

2022-2026

Legacy Report:

Scrutiny Liaison Committee

S.R.12/2026

15th April 2026



States of Jersey
States Assembly



États de Jersey
Assemblée des États

Contents

1. Foreword from the President of SLC	1
2. Introduction and Membership	3
Current Membership (February 2024 to June 2026)	3
Previous Membership (July 2022 to January 2024)	3
Remit of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee.....	4
3. Work Undertaken: July 2022 – January 2024	4
Induction and Training.....	4
Review Panels established by the Committee	5
Gender Balance on Scrutiny Panels and Committees	5
Democratic Accountability and Governance Sub-Committee	5
4. Work Undertaken: February 2024 to April 2026	6
Training.....	6
Review Panels established by the Committee	6
Oversight of States Assembly Business	7
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.....	8
5. Innovations in scrutiny practice during 2024–2026	9
Topic-based public hearings	9
SLC Hearing with the Chief Minister on the Proposed Budget.....	10
Model for Scrutinising the Common Strategic Policy	10
6. Legislative Scrutiny	12
Scrutiny of PPC Legislation	13
7. Suggested matters for further consideration	14
8. Appendix 1: Review Panel Legacy Reports	16
Assisted Dying Review Panel	16
Hospital Review Panel	22
Work Permit Holder Welfare Review Panel	26
Offshore Wind Review Panel	29
Common Strategic Policy Review Panel.....	31
Parishes and the Government of Jersey Review Panel.....	34

1. Foreword from the President of SLC



Following its reconstitution in early 2024, the Scrutiny Liaison Committee entered a distinct phase of its work, shaped by a new political context and renewed priorities. During this period, the Committee has focused on strengthening the coordination, visibility and strategic impact of scrutiny, while supporting Panels to adapt their approach to a changing and often challenging operating environment.

During this period, there was a clear shift towards more innovative and outward-facing approaches. Panels increasingly adopted theme-led and topic-based public hearings, enabling more direct engagement with Islanders and stakeholders. These included hearings on women's health, foster care in Jersey, whistleblowing and grievances, sports facilities, and the Bridging Island Plan, among others. The hearing at St Paul's Centre on women's health was a reminder of what scrutiny can be when it reaches beyond the Assembly chamber. These approaches are worth continuing and building on.

We also held a public hearing with the Chief Minister on the Proposed Budget, with all Scrutiny Chairs present. It enabled a genuinely cross-cutting examination of government policies and finances, something no single Panel can achieve alone. This can become an established part of how we scrutinise the Government.

We placed greater emphasis on how scrutiny can examine strategic and cross-cutting policy. The model for scrutinising the Common Strategic Policy brought together all Panel Chairs and the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, demonstrating the value of a more coordinated approach. It helped identify gaps and challenge siloed decision-making across government. It also highlighted the need for scrutiny to engage consistently across the full policy cycle, from development through to delivery and evaluation.

The Committee recognises that certain complex and high-profile issues require more dedicated scrutiny. Ongoing public concern regarding PFAS, including a public petition and multiple government reports, highlighted both its significance and complexity. Due to competing priorities, scrutiny was unable to examine this issue in the depth required. The next Committee may therefore wish to establish a dedicated Review Panel on PFAS to ensure focused and thorough examination.

The next Committee may also wish to consider whether clearer expectations are needed around the timing of Ministerial Orders at the end of an Assembly term. Introducing a cut-off point, except in cases of genuine urgency, would help ensure that there is adequate time for scrutiny and for any rescindment process to be properly considered.

Scrutiny is strongest when it is coordinated and strategic in its role. The Scrutiny Liaison Committee exists to make that possible. I hope this report gives the next Committee a foundation to build from and the ambition to go further.

Finally, I would like to thank all Scrutiny Panel Chairs and Members, as well as the officers who support this work, for their commitment and professionalism throughout this term.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Inna', followed by a horizontal dash. The signature is enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Deputy Inna Gardiner
President, Scrutiny Liaison Committee

2. Introduction and Membership

The Scrutiny Liaison Committee (SLC) has reflected on the work undertaken during this term in order to produce a summary of the main areas that it has given its attention to, and to provide suggestions and context for those areas that may warrant further attention by its successors. It is hoped that this legacy report will be of value to the early work of the next Committee and in addition, may serve as a useful reference point for other Members, stakeholders and the wider public.

During this term, the SLC operated in two distinct phases. From July 2022 to January 2024, the Committee worked under its post election membership following the general election. In January 2024, the States Assembly approved a vote of no confidence in the Chief Minister, resulting in a change of government and the appointment of a newly constituted SLC. The second phase of the Committee's work therefore took place from February 2024 onwards, under a revised political context with updated priorities and membership.

Given this significant mid-term change in the political environment and Committee composition, this legacy report sets out the work of each period separately, reflecting the different circumstances and priorities that shaped the Committee's activity across the term.

Current Membership (February 2024 to June 2026)

- Deputy Inna Gardiner (President and Chair, Public Accounts Committee)
- Deputy Helen Miles (Vice-President and Chair, Corporate Services Panel)
- Deputy Catherine Curtis (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel)
- Deputy Louise Doublet, (Chair, Health and Social Security Panel)
- Deputy Hilary Jeune, (Chair, Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel)
- Deputy Montfort Tadier, (Chair, Economic and International Affairs Panel)

Previous Membership (July 2022 to January 2024)

- Deputy Sam Mezec (President and Chair, Corporate Services Panel)
- Deputy Lyndsay Feltham (Vice-President and Chair, Public Accounts Committee)
- Deputy Catherine Curtis (Chair, Children, Education and Home Affairs Panel)
- Deputy Steve Luce (Chair, Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel)
- Deputy Moz Scott (Chair, Economic and International Affairs Panel)

- Deputy Geoff Southern (Chair, Health and Social Security Panel) (until 1st March 2023)¹
- Deputy Rob Ward (Chair, Health and Social Security Panel) (from 21st March 2023)

Remit of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee

In accordance with Standing Orders, the SLC is responsible for coordinating the work of Scrutiny Panels and the Public Accounts Committee, ensuring effective planning and avoiding unintended overlap in review work. The Committee oversees the prioritisation and allocation of resources, keeps the overall scrutiny system under review, and recommends changes where necessary. In addition, the Committee also co-ordinates the production of the annual report on scrutiny activity for inclusion in the Privileges and Procedures Committee annual report.

The SLC maintains structured engagement with the Council of Ministers by facilitating the exchange of forward work programmes. It develops, reviews and lodges the codes of practice that govern scrutiny engagement with Ministers, Assistant Ministers and officials, as well as the internal procedures of Scrutiny Panels, Review Panels and the PAC.

The full remit is set out in [Standing Order 143](#).

3. Work Undertaken: July 2022 – January 2024

Induction and Training

Following the 2022 general election, which returned a mix of new and former Members, the SLC invited all States Members to a training session on Effective Scrutiny held on 30th September 2022. The Committee deliberately opened the session to Members serving on Scrutiny Panels and the PAC, as well as those not engaged in scrutiny or government roles, to ensure a consistent understanding of scrutiny practice across the Assembly.

The session focused on core scrutiny skills, including questioning techniques, approaches to following up recommendations, and different methods for structuring and delivering Panel work. Members subsequently agreed that the opportunity to explore the principles of parliamentary scrutiny and examples of best practice had been valuable. However, several areas were identified for further development, particularly more advanced questioning techniques for hearings. These matters were noted and later taken forward by the newly constituted Committee following the change in government.

During this period, a number of Panels also undertook visits to Westminster. These visits were particularly beneficial for newer Members, offering insights into how UK Select Committees operate in contrast to Jersey's parliamentary system. The visits included time in the House of

¹ This report has been reissued to correct an oversight in respect of the membership period of Deputy Southern.

Commons, Portcullis House (to observe Select Committee hearings), and Westminster Hall. Some Panels with complementary remits decided to join together for these visits.

Review Panels established by the Committee

The SLC established the following Review Panels which were reconstituted following the change in government:

- Future Hospital Review Panel (later changed to Hospital Review Panel)
- Work Permit Holder Review Panel
- Assisted Dying Review Panel

The Review Panel Legacy reports can be found in appendix one.

Gender Balance on Scrutiny Panels and Committees

In July 2023, the Committee received correspondence from the Chair of the PPC Diversity Forum highlighting several outstanding actions from the Forum's 2022 Legacy Report, including work to support gender balance across Scrutiny Panels and Committees. The Forum noted that the improved gender composition of the Assembly (21 female Members) provided an opportunity to revisit whether mechanisms should be introduced to help ensure that Panels and Committees routinely included both men and women. It sought the Committee's views on potential approaches, such as the use of role descriptors, requiring Chairs to record the steps taken when forming Panels, or considering gender quotas.

The Committee welcomed the Chair of the Diversity Forum to its meeting on 11th July 2023 to discuss the matter. At that time, 10 of the 23 female Members were serving on Scrutiny Panels or Committees, which was considered broadly reflective of the Assembly's overall gender balance. The Committee agreed that the matter warranted further detailed discussion and confirmed that gender balance could be incorporated into future induction arrangements for Scrutiny Chairs.

Democratic Accountability and Governance Sub-Committee

In February 2021, the Privileges and Procedures Committee (PPC) established the Democratic Accountability and Governance (DAG) Sub-Committee to undertake a wide-ranging review of Jersey's system of government.

In 2023, the MoG Sub-Committee undertook a programme of follow-up consultation with stakeholders to assess progress on the DAG recommendations and to identify which areas should be prioritised for further work.

At its final meeting before the change of Government in December 2023, the Scrutiny Liaison Committee received an update on this work. The Committee was informed that the MoG Sub-Committee had completed an initial review of the DAG recommendations and had written to the Chief Minister and the Council of Ministers outlining a series of requests relating to their implementation.

The Committee considered the recommendations relevant to the scrutiny function and recorded detailed comments on each, noting both opportunities and practical considerations associated with potential changes to Panel structures, remits, appointments, legislative scrutiny processes and member expectations. It agreed that the MoG Sub-Committee's early work was satisfactory and no further action was taken. The current Committee did not undertake further work on this topic.

4. Work Undertaken: February 2024 to April 2026

Training

Following its reconstitution in early 2024, the Committee placed renewed emphasis on ensuring that Scrutiny Chairs and Panel Members had access to strengthened and targeted training opportunities. On 27th September 2024, the Committee hosted a Scrutiny training away day designed to enable Members to regroup, refocus and reconsider how scrutiny could operate most effectively in the new political context. The purpose of the session was to develop a clearer shared vision for scrutiny for the remaining 18 months of the term and to consider how that vision aligned with the wider aims of the scrutiny function.

In addition to this strategic session, questioning skills training was provided by the Solicitor General in May 2025. This session offered practical guidance on questioning techniques, the framing of effective lines of inquiry, and approaches for conducting robust public hearings.

Review Panels established by the Committee

In addition to re-establishing the existing Review Panels

- Work Permit Holders
- Future Hospital
- Assisted Dying)

the Committee established three further Panels:

- Offshore Wind Review Panel
- Parishes and the Government of Jersey Review Panel
- Common Strategic Policy Review Panel

The Review Panel Legacy reports can be found in appendix one.

Sub Panels established by the Main Panels

Each of the main Panels also established Sub-Panels. Whilst SLC does not have a specific role in the set up of Sub-Panels, Scrutiny Panels are entitled to set up Sub-Panels of up to five members, in addition to a Chair, to deal with particular issues, for example to undertake a review which cuts across the responsibility of more than one Panel. Sub-Panels operate on

behalf of the Panel which has appointed them and only with the authorisation of that Panel. The appointment, remit and timescale must be agreed by the full Panel and recorded in the Minutes. During this term of office, each of the following Panels set up the following Sub-Panels

Children, Education and Home Affairs

- Lifelong Learning

Corporate Services

- OECD Pillar 2 Implementation

Environment, Housing and Infrastructure

- Regulation of Care

Health and Social Security

- Family Friendly Regulations

Oversight of States Assembly Business

Throughout the current term, the SLC monitored States business and engaged where matters directly affected the structure, governance or effective operation of the scrutiny function. In such cases, the Committee contributed by issuing comments to the Assembly or by responding to questions from Members.

For example, the Committee presented comments on [P.46/2025: Non-Elected Members on Scrutiny Panels and Changes to the Troy Rule](#). The Committee outlined its concerns about appointing unelected individuals to Scrutiny Panels and emphasised the importance of scrutiny being carried out by elected Members. It also highlighted practical and accountability considerations, noting potential implications for the effectiveness and independence of scrutiny. The Committee did not support the Proposition, which was ultimately defeated.

In addition to commenting on propositions, the Committee responded to several States Questions relating to scrutiny operations, including:

- Special advisers engaged by Scrutiny Panels ([OQ.148/2025](#), June 2025)
- Use of AI in Scrutiny Panel submissions ([OQ.135/2025](#), June 2025)
- Support for amending Standing Orders for Scrutiny Panels ([WQ.441/2023](#), November 2023)

These exchanges formed part of the Committee's wider role in maintaining oversight of matters affecting the scrutiny function and ensuring that any proposed changes to parliamentary processes, resources or working practices were considered from a scrutiny perspective, where appropriate.

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

The Committee was delegated several recommendations by the PPC Diversity Forum Sub-Committee, arising from the [2024 Commonwealth Parliamentary Association \(CPA\) report on Gender-Sensitive Parliaments](#). These recommendations derived from a gender sensitive audit which had been undertaken by CPA in 2019 which were considered by the Diversity Forum. There were 3 recommendations in total assigned to the Committee which are listed below together with the outcome of meeting the objectives of each.

Any description of responsibilities for the Chair of a Scrutiny Panel should include a commitment to equality and diversity in the membership of the Panel.

The Committee agreed to incorporate this recommendation into the [Scrutiny Proceedings Code](#), updating the role description for Scrutiny Panel and Committee Chairs to include an explicit commitment to equality and diversity in Panel membership. The revised Scrutiny/PAC Proceedings Code was presented to the Committee in January 2026 and approved. The updated Code has since been circulated to Members and published on the States Assembly website.

Establish a dedicated stream of scrutiny, either under the Scrutiny Liaison Committee or the proposed Women's Caucus, focused on ensuring equality and diversity in policy.

This recommendation was implemented by embedding equality and diversity considerations into the Scrutiny Panel Scoping Document, ensuring that all scrutiny work is viewed through this lens. The Committee approved the wording for inclusion in the Scoping Documents and agreed that the updated documents would be in use from January 2026.

Collect and publicly publish sex disaggregated data on witnesses and experts giving evidence to Committees and Panels.

In considering this recommendation, the Committee discussed the sensitivities and practical challenges associated with collecting and publishing sex-disaggregated data on witnesses, experts and advisers. The Committee agreed that, as an initial step, Panels would begin collecting information on the gender of advisers engaged by Scrutiny, with this process implemented immediately. Following this implementation, it was agreed that officers would investigate the scope and mechanisms used in other jurisdictions for the collection of data pertinent to the CPA recommendation.

In addition, the Committee agreed to explore approaches used in other jurisdictions to gather and report similar data, in order to assess potential models that could meet the CPA recommendation while ensuring sensitivity, proportionality and compliance with data protection requirements. Further work on this matter will be required in the next term.

5. Innovations in scrutiny practice during 2024–2026

During this term, scrutiny bodies adopted more flexible and outward-facing approaches to public engagement, introducing new formats to make scrutiny more accessible and responsive.

Topic-based public hearings

Panels increasingly made use of topic-based public hearings, allowing focussed discussion on major issues. A notable example was the Women's Health hearing held by the Health and Social Security Panel at St Paul's Centre in April 2025. Around thirty members of the public and medical professionals attended, creating an open forum for sharing lived experience and professional insights.

Holding the hearing in a community venue enabled broader participation and demonstrated how scrutiny can adapt its methods to suit the subject matter. Panels should continue to consider flexible and innovative approaches to public engagement where this adds value to their work. However, they should also remain mindful of the practical and financial implications of hosting hearings outside the States Assembly building, including the need for additional equipment and the impact on live webcasting provision.

Other topic based public hearings held by Panels included:

Panel	Topic	Date
Children, Education and Home Affairs	Foster Care in Jersey	7th February 2025
Children, Education and Home Affairs	Violence Against Women and Girls	16th July 2025
Children, Education and Home Affairs	Work Permit Policy	16th October 2025
Corporate Services	Gender Pay Gap	6th May 2025
Corporate Services	Recruitment and Retention	27th May 2025
Corporate Services	Whistleblowing and Grievances	4th March 2026
Economic and International Affairs	Sports Facilities	12th June 2025
Economic and International Affairs	Transport Ferry Service	13th March 2025
Economic and International Affairs	DFDS Ferry Service with Chamber of Commerce and Retail representatives	13th October 2025

Environment, Housing and Infrastructure	Engagement and consultation on traffic changes	9th April 2025
Environment, Housing and Infrastructure	Bridging Island Plan	23rd July 2025
Environment, Housing and Infrastructure	Jersey Property Holdings	7th October 2025
Environment, Housing and Infrastructure	PFAS	20th March 2025
Health and Social Security	Women's Health	25th April 2025

SLC Hearing with the Chief Minister on the Proposed Budget

In November 2024, the SLC held its own public hearing with the Chief Minister on the Proposed Budget. Following extensive hearings with individual Scrutiny Panels, the Committee wanted an over-arching view of the Government Budget from the Chief Minister. This hearing led to the publication of a comments paper from the Committee. While not strictly within its usual terms of reference, this was an innovative and effective method of ensuring strategic accountability.

Model for Scrutinising the Common Strategic Policy

Under the States of Jersey Law 2005, the Council of Ministers must agree and lodge a statement of their Common Strategic Policy (CSP) and lodge it no later than the day on which the first Government Plan is lodged and lodge it within four months of their appointment. This ensures that the CSP provides the strategic foundation for the Government Plan (Budget) and sets the direction for ministerial priorities.

The change in Government midway through the political term led the Council of Ministers to present a new CSP for 2024-2026. The Review Panel held a Public Hearing with the Chief Minister on 3rd May 2024 following which it presented [comments](#). It comprised the five Scrutiny Panel Chairs and the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee. Although individual Panels were undertaking scrutiny of their own areas of the Government Plan (Budget) and the strategic policies underpinning funding streams, the SLC model enabled a coordinated approach to examining the CSP as a whole.

The Review Panel focused on identifying gaps, risks and cross-cutting issues that could affect delivery across multiple ministerial portfolios. Standing Panels contributed valuable insights on a range of themes, including:

- The ageing population
- Digital infrastructure
- Environmental priorities
- Diversity, Inclusion and Equity
- Workforce training and skills development

This model supported a more coherent assessment of the CSP and demonstrated the benefit of bringing all Scrutiny Chairs together to examine overarching strategic policy. Therefore, the Committee considers that it may provide a useful template for scrutinising future Common Strategic Policies.

6. Legislative Scrutiny

During the term, all Scrutiny Panels have continued to embed the scrutiny of legislation into their work programmes, using briefings, hearings and correspondence to examine draft Laws and Regulations ahead of debate in the Assembly. This has become a routine and important part of scrutiny practice, ensuring that proposed legislation is examined in detail.

However, the Committee identified a recurring concern regarding the time available for Panels to undertake their legislative scrutiny work, particularly where government lodging timetables had not adequately accounted for scrutiny activity. At its meeting in May 2025, the Committee raised this issue directly with the Chief Minister and subsequently [wrote](#) to confirm its position.

In its letter, the Committee emphasised that Standing Order 72 (which provides for the referral of draft legislation to a Scrutiny Panel following debate on principles) is a formally prescribed part of the legislative process and must be treated as such within government's planning. Although Panels do not routinely invoke Standing Order 72, the mechanism must remain available, and any scrutiny undertaken through this route should not be presented as "delay" attributable to Panels. The same principle applies to Standing Order 79, which permits the suspension of a debate for the purposes of scrutiny. A copy of the Chief Minister's response can be found [here](#).

The next SLC may wish to seek an early discussion with the Chief Minister and relevant officials to ensure that Standing Orders 72 and 79 are fully embedded into Government's legislative scheduling.

The next SLC may also wish to consider evaluating possible changes to the lodging process for propositions that might enhance the scrutiny function and reduce points of procedural tension. The Committee considers it too inflexible, for example, that most propositions captured under the existing Standing Orders 72 and 79 will only have been afforded a minimum lodging period of 6 weeks (the time from lodging to debate). This can often provide insufficient time to undertake adequate scrutiny, especially when the propositions relate to primary legislation. The Committee believes that extending the minimum timeframe would enhance scrutiny, improve the quality of debate, strengthen democratic participation, and ultimately lead to better policy outcomes. Consideration could be given to the following options:

- A tiered system, where routine propositions remain at six weeks but complex or high-impact propositions trigger an automatic extended period
- Mandatory extensions when major consultations or impact assessments are necessary. Standard 12 to 16 week lodging period for primary legislation

The Committee also notes that towards the end of this term of office, several large pieces of primary legislation were lodged in close succession due to planning and delays in lodging. This put immense pressure on the existing workloads of Panels and the Committee which could have been avoided. The next Committee could consider meeting with the Council of Ministers to discuss what qualifies as a large piece of legislation. Consideration should also

be given to the legislative programme and where certain dates for lodging legislation slips, this should be discussed with Scrutiny to devise a workable plan.

Scrutiny of PPC Legislation

In addition, one structural issue also remains. Legislation brought forward by the Privileges and Procedures Committee (PPC) is currently reviewed by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel by convention rather than by formal design. The Committee has considered whether this arrangement continues to be appropriate, particularly as legislation relating to parliamentary processes and governance sits outside ministerial portfolios. The next Scrutiny Liaison Committee may therefore wish to review this practice and, if necessary, discuss alternative approaches directly with PPC.

7. Suggested matters for further consideration

The Committee has identified several areas that may benefit from continued attention in the next term -

- **Scrutiny training programme:** The next SLC may wish to consider developing a dedicated Scrutiny training programme to complement the wider States Members' training offer. This could include periodic away-day style sessions, Panel visits to Westminster or other legislatures, enhanced questioning skills training, chairing and leadership development, and further training on effective scrutiny practice.
- **Sensitive Hearings:** The next Committee could discuss the benefits of holding sensitive hearings in public such as PFAS. Public discussion demonstrates openness in decision-making and can strengthen public confidence in the policy process. There are however risks associated with holding sensitive issues in public such as the hearing resulting in constraints on policy development and participants may be less willing to speak openly or explore emerging ideas.
- **Regular meetings with the Chief Minister and Council of Ministers:** The Committee highlights the value of maintaining routine meetings between the President and Vice-President of the Committee and the Chief Minister, with monthly meetings historically proving effective. Consideration may also be given to periodic joint meetings between SLC and the full Council of Ministers.
- **Gender balance in scrutiny membership:** The next SLC may wish to continue discussions with the PPC Diversity Forum Sub-Committee regarding gender balance across Panels and Committees. This could include considering whether formal mechanisms, guidance, or induction processes would support the maintenance of balanced representation in future Assemblies.
- **Collecting sex disaggregated data on witnesses and experts:** Further work remains on the collection and publication of sex-disaggregated data on witnesses, advisers and experts. The next Committee may wish to expand the personal characteristics beyond just gender to other protected characteristics and explore practical models for gathering this information, drawing on practices in other jurisdictions.
- **Innovative engagement:** Panels should continue to explore creative scrutiny methods, such as topic-based hearings and community-based events, to broaden participation and enhance visibility. The Women's Health public hearing held at St Paul's Centre and undertaken by the Health and Social Security Panel could be considered a good example of creative scrutiny. The Health and Social Security Panel compiled a 'reflections document' regarding filming in other locations. A copy of this document could be presented to the next SLC, should it wish explore alternative venues for public hearings.

Consideration should be given to the next SLC having the ability to hold Public Hearings without the need for establishing a review Panel and formal Terms of Reference. Although the Committee structures and remits are different to those in Jersey, this model is used in Westminster and further exploration is recommended.

- **Scrutiny of the Common Strategic Policy:** The model used for the CSP Review Panel in 2024-2025 should be considered again for future strategic policy cycles. The Review Panel comprised the five Scrutiny Panel Chairs and the Chair of the Public Accounts Committee which enabled a coordinated approach to examining the CSP as a whole at the beginning and end of the term. This model could also be used as part of the budget review when Panels are considering cross cutting for strategic priorities.
- **Legislative Scrutiny timetabling:** The next SLC may wish to seek an early discussion with the Chief Minister and relevant officials to ensure that Standing Orders 72 and 79 are fully embedded into government's legislative scheduling. This should include agreeing shared expectations around minimum timeframes for scrutiny and establishing clear communication routes where legislative timetables may be at risk.

The next SLC may also wish to consider a cut-off point regarding the timings of Ministerial Orders made at the end of an Assembly term to allow adequate Scrutiny and due process for rescindments.

- **PPC Legislative Scrutiny:** The next SLC should explore future arrangements for PPC legislative scrutiny, currently undertaken by the Corporate Services Panel. Consideration should be given as to whether this arrangement continues to be appropriate, particularly as legislation relating to parliamentary processes and governance sits outside ministerial portfolios. If deemed necessary, alternative approaches could be discussed directly with PPC.
- **Review Panels:** Due to their cross cutting and complex natures, the Committee should consider the establishment of a Review Panel at the appropriate time to undertake a review into PFAS. The Committee may also wish to establish a specific Review Panel to look at critical infrastructure overall which covers energy, cost of living and Island resilience.
- **Expert Advisers:** The Committee highlights the value that can be added from the appropriate engagement of expert advisers for technical/complex scrutiny reviews, with an accompanying budget of approximately £200,000 per year for this purpose. The next SLC should work with States Greffe Officers to ensure, however, that the process for the identification and appointment external advisers is as streamlined and effective as possible. At times there have been some challenges in securing such engagements in a suitably nimble fashion.

8. Appendix 1: Review Panel Legacy Reports

Scrutiny Panels are appointed by the States. Alongside the five standing Scrutiny Panels (which investigate the work of specific government departments) and the Public Accounts Committee, there are a number of Review Panels. Review Panels are set up with the agreement of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee to review particular proposals, issues or projects which may cross a number of departments or are large enough and/or contentious enough to benefit from the attention of a dedicated Panel.

Assisted Dying Review Panel

The Assisted Dying Review Panel was established in March 2024, following proposals to introduce assisted dying in Jersey. Its purpose was to examine [the detailed final proposals](#) lodged by the Council of Ministers on 22nd March 2024.

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Louise Doublet, Chair
- Deputy Catherine Curtis, Vice Chair
- Deputy Phillip Bailhache, Member

Review of Assisted Dying (2024)

A [Review of the proposals](#) was launched on 25th March 2024, focusing on:

- Whether any changes had been made to the original proposals outlined in [P.95/2021](#), and the reasons for them.
- The proposed processes and safeguards for all individuals involved in assisted dying, and whether these uphold patients' dignity and wishes.
- Examination of the evidence previously submitted by experts and stakeholders.

The Review's final Report was published on 14th May 2024 - [S.R.3/2024](#)

Methodology

The Panel centred its evidence-gathering on consultation already undertaken by the Government, with a focus on the [Phase 2 consultation](#) on assisted dying and the [Ethical Review](#). This evidence was analysed against the Government's final proposals for assisted dying in Jersey, with particular attention to the rationale for decisions and any changes made. The Panel held a [Public Hearing with the Minister for Health and Social Services](#) on 3 April 2024 to examine issues including palliative and end-of-life care provision, eligibility criteria, safeguards, processes, and the training and guidance set out in the proposals. Additional written questions were submitted to the Minister to clarify matters relating to eligibility, safeguards, training, guidance, funding, and resources.

While the Panel received written submissions from members of the public and several organisations, these did not form part of the core evidence base due to the limited timeframe, which prevented a comprehensive call for evidence.

Overview of findings and recommendations

The Panel's review identified several important considerations for implementing assisted dying in Jersey, focusing on service readiness, safeguards, training, and governance. It noted gaps in palliative and end of life care provision, limited clarity on eligibility criteria—particularly Route 2—and early-stage development of training and guidance. The Panel also raised concerns about funding, staffing, and the need for clearer timelines and documentation to support States Members ahead of future legislative debate.

To strengthen the proposals, the Panel prioritised improvements to service planning, patient protections, and professional training. It also highlighted the need for clearer guidance on locations for assisted dying, practitioner roles, and engagement with key stakeholders, including the Children's Commissioner.

Key points identified by the Panel

- Several palliative and end of life care actions remain incomplete, with limited evidence on service quality.
- Insufficient clarity on eligibility criteria, especially for Route 2 (unbearable suffering), and gaps in consultation evidence.
- Need for robust training on coercion, capacity assessment, and the skillset required for Tribunal members and administering practitioners.
- Further detail required on suitable locations, protections for other residents, and guidance for healthcare conversations.
- Training, guidance, and service development remain at an early stage, with many elements not expected until 2026.
- Risks identified relating to funding, staffing, and overall resource availability, requiring publication of plans and mitigation measures.

Amendment

The Panel lodged an Amendment to P.18/2024 to remove references to “*direct*” and “*directly*” in relation to participation, aiming to avoid narrowing the meaning of “*participation*” in future assisted dying legislation. After completing its Review, the Panel concluded that including “*direct*” participation could unnecessarily restrict an individual's right to refuse involvement. It noted that neither the 2021 States Assembly decision regarding assisted dying nor the [Termination of Pregnancy \(Jersey\) Law 1997](#) use these terms, and that relying on such distinction's risks creating ambiguity. The Panel determined that using the ordinary English meaning of “*participation*” provides sufficient clarity and allows the Courts flexibility to interpret cases based on their facts, without undermining the policy intent or public support for assisted dying. Overall, the Amendment sought to ensure clear, fair, and workable protections for those wishing to refuse participation.

The Review Panel's Amendment was [partially adopted](#).

Review into the Proposed Assisted Dying Legislation (2025 – 26)

A Review into the Proposed Assisted Dying Legislation was [launched on 8th September 2025](#), following the lodging of the [proposed legislation](#) on 2nd September 2025. The Review set out to examine the legal, medical, ethical and financial implications posed, as well as to assess the legislation's alignment with the principles of dignity, safeguarding and freedom of choice.

Methodology

To ensure appropriate specialist scrutiny, the Panel appointed three expert advisers with legal, medical, ethical, and academic expertise. The advisers met with the Panel on a fortnightly basis to review emerging issues and provide technical analysis. The Panel also consulted MP Kim Leadbeater, sponsor of the [UK Terminally Ill Adults \(End of Life\) Bill](#), to inform understanding of legislative approaches in other jurisdictions.

A detailed analysis of the draft legislation was undertaken, including comparison with earlier versions and examination of supporting documentation such as the [addendum](#), [ethical review](#), and stakeholder consultation summaries. The Panel also considered related policy developments, including the End-of-Life Care Proposition ([P.73/2025](#)).

To ensure wide stakeholder engagement, the Panel [contacted 15 key stakeholders](#) who had received the draft legislation prior to publication, conducting structured interviews to assess whether their concerns had been addressed. Public engagement included a call for evidence via social media, a poll assessing public awareness, and targeted correspondence to 20 financial experts and 17 residential homes, nursing homes, and charities to ensure representation of those not reached digitally. The Panel also held a [Public Review Hearing](#) with the Minister for Health and Social Services, during which it explored a range of issues including palliative care, safeguarding, the risk of coercion, and other matters relevant to the proposed assisted dying framework.

Overview of findings and recommendations

The Panel's review identified significant strengths, gaps, and risks within the draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law, with particular focus on palliative care, processes and safeguards, funding, training, and public awareness. Overall, the Panel found that while the draft legislation aligns broadly with the principles adopted by the Assembly in P.18/2024, further clarity, stronger safeguards and enhanced operational planning are required to ensure the safe, ethical, and sustainable introduction of assisted dying in Jersey.

Palliative Care and End-of-Life Services

The Panel emphasised that high-quality end-of-life care was essential to ensure genuine choice and prevent individuals seeking assisted dying because of unmet care needs. While the new statutory duty to provide end-of-life care represents meaningful progress, the Panel found that further clarity was needed regarding scope, access, and implementation. Although recent amendments introduced by the Minister for Health and Social Services strengthened the requirement for individuals to be informed about palliative options, the Panel identified gaps—particularly the absence of a requirement for specialist palliative assessment.

Recommendations included clarifying interfaces between the Assisted Dying Law and the End-of-Life Care Law, setting clear referral pathways, publishing workforce plans, ensuring appropriately qualified clinicians undertake assessments, and monitoring the use and outcomes of the “pause” mechanism.

Processes and Safeguards

The Panel identified several safeguarding and operational issues requiring attention. Practitioner administration posed higher risks than self-administration, and a self-administration-first approach might have provided stronger safeguards while maintaining autonomy. Concerns about the waiver of future capacity were significant, including risks of acting contrary to a person’s final wishes, practitioner unwillingness, and difficulties detecting dissent once capacity was lost.

Additional risks were identified in decision-making capacity assessments, the detection of coercion—including subtle or internalised forms—and the need for multidisciplinary involvement. The Panel found gaps in practitioner experience requirements, guidance, training, and risk-management processes.

Recommendations included introducing minimum experience requirements, undertaking additional practitioner and public surveys, strengthening multidisciplinary assessment, clarifying how the waiver should operate in practice, and ensuring clearer guidance on refusal, capacity fluctuation and coercion.

Funding and Implementation

The Panel concluded that the current financial planning for the assisted dying service was based on early, high-level estimates rather than a fully developed cost model. Key cost drivers—workforce, governance, training and digital infrastructure—remained insufficiently defined. The Panel also highlighted risks of early cost overruns, longer-term financial pressure, and potential competition with other under-resourced services such as palliative care and mental health.

Recommendations included producing a full financial impact assessment, introducing contingency funding, scheduling formal financial reviews, and ensuring transparency in the allocation and use of central budgets.

Training and Guidance

Training was identified as a core safeguard underpinning safe and consistent delivery of the law. The Panel found that guidance remained under development and that detailed, multidisciplinary training would be essential—particularly around mental capacity, coercion, communication with vulnerable groups, ethical decision-making, and compliance with legal requirements. Concerns were raised about the timing of guidance publication, the need for co-production with specialist groups, and the importance of ongoing evaluation.

Recommendations focused on timely publication of statutory guidance, development of an accredited training curriculum, co-production with experts in safeguarding and disability, and continual updates based on international evidence and local monitoring.

Public Awareness

The Panel found that public awareness was itself an important safeguard. Effective communication must reach all Islanders, including those who are marginalised or lack digital access. Accessibility and neutrality of information are essential, as is clear signposting for individuals who feel pressured. The Panel identified operational sensitivity around the boundary between factual information and prohibited promotion.

Recommendations included creating an Accessibility Annex, strengthening neutral signposting, ensuring controlled provision of materials in GP practices, publishing plain-English summaries of annual reports, and collecting data to assess awareness across all communities.

Amendments

The Review Panel lodged 7 amendments to the draft legislation, 5 of which were adopted:

- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Nineth Amendment](#) (Adopted)** - Introduced a requirement for the Minister for Health and Social Services to present the Assurance and Delivery Committee’s annual report to the States Assembly.
- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Eighth Amendment](#) (Adopted)** - The Panel lodged an amendment requiring an early statutory review of the Law within three years of full commencement and obliging the Assurance and Delivery Committee to consult with disability representatives during implementation and review
- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Seventh Amendment](#) (Adopted)** - The Panel lodged an amendment to strengthen safeguarding by requiring statutory training and guidance on identifying coercive control, domestic, emotional, and financial abuse, including risks linked to protected characteristics. It also required this training to be provided on an ongoing basis across relevant agencies.
- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Sixth Amendment](#) (Adopted)** - The Panel lodged an amendment restricting written assisted dying information in GP surgeries unless given in person with a health professional present, ensuring sensitive information was always provided in a supported clinical context
- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Fifth Amendment](#) (Adopted)** - The Panel lodged an amendment replacing “dishonestly” with “maliciously” in coercion offences and relocating certain offences into a new Article 46, ensuring Article 45 focused solely on coercion into assisted dying. They introduced a distinction between coercing someone *into* assisted dying—retaining the maximum penalty of 14 years—and coercing someone *against* pursuing assisted dying, which carried a lower penalty (a fine).

- **Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Fourth Amendment](#) (Rejected)** - The Panel lodged an amendment to remove the statutory right of third parties with a “special interest” to appeal positive eligibility decisions, limiting appeal rights to the individual seeking assisted dying.

Draft Assisted Dying (Jersey) Law 202- (P.65/2025): [Third Amendment](#) (Rejected) - The Panel lodged an amendment introducing a tiered administration model prioritising self-administration wherever possible, requiring the Minister to provide equipment or support to enable this, and permitting practitioner administration only where self-administration was impossible due to physical incapacity. The amendment aimed to strengthen safeguards and uphold autonomy.

Ministerial Response

The Panel received the Ministerial Response on 31st March 2026. A copy of the Response can be found [here](#). The Panel made 28 recommendations, 20 of which were accepted and 4 of which were partially accepted. The Panel has written to the Minister asking for further clarification on 4 of the findings within the Ministerial Response, to support its understanding of the proposed approach as implementation progresses. A copy of the letter can be found [here](#). The Panel would recommend the next Panel follow up on seeking clarity on these findings in addition to following up on the accepted recommendations and ensure that they are implemented.

Suggestions for future work

Future scrutiny of the assisted dying legislation and its implementation may wish to examine a number of areas both before and after the service becomes operational. Given the complexity, ethical sensitivity, and significant operational requirements identified during this review, continued oversight will be important to ensure the framework is safe, sustainable, and aligned with the principles agreed by the States Assembly.

In the period leading up to implementation, future scrutiny work may focus on monitoring the development of key operational components. These could include statutory guidance, practitioner training programmes, supervisory and governance structures, and public information materials. Many core safeguards, such as capacity assessment processes, coercion-awareness training, multidisciplinary assessment arrangements, and practitioner competency requirements, are still in development. Oversight of their completion and readiness would support a robust and ethical establishment phase during the 18-month implementation window.

Scrutiny may also continue to assess the preparedness and resilience of palliative and end-of-life care services. As high-quality palliative care underpins genuine patient choice, future work could involve tracking progress on the new End of Life Care Law, reviewing workforce capacity, and evaluating access to specialist palliative assessment. Ensuring strong links between palliative care and assisted dying services will be essential to safeguarding informed decision-making and preventing requests for assisted dying driven by unmet care needs.

Financial sustainability is another area that may require ongoing oversight. Given uncertainties identified around staffing, digital systems, governance requirements, and early-stage cost estimates, future scrutiny could revisit the completed financial impact assessment, monitor expenditure against forecast, and assess whether the assisted dying service places additional pressure on wider health and social care budgets.

Following implementation, a structured programme of post-implementation monitoring may be beneficial. Areas of interest could include the operation of core safeguards (for example, the pause mechanism), the use of self-administration versus practitioner administration, and patterns relating to the waiver of future capacity. Continued engagement with healthcare practitioners, palliative care specialists, safeguarding professionals, and disability organisations would help identify emerging risks, unintended consequences, or areas that require legislative or operational refinement.

Public awareness and accessibility will also remain important safeguards. Scrutiny may therefore consider the reach and neutrality of public information campaigns, including accessibility for older adults, marginalised groups, disabled people, and those without digital access. Monitoring the clarity of signposting and support for individuals who may feel under pressure would help ensure that decisions are fully informed and voluntary.

Finally, ongoing awareness of international developments—such as evolving practices in comparable jurisdictions and emerging research—could support continuous improvement. As assisted dying legislation continues to develop globally, comparative analysis may help identify new risks, new technologies, best-practice and safeguards relevant to Jersey's context.

Hospital Review Panel

The Hospital Review Panel was established in May 2024 to scrutinise the government's progression of plans for the new acute hospital at Overdale, the associated funding strategy, and governance arrangements delivered through the New Healthcare Facilities Programme (NHFP).

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Jonathan Renouf, Chair
- Deputy Steve Ahier, Vice-Chair
- Deputy Alex Curtis, Member
- Deputy Karen Wilson, Member
- Connétable Marcus Troy, Member

Prior to the Vote of No Confidence: Chief Minister [\[P.1/2024\]](#) the Review Panel was constituted as the 'Future Hospital Review Panel' and comprised the following membership between November 2022 and January 2024, with the exceptions noted below:

- Deputy Sam Mézec, Chair
- Deputy Lyndsay Feltham, Vice-Chair

- Connétable Michael Jackson, Member
- Deputy Geoff Southern, Member [November 2022-April 2023]
- Deputy Robert Ward, Member [April 2023-January 2024]

Future Hospital Review Panel (2022-2024)

New Healthcare Facilities Programme Review: Interim Report [[S.R.3/2023](#)]

The Future Hospital Review Panel was established to examine the governance of the NHFP and the development and progress of the projects to provide a new hospital and healthcare facilities for Jersey. The review was ongoing throughout 2023 and culminated in an interim report [[S.R.3/2023](#)] which took the Panel's investigations up to the publication of the Government Plan 2024 – 2027 and the funding proposed to progress that work. The report found that there was a lack of transparency and clarity over the total cost of the NHFP and a lack of Ministerial consensus on the programme of work.

The Panel also found that there was a lack of clarity over the Ministerial oversight or understanding of the rating system used to measure the options for delivering healthcare infrastructure against the chosen critical success factors. The Panel's report also expressed concerns around the lack of a Health and Social Services Workforce strategy to inform the programme, the risk of duplication of services across multiple sites and the need for structured engagement with healthcare professionals, emergency services and stakeholders, including residents of the various sites in scope. The Panel made a total of 41 findings and 16 recommendations.

The Panel also presented the following comments papers in relation to the Proposed Government Plan:

- [Comments – Proposed Government Plan 2023 – 2026: Twentieth Amendment \[P.97/2022\]](#)
- [Comments – Proposed Government Plan 2024 – 2027 \[P.72/2023\]](#)

Hospital Review Panel (2024-2026)

Review of the New Healthcare Facilities Programme [[S.R.2/2025](#)]

The current Hospital Review Panel launched its review in June 2024 which sought to monitor the progression of the NHFP, address the funding proposals for delivery of Phase One of the NHFP, consider the intended outcomes of Phase One of the NHFP, the Government's approach to stakeholder engagement and whether the NHFP meets the health and social care needs of Islanders.

In concluding its review, the Panel made a total of 34 key findings and 20 recommendations for improvement as the NHFP transitions to the Full Business Case stage.

The Panel also lodged the following proposition and amendment to the Proposed Budget 2025-2028:

- [Proposition – New Healthcare Facilities Programme \(P.43/2024\)](#)

- [Amendment - Proposed Budget \(Government Plan\) 2025-2028 \(P.51/2024\): Sixth Amendment – New Healthcare Facilities Programme Expenditure \(P.51 Amd.\(6\)\)](#)

Methodology

The Panel focused its scrutiny on ensuring that Phase One of the New Healthcare Facilities Programme (NHFP) received adequate oversight from the States Assembly. To this end, it lodged Proposition P.43/2024 on 27 June 2024, seeking a separate in-principle debate on the Phase One funding proposals ahead of the Government Plan 2025–2028 debate. This was not adopted by the Assembly.

The Panel also raised concerns about the confidentiality of the Outline Business Case (OBC) for Phase One, which the Government withheld on commercial sensitivity grounds. To promote greater transparency, it lodged Amendment P.51 Amd.(6) following its scrutiny of the Proposed Budget (Government Plan) 2025-2028, requesting publication of detailed Heads of Expenditure for the acute Overdale facility, Kensington Place Ambulatory Care facility and the St Saviour’s Health Village. This amendment was rejected by the States Assembly.

Throughout its review, the Panel held public hearings and meetings with the Minister for Health and Social Services and the Minister for Treasury and Resources.

- On 12 July 2024, the Panel questioned the Minister for Health and Social Services on governance, estate maintenance, programme progress, procurement, and funding issues.
- In July 2024, the Panel carried out a fact-finding site visit to Overdale and launched a targeted call for evidence from the local construction and supplier sector to assess stakeholder engagement.
- Following its confidential receipt of the OBC in August 2024, the Panel questioned the Minister for Treasury and Resources on 4 October 2024 regarding the OBC’s financial case, financial risk management and the Budget’s financing strategy.
- On 16 October 2024, the Panel held a further hearing with the Minister for Health and Social Services on the overall framework of the NHFP and the Strategic, Economic and Commercial Cases within the OBC.

The Panel also issued written questions to both Ministers on matters including financing proposals, mental health facilities, transparency, non-acute elements of the programme, estate maintenance, programme dependencies, procurement and Budget-related issues.

To strengthen the robustness of its assessment, the Panel appointed an independent expert advisor in October 2024 to undertake a formal appraisal of the OBC, including its technical quality and compliance with the HMT Green Book and associated best practice.

Overview of findings and recommendations

The Panel found a lack of clarity and transparency about the decision-making that informed the NHFP, and an absence of strategic healthcare, workforce and procurement planning.

The Panel acknowledged the urgent need for new healthcare facilities but considered that greater transparency and clarity about decision-making and expenditure was needed to deliver improvements through future phases of the NHFP.

The Panel was further concerned about the extent to which the Outline Business Case (OBC) for Phase One of the NHFP was compliant with best practice guidance for business cases and the level of independent oversight and challenge provided to the OBC. Furthermore, the Panel found that the future affordability of the NHFP, including the proposed Overdale, Kensington Place and St Saviours Health Village facilities was an area of ongoing concern.

Among the recommendations made by the Panel were:

- Risks associated with withdrawing £5 million per year for refurbishment works of the existing General Hospital in 2026 and 2027 should be quantified.
- Information about the intended uses for the Kensington Place Ambulatory Care facility should be confirmed and published.
- A detailed workforce model and workforce strategy should be developed and the timeframe for the development of a health and care strategy, including its alignment to the NHFP confirmed.
- The NHFP Team should produce an updated demand and capacity model to evidence the need for proposed bed capacity at each of the proposed NHFP sites.
- Assurance and oversight processes for the Programme should be strengthened.
- The NHFP team should demonstrate the affordability of the NHFP by confirming the source of funding for the revenue and operational cost increases associated with the NHFP.

The Minister for Health and Social Services presented a [Ministerial Response](#) to the Panel's key findings and recommendations in April 2025: accepting two, partially accepting seven, and rejecting eleven recommendations.

Suggestions for future work

A future Scrutiny Panel may wish to examine the following areas:

1. Scrutiny of the full business case (FBC)

Once the FBC is finalised, future scrutiny work could review the following:

- construction costs
- decant and transition planning
- digital health plan
- workforce strategy
- value-for-money assessment

Given the scale of borrowing required, further scrutiny of ongoing financial oversight could also be undertaken in relation to governance and financial oversight of the project including: debt profiles, revenue implications and capital re-profiling.

2. Oversight of enabling works and procurement

The NHFP Team is currently in the second stage of the procurement process for a main developer and therefore future scrutiny work could be carried out to review the procurement process once complete, including, but not necessarily limited to:

- contractor selection
- sustainability requirements
- risk and contingency management.

3. Scrutiny of the Functional Briefs and Development Control Plans for Kensington Place and the St Saviour's Site

Future scrutiny could include a detailed examination of the functional briefs and Development Control Plans (DCPs) for both Kensington Place and the St Saviour's site once these documents are completed and published. These sites form critical components of the phased New Healthcare Facilities Programme, and the Panel has been kept abreast of progress during private briefing sessions with the Minister for Health and Social Services and the NHFP team.

This future workstream could assess:

- The clarity, adequacy, and clinical alignment of the functional briefs.
- Whether the DCPs are consistent with long-term service modelling and estate strategy.
- The coherence between these satellite facilities and the acute facilities planned at Overdale.
- How the functional briefs consider the delivery of community-based care and how they align more broadly with the New Healthcare Framework.
- Planning dependencies, sequencing, and risks associated with both sites.
- Whether the proposed design and land-use plans support operational efficiency, workforce requirements, digital integration, and patient experience.

Work Permit Holder Welfare Review Panel

The Work Permit Holder Welfare Review Panel was established in December 2022 to examine the effectiveness of the Work Permit Policy ("WPP") and whether it provides adequate protection to workers from possible exploitation and Modern-Day Slavery.

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Beatrice Porée (Chair)
- Deputy Mary Le Hegarat (Vice-Chair)
- Connétable Marcus Troy, Member
- Deputy Lyndsay Feltham, Member
- Deputy Montfort Tadier, Member

Reviews

Review of Work Permit Holder Welfare [\[S.R.2/2023\]](#)

The Work Permit Holder Welfare Review Panel was established to address concerns brought to the attention of the Panel about the treatment of some work permit holders in Jersey. A key focus of the review was on the extent to which the welfare of work permit holders living and working in Jersey is upheld, and how issues faced by work permit holders are addressed.

The Panel presented its Scrutiny Report on 12th October 2023.

Methodology

- A general call for evidence targeted at work permit holders and employers, to understand more about the challenges of living and working in Jersey on a work permit, and the challenges associated with the WPP.
- Private briefings with the Jersey Customs and Immigration Service, Ministers for Treasury and Resources and Social Security and Government Officers from the Treasury and Exchequer and Customer and Local Services departments.
- The Panel held private meetings with community groups and employee representatives such as Friends of Africa, the Kenyan Jersey Committee, the Jersey Filipino Tambayan Group, the Jersey Advisory and Conciliation Service (JACS), a Senior Unite the Union representative and a member of the public with experience providing community support.
- The Panel also held private meetings with employers in a number of sectors, including care and hospitality, and employer representatives including the Jersey Farmers' Union and GR8 Recruitment. It also undertook a site visit to Meleches Farms, a local Jersey Royal potato grower.
- The Panel reviewed official statistics about the numbers and demographics of work permit holders in Jersey and found that a significant proportion of African and Caribbean work permit holders were employed on-Island
- The Panel held public hearings with the Friends of Africa and the Kenyan Jersey Committee, to discuss the challenges faced by African and Caribbean work permit holder communities in Jersey.
- Public hearings were held with employers and employer representatives that employ work permit holders and included the Jersey Farmers' Union and the Jersey Hospitality Association, to understand more about the challenges associated with the WPP and the recruitment and employment of work permit holders in Jersey.
- The Panel's final public hearing with the Minister for Home Affairs discussed the evidence that the Panel received in relation to its review. This included key themes related to engagement with stakeholders, information, support and advice provided to work permit holders, working conditions and supplementary employment,

accommodation, WPP and Immigration Rules, Government of Jersey information about work permit holders and Modern Slavery and exploitation.

- The Panel also ran a survey from 11th May to 19th June 2023. It asked targeted questions about work permits, work permit holder welfare, healthcare and access to benefits and the overall experience of living and working in Jersey.
- Throughout the review, the Panel maintained written correspondence with key stakeholders, including the JACS, the Ministers for Infrastructure, Social Security, Treasury and Resources, Health and Social Services, Economic Development, Tourism, Sport and Culture and Home Affairs.

Overview of Findings and Recommendations

The Panel considered evidence that suggested five key areas of concern in relation to the welfare of work permit holders in Jersey. Among the Findings and Recommendations made by the Panel were:

- Work permit holders struggled to find accurate information and guidance about living and working in Jersey and recommended that information and guidance relevant to work permit holders is made available through a centralised port to access prior to their arrival in Jersey.
- The Panel highlighted recurrent themes about restrictions on work permit holders' ability to move between employers and a lack of clear signposting for support. The Panel found that more could be done to clarify expectations with both employers and employees, and that an enhanced compliance regime would help to ensure that the welfare of employees was not being taken on trust and goodwill.
- The Panel found that the WPP does not contain adequate protections for work permit holders from Modern-Day Slavery and noted concerns around the absence of Modern-Day Slavery legislation in Jersey. The Panel recommended that the Minister for Home Affairs consult on the introduction of Modern-Day Slavery legislation for Jersey. The Panel also considered the role of the employer licensing scheme operated by the UK Gangmasters and Labour Abuse Authority and recommended that the Minister introduce a similar scheme in Jersey.
- The Panel found that the WPP did not seek to establish a minimum standard for accommodation, only that the Minister for Home Affairs supports the health and wellbeing of work permit holders. The Panel highlighted that it was unclear how an individual in sub-standard accommodation would easily find information about how to make a complaint and do so in a way that would have a positive impact on their circumstances.
- The Panel heard concerns amongst some work permit holders and stakeholders about access to healthcare in Jersey. The Panel found that most work permit holders were not aware of how the healthcare system operates in Jersey prior to their arrival, and

that information about the operation of the healthcare system in Jersey, or links to this information, was not available in the WPP. The Panel also recommended that all work permit holders be covered by a suitable travel insurance policy prior to their arrival on-Island.

- The Minister for Home Affairs presented a Ministerial Response to the Panel's Key Findings and Recommendations on 23rd November 2023: accepting five recommendations, partially accepting five recommendations, rejecting 10 recommendations and marking five recommendations as complete.
- The Panel continued to follow up in written correspondence with the Minister about the rationale for the responses to the Panel's Findings and Recommendations. However, following the change of Government in January 2024, the newly appointed Minister for Home Affairs provided a re-issued Ministerial Response on 2nd July 2024: accepting 10 recommendations, partially accepting nine recommendations, rejecting two recommendations and marking four recommendations as complete.

Suggestions for future work

Following publication of the Panel's Scrutiny Report and consideration of the Ministerial Responses, the follow-up scrutiny of the work permit holder welfare workstream was continued by the Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel. This included follow-up on key areas raised by the Panel's review, during a topic-based public hearing on work permit holder welfare on 16th October 2025. These areas of follow-up included the information available for work permit holders in Jersey, work permit holder accommodation, employment conditions, disputes and grievances, modern-day slavery and exploitation and the Jersey Customs and Immigration Service, which could be taken forward by a future Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny or Review Panel.

Offshore Wind Review Panel

The Offshore Wind Review Panel was established in July 2024 to scrutinise government proposals for an offshore wind farm in Jersey waters, following the Assembly's in-principle decision in 2023 to explore this option. The Panel's objective was to consider future policy and legislative proposals and to prepare for a full review once draft primary legislation and associated proposals were lodged in the States Assembly.

Due to the draft legislation and policy work still being under development, the Panel did not launch a review. Activity predominantly comprised structured briefings, written and oral questions in the States, and written correspondence with the Minister for the Environment rather than a formal evidence gathering review.

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Hilary Jeune (Chair)
- Deputy Kristina Moore (Vice-Chair)
- Connétable David Johnson, Member

- Deputy Montfort Tadier, Member

Methodology

- Private briefings with the Minister for the Environment and officers on the offshore wind policy workstream (including technical advisers Environmental Resource Management (ERM) Consultants) to understand legislative sequencing, strategic options and market access issues.
- Joint private briefing with the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Panel and Jersey Electricity on 24th March 2025.
- Official correspondence from the Minister for the Environment providing programme updates and signalling next steps.
- Fact-finding visit to Saint Brieuc windfarm to learn more about the opportunities and challenges with developing an offshore windfarm.
- Monitoring of developments and public statements, including the Panel's response supporting the Government's decision in November 2025 to postpone progressing to a leasing process pending clarity on market access and geopolitical risk.

Overview of Findings and Observations

1. Strategic objectives and market access

Early preliminary work highlighted that longer-term strategic objectives (energy security, net-zero contribution, and export/access arrangements) required clearer articulation before decisions on leasing could be taken. The Minister's report and the government's decision in late 2025 acknowledged significant uncertainties, particularly market access with neighbouring jurisdictions, that justified pausing progression to the leasing stage.

2. Governance, regulation and consenting

The Panel tracked the development of a primary consenting framework and future regulatory arrangements to support any eventual scheme, noting the plan to lodge draft consenting legislation and a preferred leasing approach separately.

3. Evidence base and technical assurance

Technical advisory input (ERM) and background documentation were shared with the Panel to inform the evolving evidence base (including commercial risks/opportunities). Further ecological baselining and costed feasibility stages would be prerequisites for any formal proposition.

4. Stakeholder engagement and communications

While constructive dialogue occurred between the Panel and the Minister, wider public engagement was expected to scale up only once draft legislation was lodged and a call for evidence launched.

Suggestions for Future Work

- Full review upon lodging of draft legislation and options

Undertake a formal review (with call for evidence and hearings) when draft consenting legislation and any leasing proposals are lodged, covering governance model, environmental assessment pathway, market access strategy, and risk allocation.

- **Scrutiny of market access strategy**
Examine inter-jurisdictional arrangements (UK/Channel region), export routes, and grid/commercial frameworks that were cited as reasons to pause progression in 2025.
- **Environmental and ecological baselining**
Review the scope, sequencing, and funding for environmental assessment, cumulative impact analysis, and marine spatial planning needed ahead of any leasing.
- **Skills, supply chain and local benefits**
Assess workforce implications, local participation in supply chains, and potential economic benefits/risks to ensure evidence-based decision-making when conditions allow progression.

Common Strategic Policy Review Panel

The Review Panel was originally established in March 2024 to assess the scrutinise the Common Strategic Policy (CSP) lodged by the new Council of Ministers.

As standard procedure a Council of Ministers is required to lodge a CSP for debate within four months of their appointment and, ordinarily, the Council of Ministers would bring forward the CSP for its term of office at the same time as lodging the Government Plan. This process ensures an alignment between the Council of Ministers objectives and priorities and the funding available to action them. However, a change in Government midway through the political term led the Council of Ministers to present a new CSP for 2024-2026. The Review Panel held a Public Hearing with the Chief Minister on 3rd May 2024 following which it presented [comments](#).

In July 2025, the Review Panel was re-established to assess the delivery of the Common Strategic Policy and examine how the Proposed Budget 2026–2029 supports the implementation of its thirteen priorities. The review focused on identifying gaps and risks affecting delivery, with particular attention to cross-cutting issues spanning multiple ministerial portfolios.

Standing panels provided valuable insights into these cross-cutting matters, which included:

- The ageing population
- Digital infrastructure
- Environmental priorities
- Diversity, Inclusion and Equity
- Workforce training and skills

The Panel's final report was presented on 27th November 2025 – [S.R.5/2025](#).

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Inna Gardiner (Chair)
- Deputy Helen Miles (Vice-Chair)
- Deputy Hilary Jeune, Member
- Deputy Montfort Tadier, Member
- Deputy Catherine Curtis, Member
- Deputy Louise Doublet, Member

Methodology

The Panel held public hearings with the following Ministers to question them on delivery and implementation of the CSP priorities under their remits, including the identified cross-cutting matters and associated funding models aligned with their strategic aims:

- Minister for Health and Social Services
- Minister for Social Security
- Minister for Education and Lifelong Learning
- Minister for the Environment
- Minister for Infrastructure
- Minister for Sustainable Economic Development
- Minister for Treasury and Resources

After gathering evidence from Ministers, the Panel held one final public hearing with the Chief Minister to question him on the overall strategic co-ordination and leadership of the CSP.

The Panel acknowledged that it did not hold public hearings with all Ministers. This was a deliberate decision based on the Panel's focus on cross-cutting matters within the CSP. As such, a targeted selection of Ministers were invited to provide insight into how the ministerial team was working collaboratively to deliver on shared priorities. The culminating hearing for the Panel was with the Chief Minister, which provided an opportunity to assess overall strategic leadership and coordination across government.

Overview of findings and recommendations

The Panel found that Ministers had been broadly supportive of narrowing the CSP to a focused set of priorities. This approach was viewed as beneficial because it provided clarity, strengthened accountability, and helped avoid spreading limited resources too thin during the shortened 28-month government term. The Panel agreed that this prioritisation enabled measurable progress in several key areas.

In terms of delivery, the government met a number of significant commitments. These included the introduction of nutritious school meals across all States primary schools and the beginning of the transition to a living wage, although support for businesses remained ongoing. Progress was also made on lifelong learning and skills development, reducing GP fees, advancing affordable housing measures, planning reforms, and preparatory work for the construction of the new hospital at Overdale. However, several priorities were only partially achieved. These

included implementing recommendations from the Violence Against Women and Girls Taskforce, revitalising the town centre, and reducing red tape. The expansion of nursery and childcare provision remained dependent on the approval of the Proposed Budget², while climate emergency commitments progressed slowly due to delays in environmental projects and the absence of a clear financial strategy.

Regarding alignment with the Proposed Budget 2026–2029, the Budget maintained (and increased) funding for CSP-related work, rising from £5.8 million in 2025 to £8.3 million in 2026. Ministers generally welcomed this support, although some expressed concern about the dominance of health and education growth bids. The decision to temporarily reduce the States Grant to the Social Security Fund provided short-term financial flexibility but also created longer-term sustainability concerns, given demographic pressures and rising health costs. The Budget was characterised as a “bridging budget,” intended to preserve financial stability until the next government takes office, leaving medium and long-term funding decisions to future Ministers.

The review also highlighted several cross-cutting issues that required stronger coordination across government. These included challenges relating to the ageing population, digital infrastructure, environmental priorities, diversity and inclusion, and workforce training. While Ministers acknowledged these concerns, the Panel found limited evidence of integrated strategies or coordinated governance to address them. For example, despite significant planned digital investment, questions remained about the effectiveness of previous spending and the robustness of oversight arrangements. Environmental priorities also struggled to secure funding amidst competing short-term pressures, and there was limited evidence that equity and inclusion were consistently embedded in policy development.

Finally, the Panel reviewed progress against the Future Jersey Vision and its ten Island Outcomes. While the Vision provided a strong overarching framework for shaping government priorities and measuring quality of life, delivery had been inconsistent. In particular, environmental and community well-being outcomes were not fully realised, often due to siloed working practices or funding constraints. The Panel concluded that stronger cross-departmental coordination, long-term investment, and a renewed focus on overarching outcomes would be necessary to ensure the Vision could be effectively delivered across the three dimensions of well-being.

Suggestions for future work

Future scrutiny of the CSP could first include a focus on the forthcoming full CSP Progress Report, which the Council of Ministers has committed to publishing before the end of the term. Despite the fact that a new government will be required, under the States of Jersey Law 2005, to develop and lodge its own CSP for approval by the Assembly, there remains value in reviewing the current government’s progress report.

Examining the progress report would provide a baseline for understanding the status of major strategic initiatives, many of which will continue regardless of ministerial changes. Long-term issues such as demographic pressures, digital infrastructure, environmental commitments will

² Funding was subsequently approved during the debate on the budget

likely span multiple government terms. This would create an evidence base for future scrutiny in examining the new CSP.

Looking ahead, scrutiny of the next government's new CSP could be undertaken through one of two routes, depending on decisions made by the next Scrutiny Liaison Committee:

- the establishment of a dedicated Review Panel, as used during the current term; or
- assigning responsibility to the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel, which holds a remit for overarching strategy of government.

Either model could provide oversight, provided the work remains focused on the broad strategic direction of government rather than operational policy areas that fall naturally within the remit of Standing Panels.

An overview of the [Ministerial Response](#) to the recommendations made in this review may also help inform future scrutiny. Of the 11 recommendations, Ministers accepted one, partially accepted two, and rejected eight.

This helps to clarify the context in which matters have been concluded by government, and which remain open for future monitoring or review. Ministers indicated that they were prioritising the final delivery of the government's programme ahead of the pre-election period, and this shaped their decisions on the recommendations made through the review. Several matters raised by the Panel were therefore rejected by the current government, but with scope for the next Council of Ministers to revisit them as part of the development of its new Common Strategic Policy.

Parishes and the Government of Jersey Review Panel

The Review Panel was established in March 2025 to examine the relationship between the functions and services provided by the parishes and those delivered by the government. The review considered how both tiers of administration collaborate to provide community services and assessed the effectiveness of these partnerships.

The review also explored how government engages with the parishes to implement key strategies and policies, including Putting Children First, the Carbon Neutral Roadmap, reducing bureaucracy, and community safety initiatives. Ultimately, the review aimed to evaluate how these interactions support the delivery of services to the public and whether improvements were needed to meet modern expectations.

The Panel's final report was published on 23rd February 2026 – [S.R.5/2026](#)

The Review Panel's membership was -

- Deputy Helen Miles, (Chair)
- Deputy Catherine Curtis, (Vice-Chair)
- Deputy Kristina Moore, Member
- Connétable Richard Honeycombe, Member

Methodology

The Panel agreed to gather as much evidence as possible before inviting witnesses to attend public hearings. The initial evidence-gathering period spanned from March to October 2025 and involved multiple stages including:

- **Engagement with parishes:** The first stage focused on obtaining information from all twelve parishes. The Panel wrote to each parish requesting data to inform the review. The requests were divided into stages and presented in a survey-style format, with the aim of making it easier for parishes to respond within specified timeframes.

In November 2025, the Panel also wrote to all Connétables inviting them to submit their views on any matters relating to the review. This invitation was extended to Connétables both individually and collectively.

- **Community engagement:** To gather public views, the Panel held a series of pop-up stands in various locations and attended meetings with community groups, including Age Concern, the Good Companions Club, and Arthritis Jersey. These sessions provided valuable insights into how islanders perceive the parish system and its relationship with government.

The Panel also undertook a public survey in September 2025 on the parish rates system, which received over 480 responses, providing a broad perspective on this important issue.

- **Public hearings and workshops:** Following the initial evidence-gathering phase, the Panel held several public hearings with key stakeholders. In addition, evening workshops were organised with the Procureurs de Bien (September 2025) and the Comité des Chefs de Police (October 2025). The final stage involved asking each Connétable a series of questions in a survey-style format, similar to that used with the parishes, to capture their individual views and opinions on a range of matters. The Panel also conducted a public hearing with the Chair of the Comité des Connétables in February 2026, focusing on the Panel's initial findings and testing potential recommendations.
- **Examination of previous work and reviews:** The Panel examined previous reviews and reports relating to the relationship between parishes and government to ensure that its work built on existing knowledge.

Overview of findings and recommendations

The Panel's review highlighted the strength of the parish system, noting its deep local knowledge, historical continuity, and strong volunteer ethos. Evidence showed that parishes continue to deliver meaningful local services and maintain vital connections between residents and public life. These traditional characteristics were viewed as assets rather than barriers to improvement.

While recognising the enduring value of the parish system, the Panel found that many of the processes, governance arrangements and legislative frameworks have not kept pace with contemporary expectations of accountability, transparency and accessibility. The Panel concluded that it is both possible and desirable to maintain parish autonomy while modernising outdated practices.

The relationship between parishes and government was found to be generally positive but overly informal, relying on personal relationships rather than structured mechanisms. This informality can limit consistency and reduce opportunities to coordinate Island-wide priorities. The review also identified concerns about governance and accountability, noting that legislation governing Parish Assemblies and certain parish functions is fragmented and outdated. Although some good-practice guidance exists, its voluntary nature limits effectiveness.

Service delivery was identified as a core strength of the parish system, particularly in refuse collection, parks and play spaces, and honorary policing. However, disparities in capacity, funding and sustainability across parishes were noted. The Honorary Police, while providing substantial public value, face recruitment and resource pressures that raise questions about long-term viability.

The review also identified low public understanding of parish rates. Survey results showed widespread confusion over rate-setting processes, purposes and assessment methods. Inconsistent accounting practices further limit transparency and comparability.

The Panel's recommendations centred on strengthening clarity, consistency and collaboration without undermining parish independence. Key proposals included modernising legislation governing Parish Assemblies, strengthening shared governance and the role of the Comité des Connétables, improving equity and sustainability in shared service delivery, enhancing transparency in rates and financial governance, and establishing more structured engagement between government and parishes.

Many issues identified were structural and long-term, therefore, the Panel's recommendations were intended to inform prioritisation and reform in the next Assembly term.

Suggestions for future work

Many of the recommendations arising from the review, if accepted, are long term in nature and are likely to require sustained work over several years. As such, the immediate priority for scrutiny in the next Assembly term is likely to be monitoring progress, rather than initiating further detailed reviews. The following areas outline potential future scrutiny activity.

- **Initial monitoring:** Given the structural and long-term nature of the issues identified, the SLC may wish to begin the next term considering the government's and Comité des Connétables' formal responses to the recommendations.

- **Consideration of a follow-on review:** Once initial progress becomes clearer, SLC may wish to consider whether establishing a further Review Panel would be beneficial. A follow-on review could:
 - examine the early impact of accepted recommendations;
 - identify areas where progress has been made or stalled; and
 - evaluate any changes in the relationship between government and the parishes.
- **Integration into Standing Panel work:** Some recommendations fall naturally within the remit of existing Standing Panels. Where appropriate, these Panels may wish to explore follow-up work during the next term. This could include:
 - Children, Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel - Oversight of recommendations relating to the Panel's remit, particularly in relation to the Honorary Police, play spaces and the administration of firearms certificates.
 - Environment, Housing and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel - Examination of recommendations relating to refuse and recycling and roads infrastructure.
 - Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel - Oversight of any changes to government-parish strategic engagement, particularly in shared strategic policies and aims.
 - Economic and International Affairs Scrutiny Panel: Monitor developments with ferry resilience, including interisland travel, timings, reliability of sailings and freight.
 - Monitor cost of living as a standing agenda item across all panels

The integration of these issues into Standing Panel work programmes would allow Scrutiny to maintain oversight across multiple portfolios without duplicating effort.

