

22944 - Noel
re bilateral.
28/11/01

Review Meeting (Pro-Ag)

Agenda

look at options

~~has~~ has to take forward for Mon. meeting

Clear decisions

① Voting Thresholds

Each party spoke to their papers and commented on others.

UV
over other { weighted maj - attractive simplicity but unworkable
counting 'others' votes - problems with double counting
but inconvertible
reduction of the threshold
don't favour 1st opt

SF Favour no change, ~~that~~
votes of others don't necessarily not count -
depends on balance in the Assembly,
seem to be finding a way to suit current
figures, but future election results.

SDLP Totally wrong to alter safeguard/principle
of E-c support - explore difficulties but
not remove designation

DUP avowance of large parties
next election - current system would not return
FMDAM unless outcome changed dramatically

NIWC

Alliance - current system doesn't work and is divisive
principle of c-c support ^{doesn't} needs
designate & weighted majority would
ensure widespread support, and be flexible

Major review after 4 years of operation

credibility problem of the voting system
undetermined, must be dealt with

• ~~credibility~~ problem for Assembly
question of arrogance of larger parties

is designate a principle or a mechanism?
cross community support the principle?

50% rule has focused ^{us} on intra - rather
than inter-communal ethics

• Jane - another group act there - others
not included in 'both communities'
balance sometimes needs head count,
but can't ignore a whole other
community.

SF Agreement was agreed
set of individual circumstances that
created a problem, and we used
agreed procedures - acted with honour

BCC + Alliance's power came up

Stephen King - weighted maj 66% not sufficient
to be acceptable to nationalist com.

PUP Billy opposed to re-designation, great
difficulties

Des Browne understand issues, first meeting with
peers, so it's been a valuable discussion.

[could you have a system of weighted
majority with ^{the other} designations - which caused
politically ~~without~~ ~~the~~ but no nomenclature]

NIO to prepare issues papers with parties
papers, may not be the best place to
conclude etc.

further pro-Ag parties - round table
bilaterals - organised by NIO to ensure
inclusion

Agreed series of bi-laterals

~~contact each party~~ ~~circulate lists~~
parties to inform NIO of what meetings

Meet roundtable next Wednesday ^{9am} ~~10am~~
facilities available from 8.30 for bilaterals

(3) Decision making
chair to decide what issues are looked at
which to proceed with as much consensus
as possible.

where no changes → Assembly through pro
where change to GFA → paragraph 7, UK
govt will take on to amend legislature,
but because GFA is agreed also by referendum.

para 7 / para 36 review?

If outcomes of the review require legislative change, this will trigger para 7

SF Changes to Agreement require ~~it~~ much broader consultation / acts than legislative → referenda etc.

• NIO Reluctant to take ~~the~~ acts that changes the Agreement - political posture looking at legal posture
Strand 1 = UK gov, but would ensure ROI gov.

SF Para 7, review b/w 2 govts
written interpretation

• SDLP The Agreement can't be tampered with, without a referendum

④ Circulate of papers to non-participating ~~papers~~ parties
open + transparent, they will get them through UKOP.

Confidentiality - same raised - no problem that parties are meeting about an important issue

20 March 02
Budget Seminar

Budget tight time frame

Dept. positive reports (DPRs)
realistically up to 22 April (DPP by 19 April, but can
continue deliberations)

Start of 2002 process.

Focus on role of Committees.

February Monitoring Round → final Assessment
Departments probably can't bid - not enough time
to spend it

£11m underspend

will go back into Budget 2002 pot

but a number of existing expenses - new pressures
Harland + Wolf insurance £10m.

can be carried forward by NI (not Treasury)
Capital Programmes ^{expenses} can stay in Department

Difficult to assess departments' abilities to
deliver new objectives ~ DSD change in
service delivery arrangements.

Will Needs/Effectiveness Evaluation ^{NEES} lead to change
in sub-priorities? not all depts. covered.

Rural Visioning / RTS review - similar processes

Another issue - retention of capital receipts,
arising from disposal of assets.

Review DPP/EPU

— so de facto accelerated ^{if agree} passage of bills

Timetabling of Budget Bill, difficulty of royal assent
with dissolution of Assembly prior to election
may have to compress the process.

21 March Dissolution of Assembly

Asset Management guidance? discussion developing

Circulate types of evidence? hard to be definitive to justify + support requests - research, effectiveness, business plan, comparative performance.

NEEs - late May
committees should see them then

| Month | DFP / Executive | UK Govt | Assembly's Role |
|-------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|
|-------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|

4 March Announcement of Budget Timetable
 19 April DPRE (committed to have discussed)
 24 Sept Draft Budget + PFG Expected.
 10 Dec PFG + Budget - final debate
 Oct/Nov 'Take note debate' F+P Ctee ^{may table}
 May Executive Priorities Reports
 F+P Ctee response.
 (before recess)
 July (3rd week) Chancellor's Announcement

Barnett Formula - Victor Hemitt

Very good research paper on Barnett!
check it out.

1977 at time of discussion re: Scot devolution
debate about level of expenditure
Joel Barnett developed formula (so debate
didn't need to happen over + over)
introduced in NI 1980/81

NI Block gets a proportional share of any
change in a comparable Whitehall spending
programme

3 basic components

- population relativity
- degree of comparability of English spending prog
- change in English spending prog

Eg. 3.41% of English population
if a prog is 99.7% comparable
and £1000m allocated, we get $1000m \times 0.997 \times 0.0341 = 34 \text{ milia.}$

special elements for NI

~~Element~~ NI VAT abatement 25%

(English departments have to pay VAT)
there's a discount to account for that

Departmental proxies
allocated to departments r/t programmes,
for each dept there's a weighted average of
programmes } (rather than waiting until Minister
of comparability) } allocates money to
dept. average } programmes
not perfect system, we can gain or lose

Barnett + RAB (Resource ~~Allocate~~ ^{Accounting, Budgeting} ~~Base~~)
↳ linked to public expenditure regimes

capital charges → defers against capital
projects, cuts against
recourses.