Privileges and Procedures Committee

(7th Meeting)

5th October 2026

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present.

Deputy C. S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Chair
Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour, Vice Chair
Connétable A.N. Jehan of St. John (not present for items A3, A6 – A12)
Senator S.M. Kersten (not present for items A3, A6 - A12)
Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement (not present for items B1 – B5)
Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity (not present for items A3, A8 - A12)

In attendance -

L-M. Hart, Greffier of the States
W. Millow, Deputy Greffier of the States
Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support (for a time)
S. McKee, Principal Constituency Support Officer (for a time)
K.M. Larbalestier, Principal 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 meeting held on 14th September 2026 (Part A and Part B), having previously been circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

The Committee discussed the management of business and noted a suggestion from Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South that, where a significant number of matters arose under the confidential Part B agenda, additional meetings could be convened outside the regular meeting cycle to enable those items to be considered promptly and to reduce the need for repeated deferrals. It was further agreed that the duration of future Committee meetings would be extended by 30 minutes, concluding at 3.00 p.m., to provide additional capacity for the consideration of Committee business.

States of Jersey Complaints Panel: relationship and remit.

A2. The Committee considered a report prepared by the Greffier of the States concerning the remit, operation and governance arrangements of the States of Jersey Complaints Panel.

The Committee noted that the Panel, established under the Administrative Decisions (Review) (Jersey) Law 1982, provided an independent mechanism for investigating complaints relating to maladministration, improper actions or unfair decisions by Ministers and Government Departments. The Privileges and Procedures Committee acted as the sponsoring and administrative body for the Panel, whilst the States Greffe Specialist Secretariat provided secretariat support in fulfilment of the Greffier of the States' statutory responsibilities. Although the Greffier did not direct or oversee the Panel's work, it was noted that she represented the Panel when matters

relating to its operation were considered by the Council of Ministers.

Members noted that consideration of the Panel's longer-term future had effectively been deferred since 2018 pending the development of proposals for a Jersey Public Services Ombudsman. As those proposals had not progressed, the existing arrangements for the Panel remained in place.

The Committee received an overview of the Panel's complaints handling processes, including arrangements for informal resolution, the convening of Boards of Administrative Appeal and the publication of findings and recommendations. Whilst the Panel's recommendations were not legally binding, Ministers were required to respond formally to its reports and account for any action taken in consequence thereof.

The Committee noted the historical consideration that had been given to the establishment of an Ombudsman, including recommendations arising from the Clothier Review, the Jersey Law Commission and a wider review of complaints handling undertaken by former Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade. Members were advised that these proposals had not progressed, primarily due to concerns regarding cost, proportionality, the implications of establishing an additional arm's-length public body and the view that enhancements to the Panel's existing processes and procedures within the current complaints framework could achieve many of the intended benefits without the need to establish a separate Ombudsman service. It was noted that the States of Jersey Complaints Panel had been an accredited Complaint Handler member of the Ombudsman Association for a number of years and remained subject to regular independent assessment against recognised professional standards. This included a requirement for formal reaccreditation every 5 years, providing assurance that the Panel continued to operate in accordance with accepted best practice. Members expressed satisfaction with the work of the Panel, the professionalism of its members and the important role it played in providing independent scrutiny of administrative decisions affecting members of the public.

The Committee noted that the terms of office of the Chair and one of the Deputy Chairs were due to expire in the new year and that both appointments had previously been extended owing to uncertainty surrounding the future of the Panel. It was noted that the vacancies would be advertised following the Christmas period and that the recruitment process would be undertaken in conjunction with the Jersey Appointments Commission. The Committee was advised that a previous recruitment campaign for members had attracted approximately 30 applications and produced a particularly strong field of candidates, which was considered indicative of the credibility and standing of the Panel and public confidence in the importance of its work.

In discussing the future operation of the Panel, Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity suggested that consideration should be given to remunerating the Chair and Deputy Chairs. He drew attention to the significant commitment required of office holders and the importance of formally recognising their contribution. Members noted that the Panel's work frequently had far-reaching implications for the public sector and that its findings and recommendations had contributed to improvements in policy, administrative practice and, in some instances, legislation.

The Committee was advised that the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) had altered the complaints landscape considerably and had contributed to a marked increase in the volume of complaints received. It was noted that AI-generated submissions could be more difficult to assess, often containing inaccurate or

misleading references to legislation, policy and procedures that were not applicable within Jersey. This had increased the complexity of the assessment process and necessitated additional scrutiny.

Deputy K.M. Wilson of St. Clement reflected on her experience of Ombudsman services in the United Kingdom and advised that such organisations were experienced in managing complex and persistent complaints. She noted that Ombuds operated established procedures to ensure that all appropriate avenues of redress had been exhausted before accepting a complaint for investigation and possessed powers to manage unreasonable or vexatious complainants where necessary. In response, the Greffier advised that the Panel had adopted a policy for managing vexatious and unreasonable complainants which was aligned with approaches used by comparable organisations. However, the policy had been used sparingly, given that its application could effectively represent the end of the complaints process for an individual. Whilst acknowledging that circumstances might arise in which use of the policy was necessary, the Greffier emphasised that the Panel's consistent approach had been to assist complainants wherever possible and to signpost them to alternative sources of advice or redress where appropriate. Deputy Wilson suggested that broader questions existed regarding the consistency and effectiveness of complaints handling arrangements across the public sector. She expressed concern that the Assembly's decision to establish an Ombudsman remained unimplemented and observed that, from a governance perspective, the position was unsatisfactory and the decision should either be progressed or formally revisited by the Assembly.

Having considered the matter, the Committee agreed that the Chair and Deputy Chairs of the States of Jersey Complaints Panel should be invited to attend a future meeting to discuss the Panel's work, the challenges currently facing the complaints-handling system and their views on potential changes to processes, governance arrangements and legislation which might assist the Panel in carrying out its functions.

Constituency Support Service.

A3. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A4 of 14th September 2026, considered a report on the operation of the Constituency Support Service and received the Assistant Greffier, Chamber and Members' Support, and Ms S. McKee, Principal Constituency Support Officer.

The Committee recalled that the 2026 States Members' Annual Survey had invited Members to comment on the support services available to assist them in the discharge of their duties, including the Constituency Support Service. It was noted that a number of respondents had indicated that they had not used the service and had questioned its effectiveness and value in its current form.

The Committee noted that the service had originated from commitments contained within former Chief Minister Deputy K.L. Moore's 100 Day Plan. In 2023, the Committee, as previously constituted, had established a Constituency Office Sub-Committee to consider the practical requirements and parameters for the provision of constituency offices. The Sub-Committee's work had informed the inclusion of a growth allocation of £344,000 per annum within the 2024-2027 Government Plan to support constituency services, which had subsequently been approved by the States Assembly in December 2023. The Constituency Support Service had been formally established on 30th September 2024.

The Committee noted that the service had been available to all States Members since its launch and that, as at 28th September 2026, it had received 266 enquiries from 38 Members. Casework and research requests accounted for the majority of activity, with housing, social security and infrastructure matters representing the most common areas of enquiry. The Committee further noted that the team comprised a

Principal Constituency Support Officer and 3 Research and Project Officers, who worked collaboratively with other States Greffe teams to support Members.

Progress in relation to data protection arrangements was also noted, including the introduction of a Data Processing Agreement and a Privacy Statement template to assist Members in meeting their obligations when handling personal data and to facilitate engagement with constituents. The Committee further noted that £9,970 had been drawn from the Constituency Support Fund since 2024, primarily in support of communications materials and constituency newsletters.

In reviewing the results of the 2026 States Members' Survey, the Committee noted positive feedback from Members who had utilised the service, with respondents highlighting the quality, responsiveness and professionalism of the support provided. Whilst some Members preferred to manage constituency matters independently, suggestions for future development included enhanced administrative support, correspondence handling and case management functions. The Committee also noted a number of testimonials demonstrating the value of the service in supporting constituency casework, strengthening engagement with constituents and Government departments, improving accessibility and enhancing communication. It was noted that the service would continue to be monitored throughout 2026 and 2027, with a further report and recommendations to be presented to the Committee in July 2027.

In discussing the report, the Committee considered the comparatively limited use of the service by Government Members. Officers advised that Members with Ministerial responsibilities frequently sought support through their Private Secretaries or the Ministerial Office when dealing with matters connected to their executive roles. Nevertheless, it was emphasised that the Constituency Support Service remained available to all elected Members, including those serving in Government. Officers further explained that the distinction between constituency and Ministerial responsibilities could, on occasion, become blurred and that the Ministerial Office, having access to additional resources, might sometimes assume responsibility for matters that could otherwise fall within the remit of the service. The Committee also noted that uptake amongst Connétables had increased during the current term of office.

In response to questions regarding potential overlap with Members' Resources, officers advised that the Constituency Support Team's work was principally focused on constituency casework and support for individual constituents, with only limited crossover into broader research functions. It was observed that whilst constituency issues could occasionally develop into wider States business, the success of the service was often measured by its ability to secure assistance or resolution for constituents.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Principal Constituency Support Officer advised that it was not considered that there were any significant gaps in the service itself and that lower levels of engagement were more likely attributable to limited awareness. The Committee noted that drop-in sessions designed to promote the service had not been well attended and a range of measures to improve awareness and uptake were discussed. These included holding further drop-in sessions, engaging directly with Members on States meeting days, increasing promotion at community engagement events and working with the Ministerial Office to remind Members of the support available. It was also noted that the introduction of dedicated Ministerial electronic mail addresses might assist in distinguishing between Ministerial and constituency workstreams and thereby encourage more effective use of the service. The Committee also considered whether information regarding

Members' support services was sufficiently accessible. Whilst details of the Constituency Support Service were contained within the Members' Handbook, it was acknowledged that the volume of information contained within the document could make specific guidance difficult to locate. It was suggested that more regular communications highlighting particular sections of the Handbook might be beneficial. It was also suggested that printed copies of the Handbook be made available in meeting rooms and communal areas to improve visibility of, and awareness of, the support services available to Members.

The Committee further discussed support in relation to communications and social media activity. It was noted that requests in this area were generally met through coordination with the Digital and Public Engagement Team rather than through the direct provision of communications services by the Constituency Support Team.

The Committee thanked the delegation for attending and they withdrew from the meeting.

Forthcoming remuneration review.

A4. The Committee received an oral report from the Greffier of the States in connexion with the forthcoming remuneration review for States Members.

The Committee noted that the States of Jersey (Amendment – Remuneration of Elected Members) (Jersey) Law 2022 required the appointment of a reviewer to determine the remuneration and allowances payable to elected States Members. The Committee further noted that the legislation required the establishment of an independent panel to appoint the reviewer and direct the review process. To facilitate a timely appointment, advertisements for panel members would be issued imminently with the aim of appointing a reviewer by the end of the year. The Committee noted that members of the appointment panel could neither be States Members nor States employees, although no such restrictions applied to the appointment of the reviewer.

The Committee noted the position.

Common-wealth Parliamentary Association 2026 Election Observers Mission.

A5. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A6 of 9th March 2026, of the Committee as previously constituted, received a report in connexion with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association British Islands and Mediterranean Region (CPA BIMR) 2026 Election Observers' Mission (EOM).

It was noted that prior to the 2026 public election, EOMs had also been arranged for the 2018 and 2022 elections and that any recommendations arising from an observation were provided in a report thereafter. The Committee, as previously constituted, had initially decided not to invite election observers to review the 2026 public election, given that previous recommendations arising from EOMs had been mostly implemented. However, the previous Chair of the Committee had invited observers following the adoption of P.74/2025 – CPA Election Observers.

The Committee noted that the CPA BIMR Election Observation Mission had concluded that Jersey's legal framework provided a strong basis for democratic elections, notwithstanding the implementation of significant electoral reforms shortly before polling day. It was noted that, despite challenges associated with the introduction of Automatic Voter Registration and other legislative changes, election stakeholders had worked collaboratively to deliver the election effectively. The Mission considered the election to have been competitive, well administered and conducted in an orderly manner, supported by balanced media coverage and an effective voter education campaign. The Committee further noted the Mission's observations regarding the need to strengthen resilience against misinformation and improve the efficiency of the count and publication of results, together with its 9

recommendations to enhance transparency, participation and public confidence in future elections.

Initial observations suggested that many of the findings and recommendations were similar to those contained in previous reports, and it was considered that the 2018 report had been the most substantive. It was recalled that the Committee was due to meet the Jersey Electoral Authority (JEA) later in the month to receive its feedback on the election and other processes and that both the JEA and the Electoral Administrators from the Parishes would also produce post-election reports. The Committee recognised that the recommendations arising from these reports would require detailed consideration in due course and would form a considerable part of its work programme in early 2027.

Privileges and Procedures Committee Sub-Committees: appointment of Chairs.

A6. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A2 of 14th September 2026, considered the appointment of Chairs to its various Sub-Committees.

The Committee agreed the following appointments -

Diversity Forum - Senator S.M. Kersten
Machinery of Government - Deputy K.F. Morel of St. Lawrence, St. John and Trinity
Political Awareness and Education - Deputy L.M. Doublet of St. Saviour
Pensions Sub-Committee - Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central

The Chair undertook to invite States Members to join the various Sub-Committees and to provide details of their respective terms of reference and areas of responsibility.

Financial and staffing statements on propositions: recommendat-ions of Comptroller and Auditor General.

A7. The Committee considered a report from the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with recommendations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) regarding the requirement for financial and staffing statements to accompany propositions under Standing Order 21.

The Committee noted that, in recent reports, the CAG had commented on the procedures of the Assembly in relation to the information available to support decision-making, particularly with regard to financial and resource implications. In the report entitled '*Health Insurance Fund'* (R.26/2026), the CAG had recommended that procedures governing States propositions and Ministerial Decisions be strengthened to ensure that future expenditure proposals were supported by robust business cases setting out resource and system implications, including the long-term impact on States finances and specific funds. The Executive response had been presented to the States on 8th April 2026. However, owing to the proximity of the public election, the previous Committee had not had an opportunity to consider the recommendation. The Committee further noted that Government had assigned a high risk rating to its non-implementation.

Due to time constraints, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the matter to its next scheduled meeting in order to allow for fuller discussion.

Inclusion of economic implications statements on propositions.

A8. The Committee received a report from the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with a proposal from Deputy G. Voisin of St. Helier North, Minister for Sustainable Economic Development to amend Standing Orders to introduce the inclusion of a statement of economic implications on propositions. The Committee noted correspondence from the Minister dated 5th August 2026, in connexion with the matter.

The Committee noted that the proposal would require propositions to include a brief, high-level assessment of their impact on the Island's economy, competitiveness and business environment, akin to the existing financial and staffing implications statement requirements. The Minister considered that such statements would better inform debate and noted that support would be available from the Government Economic Analysis Team and, where appropriate, the States Greffe Members' Resources Team.

The Committee noted that there was currently no requirement under Standing Orders for economic impact statements. Whilst such assessments had been prepared by Government in the past, they had not always been published. Research indicated that there was no consistent approach across other parliamentary jurisdictions, with many legislatures not requiring equivalent statements.

In considering the proposal, the Committee discussed the potential resource implications and the importance of ensuring that any new requirement provided meaningful information and did not become a procedural formality or "tick-box exercise". Deputy K. Wilson of St. Clement observed that the wider impact assessment framework merited further discussion and suggested that there should be greater clarity regarding the objectives of the process and the outcomes it was intended to achieve. Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour, Vice Chair emphasised the importance of ensuring that impacts on children remained a central consideration and that Child Rights Impact Assessments should be afforded appropriate weight in decision making. The Greffier of the States advised that Members required adequate support to engage effectively with impact assessment processes and concern was expressed that, without appropriate assistance, backbench Members could be disadvantaged.

Due to time constraints, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the matter to its next scheduled meeting in order to allow for fuller discussion.

Use of Jèrriais in the States Assembly.

A9. The Committee received a report from the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with a proposal to incorporate the use of Jèrriais into proceedings at the adjournment of meetings of the States Assembly and on continuation days.

The Committee noted that In 2019, the States had adopted a proposition entitled 'Jèrriais: Promotion by the Public Sector' (P.143/2018), thereby recognising Jèrriais as the third official language of the States Assembly, alongside English and French. As a consequence, Members were entitled to address the Assembly in any of the 3 official languages. The proposition also called for greater visibility of Jèrriais in Government correspondence and branding, a principle that had subsequently been implemented. From the Assembly's perspective, the official logo had been enhanced to include the Jèrriais title '*L's Êtats d'Jèrri'* alongside the English and French versions. Following the adoption of P.143/2018, consideration had also been given to incorporating Jèrriais more formally into Assembly proceedings. However, no changes had been introduced. States Assembly meetings continued to commence in French with the *appel* and prayers, with the majority of business being conducted in English.

The Committee was advised that, during the election period, the matter had been revisited and the Bailiff had suggested that one means of reflecting the official status of Jèrriais within Assembly proceedings might be the inclusion of a short Jèrriais element at the conclusion of a meeting day or continuation day. However, he had emphasised that such a change should be introduced only if it were acceptable to elected Members.

Currently, at the conclusion of a meeting or continuation day, the Presiding Officer

announced the adjournment of by stating, “The States stand adjourned”, followed by the date and time of the next meeting. Under the proposal, the Presiding Officer would either follow or replace that statement with an equivalent phrase in Jèrriais. Research undertaken to identify a suitable form of words, together with engagement with the Office du Jèrriais, indicated that the phrase *“Né v'là l'adgèvement d'la tâche. Les Êtats sont ajournés”,* which translated to ‘that is the end of work’ would be sufficiently distinct from French and would therefore avoid any potential confusion between the 2 languages. The Committee also noted an alternative expression, *“Les baînîns sont dans la pouque. Les Êtats sont ajournés.”* Whilst the phrase translated literally to “the limpets are in the bag”, it was a well-established Jèrriais idiom meaning that the task was complete or the deed had been done. The expression captured the unique character and richness of the Island's language and culture and, whilst informal in origin, could provide a distinctive means of marking the conclusion of Assembly business without detracting from the dignity of proceedings.

The Committee considered the proposal and expressed support in principle for the inclusion of Jèrriais within Assembly proceedings, whether through the use of *“Né v'là l'adgèvement d'la tâche. Les Êtats sont ajournés”* or the alternative expression *“Les baînîns sont dans la pouque. Les Êtats sont ajournés.”* However, recognising that the change would affect the formal conduct of States sittings, the Committee noted that the views of States Members should be sought before any decision was taken on implementation.

2027 meeting dates.

A10. The Committee received and noted a report in connexion with proposed meeting dates for 2027.

The Committee considered the proposed schedule of meeting dates and approved the timetable, subject to a review of the proposed April meeting date, which it was understood might coincide with a school inset day. The Committee therefore requested that the date be reconsidered and amended if necessary to avoid any conflict. The Committee further agreed that, once the schedule had been finalised, electronic calendar invitations should be issued to all Members.

Scrutiny Liaison Committee: updates from PPC meeting.

A11. In her capacity as the representative of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee on the Privileges and Procedures Committee, Deputy K. Wilson of St. Clement undertook to provide an update to the Scrutiny Liaison Committee on item Nos. A3, A8 and A9.