

MINUTES of the EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of CHIEF PLEAS

Held in the Assembly Room, Sark on 13th August, 2014 at 7.00pm

Present: Sieur J.M. Beaumont OBE, Seigneur; Lt. Col. R.J. Guille MBE, President; J. Godwin, Deputy Prévôt; T.J. Hamon, Greffier; W. Kiernan FCA, Treasurer; L. Belfield, Constable.

25 Conseillers were present (see attached list).

01 Opening Statements

- 0.1 [Apologies](#) –The President had received apologies from Conseillers Cottle and Prevel.
- 0.2 [Emergency Cover](#) - Conseiller Plummer had received information from Guernsey’s Emergency Services that the Helicopter “Delta Fox” will no longer be available to support the Emergency Services of all the Channel Islands. On behalf of the Emergency Services on Sark she expressed her thanks for the past availability of the helicopter in the event of an emergency.
- 0.3 [Rules of Procedure](#) - The President in accordance with Rules of Procedure 13a named Conseillers Gomoll, Melling and Prevel who have not yet completed a *Declaration of Interests*’ form as is required by that Rule. He pointed out to those Members that they are still required to declare interests during the meeting, if applicable, in accordance with Rule 13.

1 Minutes of the Midsummer Meeting held on 2nd July 2014

- 1.1 There were no factual corrections required and the minutes were **APPROVED**.

2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 [Electric Bicycles \(Ref: Paras. 5.2-5.3\)](#) – Conseiller Ventress clarified his answer to Conseiller Elizabeth Dewe in reference to the use of electric bicycles to cycle on La Coupée and Harbour Hill. He had contacted the Law Officer and, as electric bicycles are classified as invalid vehicles, there is no restriction on their use as regards cycling on Harbour Hill or La Coupée.
- 2.2 [Work of the Procureurs \(Ref: Para. 8.8\)](#) – Conseiller E. Baker responded to Conseiller Bache’s remarks and spoke on behalf of the Procureurs and the Douzaine suggesting Chief Pleas needs to look at the big picture. The Procureurs with support and advice from the Douzaine are totally committed and he commended them on the work they do; there are checks and balances and the Douzaine believes the system works, particularly with the limited finance available. Conseiller Bache spoke of several year’s expenditure but when one looks back to previous years, and he had gone back to 1995 when £127k was spent, £128k in 1996 and £140k in 1997, in real terms this possibly suggests a drop in this year’s figures.
- 2.3 [Regulation of Health Professionals \(Ref: Item 11\)](#) – Conseiller D. Baker apologised that having received further correspondence from Advocate Dawes it had not yet been circulated to all Conseillers; she would do so tomorrow.

3 Questions not related to the Business of the Day

- 3.1 There were no questions submitted.

4 General Purposes & Advisory Committee (GP&A) Amendments to the Reform Law

- 4.1 Gomoll Asked whether anyone considers he has a conflict of interests as he fulfills the qualifications as mentioned in the report; he did not consider he had a conflict.
- 4.2 President Agreed that Conseiller Gomoll did not have a conflict on this issue.
- 4.3 Bache After consideration it is clear that if either Proposition 1 or Proposition 2 were to be defeated then the whole Projet de Loi would have to be amended. He proposed that the first two propositions are disregarded when it comes to the vote, concentrating on Proposition 3 which covers the whole Projet.
- 4.4 Dealing with the Lt. Seneschal proposal first, this is designed to widen the qualification for appointment to include persons who have actually held judicial office in the UK, Jersey or the Isle of Man [Para. 2(1)(b)] as opposed to merely holding the necessary qualification and it reduces the minimum period of practice to five years (previously 10 years). It also empowers Chief Pleas [Para. 2(1A)], where it wishes to do so, to amend the qualifications and the required period of practice, by Ordinance.

- 4.5 Bache The main thrust is therefore to add to the potential pool of qualified candidates, particularly by adding those with judicial experience who are no longer members of the Bar. It will certainly provide much greater flexibility in appointment and, since more suitably qualified lawyers should be available locally, it should cut down costs.
- 4.6 The second proposal which deals with by-elections seeks simply to ensure that the successful candidate or candidates with the greatest number of votes will be given the longest term of office which the earlier ballot system did not ensure.
- 4.7 R. Dewe He recalled when he was Chair of General Purposes and Advisory Committee bringing a Guernsey Advocate as a Lt. Seneschal; was he correct in doing so as this seems contrary to previous arrangements. He didn't think that particular Advocate sat on any case; he asked if anybody could answer.
- 4.8 President One of the current Lt. Seneschals is an Advocate in Guernsey – Advocate Merrien – and he sits as a Lt. Seneschal, fulfilling the qualification of being an Advocate of the Royal Court and having been an Advocate for more than ten years.
- 4.9 Guy Would Judicial Office mean “amateurs” like Magistrates, Jurats of the Royal Court of Jersey and people like that?
- 4.10 Bache In principle it could but the key to this is the question of appointment and when a Magistrate comes before the Appointments Board it will be for them to decide if he has sufficient experience and background to rate against others who might have a wider and deeper knowledge; in theory it could be possible.
- 4.11 Gomoll The wording “*shall have been in practice as*” or “*shall have been a Member of*” does it mean they have to cease to be a Member of or could it be therefore theoretically possible that somebody holds traditional office here and somewhere else.
- 4.12 President You are talking about (1)(a) and (1)(a)(ii)?
- 4.13 Gomoll Also in (1)(b) “*shall have held judicial office*”; the question is it sounds like past tense and he wondered if there might be conflicts if somebody was appointed here whilst at the same time still appointed elsewhere.
- 4.14 Bache Didn't think that is absolutely ruled out; as Conseiller Gomoll says reading the Law as it stands so it cannot be necessarily ruled out.
- 4.15 President Propositions 1 & 2 having been withdrawn he directed Conseillers to Proposition 3.
- 4.16 Cook Pointed out that there had been no debate on the “*first passed the post*” at by-elections part of the report.
- 4.17 President Nobody has asked a question on it so if they had any concerns they would have raised a question.

4.18 **Proposition 3 – CARRIED**
That Chief Pleas approve The Reform (Sark)(Amendment) Law, 2014

5 Cross Committee Report
Securing Sark's Future – Further Work for 2014 (new Committee arrangements)

- 5.1 Cook He was introducing this report not just as a Member of the GP&A Committee but on behalf of all Conseillers as explained in the report's introduction. It comes about as a result of a growing realisation by us all that, as a government, we could better represent the community of Sark, by reviewing and overhauling how we work. Over many hours of discussion and debate in our regular workshops we believe we have identified the main problem areas and evolved solutions that are both practical and suitable for Sark; between us all we have expended some 1200 hours in reaching this point.
- 5.2 The major thing to evolve from our workshop discussions is the need to understand and separate out the current Conseillers dual role i.e. that of policy making from that of administering and carrying out operational work. To evolve a system that continues to deliver the day to day work involved with the functioning of the Island whilst also having the ability to identify, plan, prioritise and implement policies that will deliver a future for the Island as expressed by the inhabitants of Sark through the *Vision for Sark* document. Also to enable the Government to share its plans and progress openly with those inhabitants in a manner that ensures every opportunity for the whole community to be engaged.

- 5.3 Cook The new way of working proposed today is not imposed from outside, it does not copy any other system; what it does do is to draw on the very unique quality that defines Sark as such a very special place to live; the ethos of voluntary working for the benefit of the community. It is a uniquely Sark solution with no additional identified cost; indeed no additional cost was one of the criterion that evolved from our deliberations. It achieves all this by keeping the underlying committee structure that ensures the administrative and operational running of the Island and separates out the policy making functions, an essential in good governance terms.
- 5.4 Just as importantly it streamlines and coordinates policy development in a manner that will make it much easier for everyone to understand and access. Economic development being a case in point; currently this topic encompasses the work of several committees and unless we can develop an overarching policy for economic development we will remain with a piecemeal approach, satisfying the mandates of each committee while failing to meet the aspirations of the community in the longer term. The ever important resources, including the finances of the Island, would be coordinated in one place as well.
- 5.5 Above all this, these proposed changes give every Conseiller an equal say in the creation and prioritisation of policies whatever committee they serve on. The remainder of the changes are to ensure those policies are properly taken forward. When we determine more improvements in future on how to work; for example scrutiny, Conseillers will be the ones to decide how it works and when it's implemented.
- 5.6 He believed these proposals offer Sark an opportunity to address the issues within its Government which we have identified as causing difficulties whilst retaining all that is good – the community spirit that ensures so many people here contribute voluntarily to make Sark work. We're all partners in this report so perhaps discussion and debate will reflect individual thoughts and opinions as much as seeking answers.
- 5.7 Adams When standing for election in December 2012, she was fully aware that as a Government we are under review. We'd had the *Crowe Report* in May of that year, then the *Vision for Sark* survey was implemented and soon after that we had the *Kniveton Papers*. She knew from the outset that change was probably inevitable. That didn't put her off standing for election; indeed she regarded it as an exciting time to join and she wondered which way things were headed.
- 5.8 So now, we're here; after much frank and open deliberation at our Conseillers' Workshops we are at the point of voting for a fundamental change to our Government today.
If we vote in support of Version 1 we will be choosing to clearly separate the policy making function of our role in government from the operational elements. We will leave behind the current practice of developing laws and voting on them in Chief Pleas and then, at the next moment, applying those laws within the same committee. We have worked in this way with the very best of intentions, but when looked at objectively, it seems obvious that this is not good practice.
- 5.9 The element that concerned her most however, is not so much where we are going, but how we will get there. The transition from old to new will be complex and will need to be very carefully managed by us, and she hopes that setting a target of Michaelmas Chief Pleas for putting the transition plan together will be achievable. She also hopes that at the end of it all we will be a stronger Government and better able to govern through forward planning and policy development. She was still very excited about being in this Government at this time, so will be voting today for change, and supporting the proposition.
- 5.10 E. Baker He started by saying that he was not speaking as Chairman of the Sark Douzaine, and that the opinions that he was about to express are his and his alone. In this report you will see the six principles of 'good governance'; you won't see those principles in any Order in Council or a *Projet de Loi* or even an Ordinance. In fact he doubted that many of the Conseillers would have known of these principles until the *Crowe Report*.
In 2004, an independent commission on good governance in public services produced these six principles. They are principles to which, as an elected government, we should endeavour to aspire. However, we must take into account the smallness of our jurisdiction and the fact that most residents have multiple roles within the community.

- 5.11 E. Baker He thought it is a good report and lays out clearly our concerns. There is just one part of the Report with which he did take issue and that is in Version Model 1 where it is proposed that all the responsibilities of the Douzaine and Public Works are transferred to a future Finance and Resources Committee; that is employees / plant / buildings / equipment / land etc. It is the 'etc.' that concerned him. These functions have been the responsibility of the Douzaine for many years and to him it seems an unnecessary complication to move that to another Committee with all the law changes and upheaval this will cause.
- 5.12 He believed this is done without the necessary checks and balances in place and certainly there are implications that are difficult to foresee. Also in this particular paragraph of the report, insurance arrangements are mentioned and he again believed this is wrong and quite hurtful towards Conseiller Melling who has worked so hard with our insurers over many years on all aspects of Island insurance. We now appear to be changing a system that is in place without a word of thanks or appreciation for what Conseiller Melling has done. Having been assured by other Members of the GP&A Committee that in fact there will be very little change, he will reserve judgement until the time the detailed transition plan is developed. He will be supporting this proposition.
- 5.13 Bache This report is long but there need be no apologies for its length. It is important at this stage of the development of Chief Pleas that the suggestions for new arrangements for committees should be fully set out and debated. Given a clean sheet of paper none of us would have come up with the proposed solution and it would be amazing if all of us were satisfied by every part of it. However, we have to recognise that it has been put together after 28 Conseillers have worked through hundreds of hours of sometimes heated discussion to arrive at a broad consensus which means that the proposal has been erected from a democratic base. It will also include many more checks and balances and will be more open than the present system. In essence it is a Sark conceived proposal for Sark's Chief Pleas and he will vote for it.
- 5.14 Having said that there are comments which need to be made. In his view the system suggested will be more complicated than the present imperfect one and will probably require more work, certainly in the initial stages. He is also concerned that the decision process is a slow one when on occasions there will be a need for more speed. There will also be the need to spread the workload, perhaps by limiting Conseillers' memberships to just two committees or at least a maximum of three. This would ensure that the experienced could concentrate their expertise leaving the less experienced more room to be brought on to play a more active role. How Conseillers are elected to the committees will be crucial to ensure that experience and expertise is fully utilised as it will need to be if the system is to run effectively.
- 5.15 He also welcomed the greater attention that will be given to Economic Development and planning but noted that the description of the Finance and Resources Committee includes no mention of the Budget. This major responsibility will no doubt fall to that Committee but it will be important that it takes full responsibility for it. This will require it to make recommendations about budgetary expenditure, revenues and priorities to Chief Pleas and it will be essential that it does not leave Chief Pleas with no steer on these issues, as at present. The size of the Committee will need to reflect its enhanced responsibility.
- 5.16 No doubt these and other points will be worked out in the coming weeks. Overall it is important that all of us should recognise that this proposal is not one about to be cast in stone. Rather it is a new arrangement, with very definite advantages over the present system, which will be adapted as and when its weaknesses appear. It is on this basis that he will vote for the proposition.
- 5.17 Fry At the first Conseillers' Workshop, in November 2013, the re-organization of government and mandates was recognized as a priority. We acknowledged the need to improve the way committees coordinate, communicate and work together. At Workshop 3, we agreed that some issues fall down the cracks in the pavement, so to speak; there is often poor communication and a lack of clarity about who does what. Also, we agreed, there is often too much focus on firefighting and operational detail. It is out of these discussions that this proposition is being presented.

- 5.18 Fry Change is difficult, but we all know that Sark has changed, the world has changed. On page 5 of the *Belinda Crowe Report* there is a paragraph that had always interested her greatly. It says “*Arresting the change that is happening now requires action and intervention.*” In other words, if we don’t make changes the Sark we love will disappear and die. We must change in order to retain what we have. A lot of changes have been forced upon us, but not this one. These proposed changes to government are designed to suit and help Sark, not anywhere else. We are, after all, a very little place, even though we all know that Sark is the centre of the universe! This will be an evolving change, which we’ll only fully grasp as we move into it. Nothing is set in stone; there’s an exciting adventure laid out before us and she announced her intention to vote for the proposition.
- 5.19 Melling It is well known that he did not like change! He had been in Chief Pleas a long time and he felt the changes that we are going through are too drastic and too fast. Conseiller Cook in his opening remarks said no additional cost; you as Members were at certain workshops and are aware he had expressed his very strong views on the cost of government; the cost of this Government. It worried him and he failed to see that, if we continue to change government, how we can afford to run the administration of this Island. He picked up on Conseiller Cook’s words – “*no additional costs*”; it has been said and is in the papers that you have read that there is every possibility that Conseillers will require civil service back-up to assist them to remain neutral when it comes to Law making and Law enforcement or on policy making and operational elements; to separate those two would require a civil service. Let none of us be under any illusion that such a remark as “no additional cost” can be accepted. He foresaw that this system and the way our Government is going will cost this Island financially and it will hurt.
- 5.20 Cook Clarified his statement; he had said “no identifiable cost” and he didn’t think that Conseiller Melling had put forward a case of identifying the additional cost.
- 5.21 Gomoll He had heard that the majority of Conseillers in principle favour the Version 1 model but were wary of the transition, having the feeling that it would be government by trial and error for some time until the perfect model has been found. He wondered whether the wording of the proposition – “*that Chief Pleas adopts the Version 1 model*” – is really what is intended today or whether it should be slightly changed to say that Chief Pleas wished to receive a transition plan at Michaelmas Chief Pleas based on Version 1, because if you leave it as it is it could be deemed to be accepted and adopted rather than being progressed into the next phase.
- 5.22 S. Williams She didn’t like change either and admitted to being a bit of a dinosaur; she agreed with a lot of what Conseiller Melling said, realising that something needs to change but whether it needs to be quite as drastic as the change being put before Chief Pleas. Many members of the public had found the report to be a good report but had found the report very confusing and have asked where was the public consultation; she told them of the many hours Conseillers had spent trawling through the options at all the Conseillers’ Workshops but was told “*that’s fine, if you’re a Conseiller at a Workshop you will know much more of what is going on than we do out here*”. She was very concerned at the cost implications and on this occasion she would be voting against.
- 5.23 Audrain She wanted to pick up on a point that Conseiller Adams said as to whether the transition plan in this time-frame is achievable. That was also her concern but having now listened to Conseiller Gomoll she felt his suggestion was very sensible and she too was uneasy about the wording of the proposition and to make such a change might be helpful.
- 5.24 R. Dewe He first became a Member of Chief Pleas at the age of 21 and as can be imagined he has seen many changes. He felt this was a brave move to the future and he would be supporting it.
- 5.25 Guy Two expressions are key here; one is *Vision for Sark* and the other is *Securing Sark’s Future*. Both signify moving forward securely into the medium and long term future to provide a Sark that can hold its head up in terms of reputation, financial independence, good governance and, above all, being the place that residents and visitors to the island want it to be.

- 5.26 Guy Through the workshops Conseillers identified a number of issues that hindered one or more of these points. They were identified in a professional and, particularly, an honest manner and it is not always easy to admit that one might be doing things wrong or that there might be a better way of proceeding. These hindering issues are listed in the twelve points identified at the beginning of this report and she doubted that there is a single Conseiller here that would not agree that these twelve points need to be addressed.
Does the model outlined in Appendix 1 address the issue?
Will it provide solutions?
Having looked pretty carefully, she believed that it does both.
It has additional benefits:
- there will be no additional costs to working in this way (and in fact it was Conseiller Melling who suggested this way forward to minimise costs at one particular issue);
 - at the operational level there will be little practical change though there will be philosophical change there;
 - it has the potential to use more expertise of people who are not elected Conseillers but who may well have much to offer;
 - it will bring Conseillers together more to have a greater involvement at the policy development stage for *overall* planning, providing wider expertise and experience and perhaps even, on occasions, ‘a touch of the loyal opposition’.
- 5.27 This broad based level of policy development should minimise legislation and decision making on the hoof and perhaps allow situations where some issues that might have come to Chief Pleas in the past to be adequately dealt with in a different form. It should make for us becoming more effective and more mature (and she was not talking chronological age here!) politicians.
She doubted it will be ‘right first time’. It is a significant, though not a radical change and there will be glitches that will occur and have to be worked through. There will, inevitably, be crises occasionally which may have to be dealt with outside this structure but model one which we have before us is an excellent start that comes, not from outside pressure, not as a knee jerk reaction to illogical criticisms of a hardworking government but from us, the elected Members of this House, as a response to the desires of the people of Sark.
She will be voting for the proposition as it stands.
- 5.28 Cook Having been invited to sum-up he made it clear that his role was to present the report on behalf of all Conseillers. He saw no need to change the proposition; unless anyone else had a pressing urge to do so, he suggested it stay the same.
- 5.29 President There are two who have said they would like to see a change.
- 5.30 Cook It would be for GP&A Committee to change that proposition?
- 5.31 President Agreed that would be the case but asked for clarification that the proposed change be read out again.
- 5.32 Gomoll He was just trying to remove the phrase “*adopt the Version 1 model*” as that sounds to be a final decision which he did not think it was intended to be. He repeated his earlier suggestion – “that Chief Pleas wished to receive a transition plan at Michaelmas Chief Pleas based on the Version1 model”.
- 5.33 Cook Thought that by so doing, we would be twisting what we are trying to achieve here; the object of tonight is to agree that we are going accept Version 1 and receive a detailed transition plan at Michaelmas Chief Pleas. It is not to debate it again at Michaelmas Chief Pleas as to whether or not we wish to adopt it.
- 5.34 Gomoll He asked if anyone had gone to the trouble, and he did appreciate that a lot of work and effort had gone into this, to populate the different teams, committees and so on, with the 28 Conseillers, whether by names or numbers 1 to 28, to see if there is a conflict and to see if all the committees can be populated and whether there needs to be details as to whether someone who sits on a specific committee such as policy and performance, cannot sit on another specific committee. This is what he was hoping we would receive in the next version because the Appendix 1 heading says Version 1 First Draft which is a contradiction to saying today that we firmly adopt the Version 1 model without re-debating it later.
- 5.35 Baker He would like to see the proposition to stay as it is; he thought the detail of how the committees are furnished would come out in the detailed plan at the next stage.
He felt we need to accept this Version 1.

- 5.36 Cook Some of Conseiller Gomoll's concerns have been allayed in many of the workshops; we have discussed many of the options and versions which could go forward and the transition plan and we are informed by the discussions we have had. Obviously, not everyone has been at every workshop. He felt that he had a consensus from GP&A Committee to leave the proposition as it is.

5.37 Melling Called for a named vote.

- 5.38 **Proposition – CARRIED on a named vote – 18 Pour, 7 Contre**
That Chief Pleas adopt the Version 1 model and agree to receive a detailed transition plan report at Michaelmas Chief Pleas 2014.

6 Education Committee

Sark Children's Law

- 6.1 Audrain Apologised for this being a verbal report but she had only just received all the relevant information.
- 6.2 A Children's Law for Sark is identified in 'Securing Sark's Future' Policy 2014 because of reputational and good governance issues. It is about, among other things, protecting children to internationally recognised standards.
The background to developing this legislation is very long -
- 2005: Guernsey and Alderney Children Law was being developed and it was suggested that this could include Sark, discussion of wording of the Law with the Medical and Education Committees; Guernsey Health and Social Services Department were involved over the use of Social Services.
 - The Guernsey and Alderney Law was passed in 2008.
 - 2012: Education Committee took the initiative to push for drafting of a Sark Law, using the main elements of the Guernsey and Alderney Law but adapted to Sark's needs.
- 6.3 What are the benefits to Sark? It would clearly set out, among other things -
- Principles of child welfare (putting child at centre);
 - Establishing parental responsibility (a set of duties towards the child) and might be taken by others and not the child's natural parents;
 - Provision for children needing care, protection, guidance or control.
- However, adaptations would need to be made for Sark in respect of the services and support available and the services of the courts.
- 6.4 In 2012, a plan was put forward by Advocate W. Simmons, responsible to the Law Officers of the Crown, with a two tier approach involving -
- Stage 1.** Parental responsibility, general principles and orders for use by families who are in dispute over care and contact arrangements and court procedure.
- Stage 2.** Provisions relating to child protection, child offenders and the possible use of the Child, Youth and Community Tribunal.
- 6.5 The Education Committee is considering the above approach and requested further information in order to move forward with drafting of the first stage. This has been continually delayed. We have (yesterday) received a communication from the Officers of the Crown that work will be done for the Committee during Autumn 2014 'with a view to producing detailed proposals for a first stage Children's Law by the year end.'

This meeting closed at 7.54pm

Brian Garrard CMLT (Sark Committee Secretary) 14th, 18th-20th August 2014

President of Chief Pleas

Finalised on 20th August 2014

The Greffier

The reports, to which these minutes refer, are shown in full on the website

www.gov.sark.gg

and are also available from the Committee Office for a small charge per sheet.

MEMBERS OF CHIEF PLEAS

Extraordinary Chief Pleas Meeting – 13th August 2014

	Attending	Item 5							
Seigneur – Sieur J.M. Beaumont OBE	/								
The President – Lt. Col. R.J. Guille MBE	/								
CONSEILLERS									
2	Mr. D.T. Cocksedge	/	P						
2	Mrs. H.M. Plummer	/	C						
2	Mr. D.W. Melling	/	C						
2	Mr. C.R. Nightingale	/	C						
2	Mr. A.P.F. Bache CMG	/	P						
2	Mr. E. Baker	/	P						
2	Mr. S.B. Gomoll	/	C						
2	Mrs. D. Baker	/	P						
2	Mr. A.G. Ventress	/	P						
2	Mr. A.J. Cook	/	P						
2	Ms. M.A. Perrée	/	C						
2	Ms. J. Guy	/	P						
4	Mrs. S. Williams	/	C						
4	Mrs. H. D. Fry	/	P						
4	Mrs. K. Adams	/	P						
4	Mr. R.J. Dewe	/	P						
4	Ms. E.M. Dewe	/	P						
4	Mr. A. Dunks	/	P						
4	Mr. A.C. Prevel	A	-						
4	Mr. P.J. Williams	/	C						
4	Mrs. R.E. Byrne	/	P						
4	Ms. C.D. Audrain	/	P						
4	Mr. R.W. Cottle	A	-						
4	Mr. A. Blythe	/	P						
4	Mr. M. Joyner	/	P						
2	Mr. P. Byrne	/	P						
2	Mr. P. Burgess	/	P						
4	Vacancy	-	-						
2 – Term of office ends in January 2015		A	Apologies	C	Contre				
4 – Term of office ends in January 2017		/	Present	P	Pour				
				NV	No Vote				

Brian Garrard, Committee Secretary CMILT, 13th August 2014