

Privileges and Procedures Committee

(39th Meeting)

16th June 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair and Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin, Chair
Deputy L. K. F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter
Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour

In attendance -

W. Millow, Deputy Greffier of the States
Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support (for a time)
B. Siddall, Research and Project Officer (for a time)
L. Plumley, Senior Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
C. Fearn, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
E. Patterson, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Parts A and B.

- | | |
|--|--|
| Minutes. | A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 27th May and 2nd and 4th June 2025, having previously been circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed. |
| Action list:
Privileges and
Procedures
Committee. | A2. The Committee noted the actions and outcomes arising from previous meetings. |
| Remote
participation:
Members'
survey. | A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A8 of 2nd June 2025, received a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with a survey which had been devised to garner opinions on remote participation in States Meetings (Standing Order 55A refers). |

The Committee recalled that it had previously lodged 'au Greffe' 2 propositions, both of which sought to amend Standing Order 55A. The propositions had been subject to a reference back to the Committee with a call for further consultation with Members on the subject.

The Committee had recently expressed support for revised proposals based on the comments made by Members during the most recent debate, subject to the removal of a reference to remote participation outside of Jersey being permitted in "unforeseen circumstances that could not be reasonably predicted". Ahead of lodging the proposed amendments, the Committee had agreed that Members should be surveyed with a briefing to follow.

The Committee noted the results of the survey, which had been completed by 37

Members.

33 or more Members agreed that –

remote participation should be possible in times of emergency or where the Bailiff determined that a quorum could not be achieved in person;
Members should be able to participate remotely for health or wellbeing reasons;
Members should continue to be able to be marked *malade* or absent due to parental responsibilities;
the Minutes of States Meetings would record which Members had participated remotely;
the Greffier of the States would retain anonymised records of the reasons given for remote participation for monitoring purposes; and,
suspected abuse of the system would constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct for Elected Members.

30 – 32 Members agreed that –

Members should be able to participate remotely as a result of caring responsibilities;
Members should provide the reason for participating remotely to the Greffier;
Members would be able to participate both remotely and in person during the course of a meeting day; and
the Minutes of the States Meetings would record the reason in general terms for Members' participating remotely.

25 Members agreed that –

remote participation from outside the Island should only be permitted with the agreement of the States Assembly (through the adoption of a proposition without debate) with no requirement for prior notice of the proposition;

The following matters had not been agreed by a majority –

Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island for reasons relating to their own health or wellbeing (23);
Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island where caring responsibilities applied (21); and,
Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island when absent on States business (14).

It was recommended that those matters which had been agreed by 33 or more Members and 30 – 32 Members should be incorporated into a revised proposition. The Committee was also asked to consider the following –

whether to include a provision which allowed remote participation from outside the Island with the agreement of the States Assembly (through the adoption of a proposition without debate), with no requirement for prior notice of the same; and,
whether to include the matters which had not been agreed by a majority, as detailed above, in the proposition.

If the Committee supported the inclusion of the aforementioned provisions, Members were asked to determine whether the proposition should be structured so as to allow for separate voting on the various aspects.

It was noted that Members had posed certain questions in their responses as follows –

Some Members had requested guidance in relation to the circumstances in which the Bailiff would determine that a quorum could not be achieved. Others believed that

remote participation should automatically be permitted when an emergency had been declared. However, the Committee noted that no such declaration had been made during the Covid Pandemic. Consequently, remote participation had been permitted on the basis that a quorum could not otherwise be achieved.

Some Members had distinguished between “health” and “wellbeing” and supported remote participation for reasons relating to the former but not the latter. Others highlighted a preference for each term to be defined.

Some Members believed that the Bailiff should also be made aware of those Members requesting to participate remotely.

Some Members indicated that the submission of documentary evidence to the Greffier in support of long-term periods of remote participation might be beneficial.

Concerns existed with regard to the recording of such information in the States Minutes and whether this would have a detrimental impact on Members.

The Committee considered the survey results and the commentary detailed above and agreed that the question of remote participation from outside the Island should be considered separately in a stand-alone proposition. With regard to facilitating remote participation from outside the Island *via* the agreement of the Assembly, concerns were expressed regarding the potential for abuse of process to facilitate voting during critical debates, and the potential for public criticism was highlighted. The Committee was reminded that the ability to seek leave to participate from outside the Island already existed (P.3/2024 refers). The Deputy Greffier advised that structuring the proposition to allow for remote participation from outside the Island in certain circumstances would negate the requirement for approval by the States in those circumstances. Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour raised concerns that Members wishing to participate remotely for health-related reasons may not wish information to be shared publicly, and that recording the reason in general terms could subject Members to pressure to explain an absence. Deputy Doublet subsequently requested that Members be provided with the option to submit such information to the States Greffe in confidence. Data protection and safeguarding considerations relating to the storage of personal information were highlighted, and it was suggested that guidance to accompany the proposition could be produced to encompass this element.

The Committee considered whether to structure the proposition to include the option to remove the provision of remote participation in any event and ultimately decided that it would instead allow Members to vote separately on the circumstances under which remote participation could be allowed (in line with support from a majority of Members surveyed). It was agreed that the first part of the proposition should ask Members to consider whether they wished to maintain the current provision outlined in Standing Order 55A which, if supported, would cause the remainder of the proposition to fall away.

The Deputy Greffier was requested to draft a proposition and accompanying guidance on the basis of the above for consideration at a future meeting.

On a related matter, Deputy Doublet stated that remote participation could be viewed as a means of increasing accessibility for candidates with disabilities and requested that advice from subject experts in this area was sought on the matter. The Committee was reminded that Standing Order 55A had not been intended to facilitate permanent remote participation for individuals who were unable to access the Chamber.

E-petitions
system: review

A4. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A10 of 2nd June 2025, considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with the results of a survey in relation to the e-petition system review.

The Committee recalled that it had previously considered the survey results and had

concluded that the main issue appeared to be that expectations exceeded actual outcomes, with the lack of a tangible decision causing frustration. The Committee had requested that the States Greffe explore alternative approaches with a view to addressing the issues raised in the consultation responses. The Committee had also requested data on the number of petitions which met the threshold for a Ministerial response.

The Committee noted that Standing Orders could be amended to alter the parameters for e-petitions, by virtue of reviewing thresholds and outcomes. This would have the added benefit of bringing together the procedures for e-petitions and paper petitions in Standing Orders. In order to address frustrations with regard to the lack of a distinct vote on e-petitions, a system akin to the existing paper petition process could be adopted whereby an elected Member could lodge a proposition on the basis of a petition which had reached the required threshold. Alternatively, petitioners could be invited to participate in in-committee debates where the threshold was reached or the system could be amended so that a Committee of States Members considered e-petitions which reached the appropriate threshold, as was the case in other jurisdictions. However, with the exception of an arrangement which mirrored the paper petition system, the options set out would not address the lack of a tangible outcome in response to e-petitions.

Turning to the thresholds that currently applied, the Committee noted that 1,000 signatures were required to elicit a Ministerial response and 5,000 signatures were required to trigger an in-committee debate. The Committee's attention was drawn to statistics to date in relation to e-petitions and it was noted that 89 petitions had reached the threshold for a Ministerial response and 8 had been considered for an in-committee debate. The impact of reducing the thresholds to 500 for Ministerial responses and 2,500 for an in-committee debate was noted at 132 (Ministerial responses) and 24 (in-committee debate).

The Committee was requested to consider whether the system should be revised to allow for an explicit vote by the States Assembly in response to an e-petition which met an agreed threshold and whether to amend the existing thresholds.

The Committee discussed the current system for e-petitions and noted that a public misunderstanding of in-committee debates appeared to be the cause of the misalignment between expectations and outcomes. It was noted that Standing Orders did not allow for a vote to occur during an in-committee debate. It was proposed that, as an alternative to an in-committee debate, the 5,000 signature threshold could instead trigger correspondence to all States Members requesting sponsorship for the e-petition. Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South proposed a significant reduction in the threshold for such correspondence to allow petitioners to engage with Members at an earlier stage. This would also assist with setting realistic expectations and improve Members' understanding of the issues raised in petitions. Additionally, Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour proposed that petitioners should be directed to the vote.je website with the view to encouraging individuals to stand for election.

The Committee expressed support for a revised approach to the e-petitions system, whereby a petitioner would be given the option to engage directly with a States Member with a view to that Member lodging a proposition, similar to the existing paper petition process. It would be made clear to petitioners who did not want to engage with Members that a vote on the petition would not be possible without a proposition. The Deputy Greffier was requested to draft the revised e-petitions process for consideration by the Committee at a future meeting.

Safeguarding
guidance.

A5. The Committee considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with draft Safeguarding Guidance for States Members.

It was noted that a safeguarding policy for the States Greffe had been produced in response to the transfer of responsibility for the Jersey Youth Assembly to the States Greffe. Designated Safeguarding Leads had been identified within the Department. To accompany this, it had been decided that safeguarding guidance should also be developed for States Members.

The Committee considered the guidance which had been produced and noted that it was intended to inform independent work undertaken by elected Members (outside of work organised by the States Greffe). On the basis that the Committee was satisfied with the guidance, it would be shared with all States Members.

The Committee approved the guidance and the Deputy Greffier was requested to circulate the same to all States Members.

On a related matter, Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North highlighted that the guidance recommended that States Members who wished to take part in work with vulnerable children and adults should apply for an Enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate. It was recalled that a Member of the Committee had previously independently obtained an Enhanced DBS certificate having been advised by People Hub that the role of States Member was not included in the list of professions subject to Enhanced DBS checks, as set out in the Rehabilitation of Offenders (Exceptions) (Jersey) Regulations 2002 (Minute No. A7 of 11th November 2024 refers). Deputy Ahier expressed the view that the States Greffe should offer the service if it was included as a recommendation in the guidance. The Committee was reminded that Members' Resources was able to arrange for the provision of Basic and Enhanced DBS certificates. The Committee requested that all States Members be advised of this service.

Risk-based
exclusion
policy.

A6. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 9th December 2024, considered a report which had been prepared by the Members' Resources section of the States Greffe in connexion with the development of a risk-based exclusion policy.

The Committee recalled that it had previously met Ms. K. Wright, Independent Chair of the Violence against Women and Girls (VAWG) Taskforce and Chair of FREEDA (Free from Domestic Abuse) in connexion with a decision of the House of Commons to support a risk-based exclusion policy for Members accused of violent and/or sexual offences (Minute No. A4 of 11th November 2024 refers). The Committee had agreed that the development of such a policy should be considered in the context of the review of the Code of Conduct for Elected Members.

The Committee recalled that the Commissioner for Standards had been consulted, among others, in connexion with the above matter and had concluded that, whilst the adoption of a risk-based exclusion policy was a matter for Members, such a policy would likely enhance standards by ensuring a safe working environment. The Commissioner had also highlighted the fact that concerns regarding the impact of such a policy on the ability of a Member to undertake their duties had been mitigated in the House of Commons policy by enabling proxy voting.

Turning to the draft policy, the Committee noted that this would have to be considered in the context of Ministerial duties and the Codes of Conduct and Practice for Ministers and Assistant Ministers. No provision currently existed for the suspension of a Minister, albeit it was understood that the Chief Minister was considering revisions to the States of Jersey Law 2005 to allow for this.

The Committee considered the draft policy and the nature of the offences which warranted exclusion. The Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support, advised that the exclusion process would automatically commence when a Member was charged with an offence listed in the policy, and that the exclusion

period would end upon the outcome of that charge. In the instance that a Member had been charged with an offence overseas, the Greffier of the States, the Bailiff and the Chair of the Committee would consider whether exclusion was appropriate, owing to jurisdictional differences in approach to certain offences. The Committee queried whether the policy would be applied in instances of threats of violence towards other Members or staff, and the Assistant Greffier advised that the policy was solely intended to address behaviour which had met the threshold for a criminal charge. Attention was drawn to the potential implications for the provision of remote participation, as the policy proposed that Members who had been excluded would be allowed to participate remotely in States meetings in order to continue to undertake their duties. The Committee was advised that an amendment to Standing Orders to facilitate this would be required.

Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour proposed that domestic abuse be included in the list of offences warranting exclusion, and it was agreed that Members' Resources would consider the same to ensure all crimes of equal severity were covered by the policy. Deputy Doublet further proposed that Ms. Wright and the VAWG Taskforce should be consulted on the policy, whilst recognising the urgency of its implementation to safeguard Members.

The Committee approved the draft policy in principle and requested that, following consideration of the inclusion of domestic abuse, the revised draft should be re-presented for approval. Upon final approval, the policy would be circulated to all States Members and a briefing would be arranged.

The Committee thanked the Assistant Greffier and Ms. B. Siddall, Research and Project Officer, and they withdrew from the meeting.

Management
of electronic
mail messages
to all States
Members.

A7. The Committee considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States and correspondence, dated 11th June 2025, from Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade regarding the process for managing correspondence addressed to all States Members.

The Committee noted that, in her letter, Deputy Scott had requested that the Committee consider the introduction of a Standing Order which required Ministers with responsibility for relevant subject areas to respond in the first instance to correspondence addressed to all States Members. This would be followed up with a response from the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Panel and a requirement for both the Minister and the Scrutiny Panel Chair to keep all States Members informed. The Deputy's proposal sought to avoid duplication, and she had suggested that failure to comply could be viewed as a breach of the Code of Conduct.

The Committee noted that the above matter had been raised by Deputy Scott following the receipt of an electronic mail message from a Member of the public which had been forwarded (in error) by the States Greffe to all elected Members. The Committee noted that when electronic correspondence intended for States Members was received by the States Greffe, the policy was to direct correspondents to a page on the States Assembly website which included Members' contact details. This allowed correspondents to direct queries to all States Members or a specific Member. It was noted that this system had been developed in response to concerns of this nature which had previously been expressed by Deputy Scott.

The Committee recalled that the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey were effectively the rules and procedures which governed the States Assembly and its Committees and Panels. Consequently, it was not considered appropriate to establish a Standing Order which related specifically to the management and receipt of electronic mail messages from members of the public as such correspondence did not constitute States Assembly proceedings. However, in the event that the Committee was minded to consider a set procedure for the management of such

matters, it was suggested that this could take the form of guidance or be added to the guidance associated with the Codes of Practice that already existed. If this approach was supported, consultation with the Council of Ministers and the Scrutiny Liaison Committee would be required in the first instance. In terms of the Deputy's suggestion that a failure to respond could constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct, it was recommended that the Committee seek advice from the Commissioner for Standards in this regard.

The Committee discussed Deputy Scott's proposal and agreed that the introduction of a Standing Order for this purpose would not be appropriate. The Committee agreed to consult the Council of Ministers, the Scrutiny Liaison Committee and the Commissioner for Standards on the matter, and the Deputy Greffier was requested to draft a holding response to Deputy Scott informing her of this course of action.

Hansard:
survey.

A8. The Committee considered a report which had been prepared by the Specialist Secretariat in connexion with a survey designed to gauge the opinion of Members in relation to Hansard in its current format.

The Committee noted the proposed survey questions and was advised that it was hoped that the responses received would inform consideration of improvements to the layout of the official report. A link to the Welsh Assembly Hansard had been provided in order to illustrate additional features.

The Committee approved the survey questions set out in the report and requested that the survey be circulated to States Members.

States meeting
dates for 2026.

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A11 of 2nd June 2025, considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with the States meeting schedule for 2026.

The Committee recalled that, in accordance with Standing Order 4 of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey, it was required to present to the States Assembly, no later than the end of September each year, a list of days for meetings of the States for the first and second sessions in the following year. In this connexion the Committee considered proposed meeting dates for 2026/2027, as suggested by Deputy C. S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair, as follows -

First Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
January 20th	January 21st, 22nd and 23rd
February 3rd	February 4th, 5th and 6th
February 24th	February 25th, 26th and 27th
March 10th	March 11th, 12th and 13th
March 24th	March 25th, 26th and 27th
April 7th	April 8th, 9th and 10th
	OR
April 14th	April 15th, 16th and 17 th

***proposed electoral candidate nomination week – 20th April**

May 9th (Liberation Day)

***public election – June 7th**

June 16 th	June 17th, 18th and 19th
	OR
June 23rd	June 24th, 25th and 26th

***proposed Chief Minister selection – no later than 26th June**

July 1st, 2nd and 3rd

***proposed Ministerial/Committees/Panel Chair selection – no later than 2nd July**

July 8th, 9th and 10th

***proposed inaugural sitting of newly constituted Assembly**

Second Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
September 8th	September 9th, 10th and 11th
September 29th	October 30th, 1st and 2nd
October 20th	October 21st, 22nd and 23rd
November 10th	November 11th, 12th and 13th
December 8th	December 9th, 10th and 11th

The Committee noted that Deputy Alves had also identified possible meeting dates for the first session of 2027, as follows -

First Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
January 19th	January 20th, 21st and 22nd
February 2nd	February 3rd, 4th and 5th
February 23rd	February 24th, 25th and 26th
March 16th	March 17th, 18th and 19th
April 13th	April 14th, 15th and 16th
April 27th	April 28th, 29th and 30th
May 9th (Liberation Day)	
May 18th	May 19th, 20th and 21st
June 8th	June 9th, 10th and 11th
June 29th	June 30th, July 1st and 2nd
July 13th	July 14th, 15th and 16th

The Committee noted that the candidate nomination period had recently been agreed at the inaugural meeting of the Jersey Electoral Authority and this would commence on 20th April 2026, with the announcement of candidates taking place on 27th April 2026. Consequently, the last week in which the Assembly could meet was the week commencing 13th April 2026, which fell during a school holiday period. It was recalled that, as a consequence of a decision taken by the Committee several years previously, States meeting dates were generally arranged to avoid school holiday periods. However, due to the fact that the public election would be held in June 2026, it was certain that any States meetings in April 2026 would take place during school holidays. It was hoped that sufficient advance notice of this would allow Members time to plan ahead. At the request of Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour alternatives to meeting dates during school holiday periods had been requested. The Committee noted that any alternative arrangements would likely involve meeting on additional days (and could possibly result in longer meetings) in order to complete the business of the Assembly ahead of the Pre-Election Period. Deputy Doublet also asked that consideration be given to avoiding States meetings on school inset days. It was recalled that the Committee had previously considered this matter and had concluded that it was impossible to accommodate individual arrangements for inset

days for each of the Island's schools (Minute No. A16 of 9th December 2024 refers).

The Committee noted that the meeting dates proposed by the Vice Chair effectively placed the Assembly on a 2 weekly meeting cycle during the first part of the year. Consequently, the only alternative which could be envisaged was a weekly meeting schedule during March 2026, with the exception of the week commencing 30th March 2026, as this coincided with the beginning of the Easter school holidays. From a lodging perspective, Standing Order 19A prohibited the lodging of propositions during the Pre-Election Period; which in 2026 would commence on 20th February 2026. The final lodging date would therefore be 19th February 2026. If the final meeting of the Assembly were to take place on 24th March 2026, a decision would most likely be required to reduce the lodging period for many propositions scheduled for debate on that date.

Turning to the dates for the selection of the Chief Minister, Ministers and Chairs, it was noted that the Vice Chair had highlighted 2 options, with the earlier date potentially allowing the Assembly to meet before the summer recess. However, Standing Orders required the nominations for Chief Minister to be made 5 clear working days before the start of the meeting. If the meeting were to take place on 15th June 2026, for example, the deadline for nominations would be Friday 5th June 2026 (before the election). The Committee was asked to determine how much time should be allowed following the election for nominations to be prepared. As an example, if nominations were required by 5.00 p.m. on Thursday 11th June 2026 (3 clear working days after the elections), the meeting to select the Chief Minister designate would take place on Friday 19th June 2026. The meeting to select Ministers and Chairs would then take place on Monday 29th June 2026. A standard meeting of the Assembly (that would incorporate the appointment of Panel and Committee Members) could take place on 7th or 14th July 2026 (both of which fell within school term time).

In conclusion, the Committee was asked to approve the proposed meeting schedule, with consideration being given to the date of the last States meeting in 2026 and the date of the meeting to appoint the Chief Minister designate.

The Committee considered the proposed dates and the potential for public criticism if a meeting was not held in April 2026 was recognised. Ultimately, the Committee agreed that the final sitting ahead of the election should be scheduled to commence on Monday 30th March 2026, to compensate for the potential loss of a continuation day due to the public holiday (Good Friday) falling on 3rd April that week. In arriving at this decision, the Committee noted that the school holidays commenced on 1st April 2026 and that the preceding week was also designated as a meeting week. The Committee approved the proposed timeline for the selection of the Chief Minister designate (19th June 2026), with nominations for Chief Minister being required on 11th June 2026, and for Ministers and Chairs (Monday 29th June). It was agreed that a standard meeting of the Assembly would subsequently be held on 14th July 2026, ahead of the summer recess.

The Deputy Greffier was requested to draft a revised timetable of sittings for 2026 and to make the necessary arrangements for the same to be presented to the States.

Non-elected
Members on
Scrutiny
Panels and
change in Troy
Rule
(P.46/2025):
comment.

A10. The Committee considered a draft comment which had been prepared in response to the proposition entitled 'Non-elected Members on Scrutiny Panels and change in Troy Rule' (P.46/2025 refers), which had been lodged 'au Greffe' by Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade.

The Committee noted that the proposition sought approval for the appointment of non-States Members to Scrutiny Panels and an increase in the limit on the number of Ministers and Assistant Ministers, as prescribed in Standing Order 112A.

The Committee considered the draft comment. Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour noted that the Scrutiny Liaison Committee had also discussed Deputy Scott's proposal and would likely be publishing a comment with a similar view in due course.

The Committee approved the draft comment and requested that the Deputy Greffier of the States make the necessary arrangements for it to be presented to the States.

Forthcoming
business.

A11. The Committee considered propositions which had been lodged 'au Greffe' for forthcoming meetings of the States Assembly.

With regard to the draft Civil Status (Abolition of Legitimacy Etc.) (Jersey) Law 202- (P.44/2025 refers), which had been lodged 'au Greffe' by the Minister for Justice and Home Affairs, Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour highlighted that the draft legislation included a provision to enable the Minister to bring it into force, alongside the Children and Civil Status (Amendments) (Jersey) Law 2024, via Ministerial Order. This would negate the requirement for an Appointed Day Act to be lodged and voted upon by the Assembly.

Attention was drawn to the ability for non-Executive Members to challenge Ministerial functions, to include Orders, Regulations and Decisions. It was also noted that Orders were published on the Order Paper for Members' information.

Record of
Members'
declaration of
interests on the
States
Assembly
website.

A12. The Committee heard from Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North in connexion with the record of Members' declarations of interest on the States Assembly website.

Deputy Ahier advised that some declarations made no longer appeared on his individual page on the States Assembly website. Deputy Ahier had raised the issue with the Members' Resources team but had yet to receive a response. The Deputy Greffier of the States undertook to follow-up on the matter.

On a related matter, Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South informed the Committee that he too had sent a request to Members' Resources to update his declarations of interest, but no action had been taken. The Deputy Greffier also undertook to investigate the matter.

Date of next
meeting.

A13. The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on 7th July 2025, from 10.00 am – 1.00 pm in the Blampied Room.