal of sense! (*Laughter*)

3665

I give way.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you. I was illustrating the problems with managing bring banks. This harks back to the idea that we can somehow enhance them. In order to expand the capacity to meet even the current levels of demand, we would need to significantly expand them and that is one of the very many problems with bring banks.

3670

Deputy Roffey: Okay.

Nevertheless, to use Deputy Yerby's, I think one of the subtexts of this Strategy is getting rid of bring banks, altogether, and I actually think that would be a mistake, so I am absolutely pleased that I put into this amendment that the future of bring banks should actually be considered in this report.

3675

However, more central to it is, I suppose, is people believe that kerbside is essential, and there are some strange arguments, we have heard Deputy Hansmann Rouxel say it is absolutely essential that we keep kerbside in order to make sure that the user pays – absolute rubbish. People can produce shedloads of plastic and we will take it away for nothing. It depends what sort of waste you generate. All going to be shipped off the Island to various places and, actually, if food waste is 40% of our black bags, how is the best way to encourage people and educate them to actually produce less? Is it by saying we will take it for nothing, you carry on, we will take it away, or is it to say if you produce food waste it has got to go into a bag where you are going to be charged to take it away. That is more of an incentive, so I think there have been some slightly illogical arguments.

3680

3685

3690 However, I accept, I think that the majority of this Assembly want to maintain universal kerbside collection from the Island, but surely we want to do it as cost-effectively as we possibly can?

In this Policy Letter, it claims that a centralised system of kerbside recycling would save between £150,000 and £250,000 per year. I think that is significant. Let us take the average figure of £200,000. It is not much, I know, with the multi-millions – yes, I can see Deputy Langlois sighing, and I will come onto that in a minute – £200,000 a year is significant.

3695 Call me old-fashioned, but my gran used to say to me, 'Peter, look after the £200,000s and the £10 millions will look after themselves.' (*Laughter*) Or words to that effect. I may have re-inflated them to 2017 values. But I think that that is right; £200,000 a year is a part of the millions that we are looking to look after.

3700 I understand, to come to the sighing on my left-hand side, that the Douzaines would dispute whether what is written in this Policy Letter is correct. I am not taking sides, actually, in this. What Deputy Parkinson said about the collection method sounded logical to me, but I am not taking sides.

3705 If I were, I would be putting a direction in here to actually move to one system across the Island of collecting kerbside, rather than parochial. But, I think the Douzaines should have the chance to make their case. But, I do want, in the relatively near future, by the end of this year, for us to be able to make a decision about whether that kerbside should be done centrally, or whether it should be done by the parishes.

3710 I know there are not many officers available to draw up reports, but if they put that figure in this Billet, I doubt they plucked it out of the air. They must have done the work. They must have done the research, to understand. Maybe they are plucking it out of the air, but I doubt it, so what work is there still left to do? Not a great deal. So, let us have that decision.

3715 I have heard it said that the poor Douzaines do not have much left to do now. Well, maybe they do need to have to reinvent themselves for the 21st century. I have huge respect for the Douzaines. They are part of our heritage and they give up their time for absolutely nothing, to do various useful things. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) But, I do not believe that the taxpayer on this Island wants to pay more than necessary on a heritage preservation scheme. I really do not.

3720 I think they want their recycling to be collected from their doors in the most cost-effective way. If the Douzaines can prove that, and come the end of the year prove that this report is wrong, then I will accept that, but I think we should take what is laid before us by two senior Committees of this States, claiming that it can be done much more cheaply by a centralised scheme, seriously, and see whether that is true.

3725 If we are not even willing to look at that and have a report back, then the people listening in who believe that actually cost has gone by the wayside as a consideration in the Waste Strategy of Guernsey, I think, will be proven absolutely right.

So, please, ask for that report back.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, do you formally second amendment 2?

3730 **Deputy Meerveld:** Yes, I do, sir, and I reserve the right to speak.

The Bailiff: And Deputy Merrett, do you formally second amendment 4?

3735 **Deputy Merrett:** Yes, I do, sir, and reserve the right to speak.

The Bailiff: Thank you. Does either Deputy Brehaut or Deputy Parkinson wish to speak at this point on either of these amendments? No.

Deputy Fallaize.

3740 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

The problem, I think, with amendment 2, this is the one seconded by Deputy Meerveld, is that it tries to reverse-engineer the basis of this Strategy.

3745 Deputy Roffey does not like this Strategy. He has always been very honest about that. He did not like it when he was a columnist at the *Press*. He did not like it when he was a Member of a previous States and he was voting for a 70,000-tonne incinerator, and he does not like it now, and he is very honest about that.

3750 But this is the Strategy the States adopted. It is not entirely based upon, but at least part of it is based upon having recycling targets. I would agree with Deputy Roffey and other speakers who have criticised targets generally. I think they often do create perverse decisions in policy making, but we are at the stage where the States' Trading Supervisory Board is charged with implementing the Strategy.

3755 They have to know what all the component parts of the Strategy are. To know which direction to move in, these recycling targets are necessary. I do not think that, having inserted them initially, and then built the Strategy around them and gone out to tender based on them, you can then say, 'We are taking out the targets completely and we are not going to replace them with any new targets.' That is what Deputy Roffey is proposing.

3760 If he was saying let us keep recycling exactly where it is, unless it is cost-effective to increase, then, perhaps, that would give the Trading Supervisory Board some direction, but what kind of direction are they going to have, in terms of recycling, if we take out the targets altogether, and do not replace them with any new targets?

I do not think the reason that Deputy Kuttelwascher's amendment was so heavily defeated was just because of the second part of it, I think the whole of it was flawed and I would urge most, if not all of those Members who voted against that amendment also to vote against amendment 2.

3765 Amendment 4 is different. It is somewhat surprising that we are debating them together, because they are on completely different subjects, really.

Amendment 4, which is seconded by Deputy Merrett, does have some merit. (*Laughter*) One of its problems, though, is that the criterion that would be taken into account in this investigation is the cost-effectiveness.

3770 But that is the only factor. There is no other factor which the proposer and seconder want the Committee and the Board to take into account, when assessing the best way of arranging recycling.

Now, I agree that cost-effectiveness is very important, but it should only be one consideration. What about accessibility? What about convenience for the consumer? These things may be of secondary importance to cost-effectiveness, but they are not of no importance whatsoever.

3775 The amendment actually directs the Committee and the Board to investigate the most cost-effective way to collect recyclables and to report back and I think that is too narrow a consideration.

3780 I would like to know what these enhanced bring banks look like. Do they play music when you drop your cardboard or your glass in? Do you get a car wash when you drive up alongside them? How do the enhancements stop gale force 8 wind from blowing rubbish all around the bring bank site?

I will give way to Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, I could suggest an enhancement. Fill in the potholes.

3785 Thank you, sir.

3790 **Deputy Fallaize:** That does cost money and, if Deputy Kuttelwascher lived in a northern parish or a western parish and ever tried to get a States' Committee to create a permanent solution to the craters which exist in most of our coastal car parks, he would realise that that is much easier said than done.

Enhanced bring banks are like modern landfill. If you put a nice, cuddly word at the front of a rather unpleasant word, then you can create an image that you can do something so much better.

3795 But modern landfill, the image that is created is that we like landfill because it is cheap, but we know it is dirty, so we cannot. But if you stick 'modern' in front of it, it becomes really clean landfill, so you can have something that is very clean and very cheap.

Bring banks, we like because they are cheap, and we know that some people prefer bring banks. But we do not like them because they are often not in terribly convenient locations. They do not do much for the coastline. They are sometimes not very accessible and rubbish blows everywhere. But if we stick 'enhanced' in front of them, then we can get rid of all of those problems.

3800 I think that bring banks are a crazy idea. I know some people prefer bring banks. We have dotted these rubbish bins, which is what they are, in some of the best coastal areas in the British Isles and we invite people to turn up and dump their rubbish into them. Of course, predominantly, people will do it in the evening, or at the weekend, and if you go to any of these large sites on a Sunday afternoon, they are full of rubbish. You go to the one by Mont Cuet, there is more rubbish created by the bring bank site than there is by the tip!

3805 The idea that these bring bank sites, yes, okay, there are some locations in which some of the problems with bring banks can be mitigated, but some of those are in private ownership. How are we going to require private businesses to house these bring bank sites?

3810 When people talk about enhanced bring bank sites and reference what is done in other jurisdictions, some of these things are subterranean. Are we going to turn up to the Co-op and say, 'We want to reach an arrangement whereby you house bring bank sites, but we want you to create an all-singing and all-dancing recycling depot for us? We want you to bury them in the ground.'

3815 You cannot put right the problems of bring banks, simply by sticking the word 'enhanced' in front of them. I want to know what enhanced bring banks look like and I want to know what it would cost to get enhanced bring banks.

I suspect that it is virtually a made-up word. The enhanced bring banks will look exactly like the bring banks look at the moment. We have had two decades to make enhancements to bring bank sites and most of them still have rubbish all over them on a Monday morning. What enhancements, which have eluded us thus far, are suddenly going to be put into place if we adopt the system of enhanced bring banks?

3825 We are told, Deputy Queripel says, you can combine the visit to the bring bank with some other activity. Perhaps, when you go with your family to a day out to the beach, you can load your car out with your rubbish and you can visit a bring bank. Only in Guernsey, could Government come up with the idea that your –

Deputy Kuttelwascher: Sir, point of correction.

3830 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Kuttelwascher.

Deputy Kuttelwascher: On numerous occasions, now, Deputy Fallaize has referred to bring banks as a place where you take your rubbish. I thought you took your recyclables and I do not consider that rubbish.

3835 I think that is being a little bit emotional.

The Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: It is a very, very emotional subject.

3840 Only in Guernsey could politicians sell the idea that your family day out at the beach can be enhanced if you take your recycling with you as well.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Point of correction, sir.

3845 Actually, there are many recycling centres across Europe and across the world, and in very progressive countries and those centres do not in any way resemble the kind of picture that Deputy Fallaize is painting.

I think, actually, if you want to have enhanced bring bank recycling facilities, you have to look across the globe, across Europe, to see what they do and how they enhance their facilities. It is not quite the grim sort of dirty picture that Deputy Fallaize is creating.

3850 We just need to look further afield to look at how other countries and jurisdictions improve and enhance their recycling facilities and, of course –

The Bailiff: This is becoming a speech, Deputy Queripel.

3855 **Deputy Laurie Queripel:** Well, Deputy Fallaize has accused me, sir, of making a particular statement and I am just trying to address that accusation and also, of course, people need to go shopping, so they can take their recycling when they go shopping, to a bring bank centre and facility.

3860 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: What, at L'Ancrese? People are not going shopping at L'Ancrese.

I think comparing our capacity to enhance bring banks with what is done in Europe is as daft, frankly, as the comparison with Wales that is in the Policy Letter. The whole thing is completely different. One of the things they do is pay a lot more tax, which probably allows them to have more enhanced bring bank sites.

3865 The point about individual parishes, or Island-wide collection, is well made. What happened is that the former Public Services Department wanted to have centralised collection of recycling. The parochial authorities were not very impressed by it and the Public Services Department capitulated. That is what happened. That is why the Strategy, thus far, has been based on the parishes continuing to have a very significant role in waste collection.

I do not disagree. If waste or recycling can be collected more cost-effectively through an Island-wide scheme than it can be through parochial schemes then, of course, it is worth investigating that. It is worth making the saving if, indeed, there would be a saving, I am not sure that there would be. I think it remains to be proven, but I accept that it is worth the investigation.

3875 However, if the Committee and the Board have to report back to the States by the end of 2017, that is going to take some resources. Now, I do not think that rules the amendment out automatically, but I think Deputies Brehaut and Parkinson, when they speak on this amendment, need to give some idea, and I trust that they will do it in a straight-forward, genuine way, of whether the commitment of resources to this exercise would, in any way, affect the implementation of the Strategy.

3880 Is this the kind of thing that could be done in tandem with getting a Strategy up and running, or would it take away resources which are necessary to work on the Strategy.

I am torn by the amendment, because I do think it is worthwhile carrying out an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of an Island-wide kerbside scheme, or a parish-based kerbside scheme. But, I am not very impressed with bringing these so-called enhanced bring banks into the equation and I also think that cost-effectiveness is not the only consideration.

I will have to await the summing-up speeches before deciding how to vote but I just repeat, I would like supporters of this amendment to tell me what enhanced bring banks look like, how much they will cost, where they might be located. Because I think it is, to use a States' term, a superficially attractive idea, which amounts to a hill of beans.

The Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

3895 **Deputy Langlois:** Thank you, sir. After my introduction from Deputy Roffey, I probably should still say that I have an interest that I am a Douzenier and also Chairman of Guernsey Douzaine Council.

One of the things that has bedevilled our waste debates for almost 20 years, and distorted them, has been that we are talking about a service to every household in the Island every single week. So, the aggregate cost of anything like that is bound to reach pretty high numbers. Very often, that high number, the Suez £80 million, cropped up in virtually every *Press* letters page for months and online distorted the whole debate.

3900 What has happened since 2014 is people have concentrated on the real cost, which is the cost per household, and, a bit too late, it has concentrated everybody's minds. In 2014, for instance, we were told it was going to be up to £3.50 a household. Suddenly, that is a lot more real than comparing the costs of an on-Island incinerator with landfill. It becomes real.

3905 Inevitably, everyone was very disappointed, now, with this Report, that after £3.50, we are now up to £5 more than people are currently paying. So, basically, the average household in Guernsey is going to be asked for another fiver a week. That is not a trivial sum of money.

3910 But a lot of these amendments we have seen before us, the effect they will have on that fiver is trivial. For instance, last week, just to make sure I had my facts right, I did get in touch with all the parishes. They all sent me through their current contracts for recyclable collections and the residual waste collections and I did the sums.

3915 At the moment, every household, on average, is paying 40p a week to have their recyclables picked up from their homes. I will leave it to people to decide whether they think 40p a week is a trivial sum or not, but even if you talk about doubling that to 80p a week, which the Report says is possible if you add food and glass into it, I have spoken to one contractor who think sit will not be anything like that amount, but let us take 80p a week. Then, you are thinking about centralising. Everybody is getting very excited about the huge savings we could make. Even if you saved 20% of the cost, you are talking about 16p a week.

3920 So, at the moment we have got a system which has got a very high degree of user satisfaction, it is very responsive, it works quite well, and you are hoping to save 16p a week by doing away with it and centralising it. I think that is quite a gamble.

3925 It is not as if there is nothing in the Report to allow for negotiations. It might be that the only efficient way of collecting food waste and glass is to have specialised vehicles, and the parish collection might end up falling by the wayside on the basis that we cannot find a way of having specialist vehicles at a sensible cost employed on a parochial basis. In which case, the centralised system will come in.

3930 It does not need this amendment. I cannot understand what the point of it is supposed to be, unless the key is the desire to see the bring bank system being brought back. Obviously, what has happened is the bring bank system has shrunk to a degree.

3935 I find it amazing, Deputy Fallaize articulated my feelings very well, it is beyond me why anybody would want to bring back our bring banks. There are always going to be some super bring banks for various reasons, everybody has acknowledged that, but the idea of having these bring banks dotted around in hotel car parks around the Island, relying on the goodwill of the owners of those properties, or eyesores on our coast, is extraordinary.

One of the great things will be when those bring banks disappear. I find it amazing that anybody would be suggesting that we should actually be relying and increasing the number of bring banks, all for the sake of, somehow, saving a bit of money on what is currently 40p a week.

3940 It is beyond me why we are even talking about this. We came in for a lot of criticism for spending the best part of a day talking about bonfires, but that was far more substantial a debate than tinkering around with a few p, knocking a few p off a 40p a week bill for the average Islander.

I think I have probably said enough about it. Either you believe me or you do not. (*Laughter*)

3945 The other thing Deputy Roffey seemed to have almost a paranoid fear about was targets. I was amazed how often that subject has come up, both in the debate about the previous amendment and on this one. I cannot see a problem with having targets.

Deputy Dorey, earlier, mentioned the Deputy Spruce amendment in 2012, which I seconded, in fact I co-wrote. In that, I did have a concern about the quantity in some of the targets. As you know, it was 50, 60, 70. I could see lots of ways you could reach 60 relatively easily, if you include
3950 food waste, but I could never see a way and I still do not believe we are actually going to every reach 70%.

This idea that there is going to be a waste police, we will have reached 60% somehow and then we are going to spend vast sums of money in a totally uncontrolled way, just to get to 70% is, frankly, ridiculous.

3955 What is going to happen, as it has to date, we have had a 50% target we have kind of tried to achieve it through our own kerbside collections. We are hovering around about that level and the same thing is going to happen to 60%. We are not going to suddenly do something drastic to achieve that 70%. It is certainly not going to work like that.

3960 So, I have no concerns whatsoever about the targets now, having seen, since 2012, how they work. We have had them for a while, they work. I was slightly worried that the States might get ahead of itself in a rush to 70%, but that never happened. Everyone has acted quite sensibly and I imagine that is what is going to happen in the future.

I see no point in voting for either of these amendments. I spend far too much time wondering why Deputy Roffey has actually brought them. I can understand, he was not in the States from
3965 2008-2012 and I think everybody now acknowledges that was the golden age of waste. *(Laughter)*.

We had the Suez replacement for Lurgi, which was very exciting. I remember there was a presentation at Cotils and I remember thinking they have got it absolutely right, it is absolutely brilliant and then, of course, a few years later, we had the goodbye Suez debate. Then we had the export, which was, again, quite exciting times. When I look back in my folders it is extraordinary
3970 how much I know about waste in those days when I read through my speeches. Some of them were quite detailed.

It is also interesting to look back and see how things have turned out today.

3975 That was an exciting time if you were interested in waste and I realise Deputy Roffey missed it, he has just rather sad memories of supporting Lurgi, which is something he is going to have to live with for a long time.

I am talking slightly off the amendments now, but I just wanted to share with you the difficulty I have had understanding why anybody of Deputy Roffey's reputation would bring such trivial amendments to this Assembly and, really, we are wasting time. There is no problem with the parochial collection at the moment. If it does not work out, it is not efficient, the Douzaines will
3980 not hang onto it for self-interest, they will let it go. The reason they have hung onto it at the moment is because they are not convinced the States could do it cheaper than they could. No other reason. It is nothing to do with preserving our heritage status.

I am hoping everybody will reject amendment 4, the superfluous report one, and as for amendment 2, well, surely, we have already voted on that? I assume we will get a very similar
3985 result to amendment 1, the Deputy Kuttelwascher amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

3990 **Deputy De Lisle:** Yes. The investigation that Deputy Roffey wants was already done and the modelling of kerbside options was done by Integrated Skills in 2008. Again, of course, he was not around when we were doing all these studies.

3995 But all the various options were costed in that report. A wide range of options were reviewed, in fact, and it showed that we were unable to push recycling levels higher through bring banks. It also showed that household food waste, recycling and dry recyclables picked up kerbside would push the recycling level to 61% and, at the same time, reduce black bag waste. Collecting dry recyclables, alone, without food waste, was a high cost route, they maintained at that time, for a

relatively small increase in the recycling rate. Unlikely to reach 50% recycling target rate and this has been borne out, actually, in practice.

4000 However, a 10% reduction in black bag waste has resulted from kerbside collection of dry recyclables. So, that has been the importance of bringing the kerbside in, because we have reduced residual waste that has to go to the quarry.

This was more than we expected actually.

4005 The collection of all dry recyclables, and organic wastes, provided good value, though, they maintained very strongly and the highest recycling rate of all scenarios modelled by Integrated Skills in 2008, which was at 61.2%, but all the others are also modelled in there, showing their various recycling rates, as well.

4010 It was a very good study that was done at that time. However, they also made the point, because they also looked at the very point that Deputy Roffey is on about, in terms of looking at Island-wide collection, rather than by the individual parishes, and they said the model forecast for parish-based collections would be more than twice the cost of Island-wide collections. But then, taking that point with the point that Deputy Langlois has just made, that would only increase the weekly rate from 40p to 80p, so it is barely worth going for a new study when we have already got the study, that the departments have on file to refer to anyway, so they can make their decisions from that information and they do not really need to go to the expense of a new study again.

4015 Yes?

Deputy Roffey: Thank you for giving way.

4020 Would Deputy De Lisle, then, agree with me, that if the Integrated Skills report sets out the facts very clearly, and more work does not have to be done, as he contends, then the report back on the basis of that information, by the end of the year, to allow us to decide what system of kerbside recycling, will not be very onerous at all, because the work has been done?

The Bailiff: Deputy De Lisle.

4025

Deputy De Lisle: That would depend on the departments that have to put that material together and the work involved, which would detract them from steaming ahead with the overall policy, which I think is the way to go at the current time. Any detraction from the actual policy that we want will cost time and effort and money and I think we should refrain from repeating something that we have already done. But I am not going to remark too much on the recycling rates with respect to targets, because targets drive the Strategy and Deputy Roffey wants recycling rates to go up, sir, and I think this is the way that we are going to see them going up, with definite targets out in front, that stimulate and drive recycling forward.

4030

Thank you, sir.

4035

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

4040 I am certainly going to vote against amendment 2, but I am attracted by amendment 4. Some of the comments I have heard about it rather concern me, because it makes me think I have missed something obvious and I am going to make a fool of myself by raising it.

4045 It seems to me that, if you start with the premise that recycling is going to be a major element and almost an irreversible element of the Strategy and, if you then add to that the fact that kerbside recycling is an essential element of that, it does seem to me, almost a *sine qua non* to know in an up-to-date way what is the most cost-effective way of putting that kerbside collection into operation.

I am a Douzenier in the Castel and I can tell you, I do not think my fellow Douzeniers would be satisfied with the answer that a report made nine, 10 years ago, came up with a certain answer and that the savings are going to be minimal.

4050 Certainly, the feeling in the parishes, actually is that they remain to be convinced about where the balance of cost-effectiveness lies in this. It may be a red herring, but certainly the last time the Castel parish put out to tender our refuse collection, we had three bidders and, of the three bidders, the States' works were almost twice as expensive as the one that we eventually selected and one that has been doing it extremely efficiently for a number of years.

4055 As for the agonising over the aesthetics of bring banks on the coast, I am not too fussed about those. Many people who I know use them would be reluctant to see them all go. Like Deputy Fallaize, I have no idea quite what the enhanced ones are going to look like, but I am not dismissive of the prospect that they can be enhanced.

4060 **Deputy Roffey:** I am sorry to keep interrupting Members ...

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

4065 **Deputy Roffey:** I think it would help to actually read the wording, as Deputy Fallaize often does, it does not say a system of enhanced bring banks, it says 'an enhanced system of bring banks'. Totally different.

The Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

4070 **Deputy Graham:** Right. *(Laughter)*

Nor am I particularly agonising about the aesthetics of these bring banks. To me it is a balance. On the one hand, they do not look very attractive, the west coast bring banks that I go to, but nor do several thousand mixed colour bags left on the side of the road awaiting collection. It is just a part of the necessary process.

4075 I do think that Deputy Fallaize has a point. Cost-effectiveness is not the only aspect of kerbside collection that we need to consider, but some of the other aspects, whether it user-friendly and so on, we can judge for ourselves.

4080 What we cannot judge for ourselves is cost-effectiveness and, therefore, to that extent, I think amendment 4 is attractive. Unless I really hear either from Deputy Parkinson or Deputy Brehaut that this going to totally de-rail the staff and divert their attention from the task in hand, I will be minded to support it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld, you are wanting to make a ...?

4085 **Deputy Meerveld:** Yes. With your indulgence, I will make some general comments and waive my right to speak in the general debate.

The Bailiff: How long are you likely to be?

4090 **Deputy Meerveld:** One minute. No, I will wait until tomorrow. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: This morning, as Members will recall, I gave Deputy Trott permission to make a personal statement. I am not sure whether Deputy Lowe would wish to make a personal statement now or wait until the morning.

4095 **Deputy Lowe:** I will wait until the morning.

The Bailiff: She will wait until the morning. In that case, we will rise now and resume at 9.30 a.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 p.m.