STATES OF JERSEY

COMMON STRATEGIC POLICY 2026 – 2030 (P.75/2026): TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT (P.75/2026 AMD.(22)) – COMMENTS

Presented to the States on 5th November 2026
by the Council of Ministers

STATES GREFFE

COMMENTS

The Council of Ministers opposes this amendment, which proposes that the Common Strategic Policy 2026 should be revisited and potentially replaced before the 2028 Budget is debated because, in the Deputy's view, further work is required to develop certain longer-term policy proposals and funding requirements.

The CSP is a statutory requirement of Article 18(2A) of the States of Jersey Law 2005. It serves as the strategic framework for the Council of Ministers' term of office, setting out the Government's priorities and direction of travel. The Budget performs a different function, establishing Government's overall financial position and detailed spending plans. Budget decisions are developed and scrutinised within the context of the CSP, but the two documents are not intended to operate on identical timescales.

The CSP is not intended to be, nor has it ever been, a comprehensive spending plan.

Many strategic priorities are delivered through existing departmental budgets, policy reform, legislative change, reprioritisation of resources and improvements to delivery. Consequently, the absence of a specific budget allocation for every action at the outset of a ministerial term does not diminish the validity of the strategic priorities themselves.

The amendment suggests that Members are being asked to endorse priorities before there is sufficient visibility of the funding arrangements required for their delivery. The Council of Ministers does not agree.

The proposed Budget 2027-2030 already demonstrates how the Government's strategic priorities are being supported through significant investment in areas including cost-of-living support, health services, competitiveness, infrastructure, public realm improvements, safety and resilience. The Budget therefore provides clear evidence that the CSP and financial planning are already closely aligned.

It is also important to recognise that some major policy commitments will naturally require further development before detailed costs can be established.

Proposals such as the higher and further education campus, health and care funding reform and major infrastructure projects depend on detailed policy work, business cases and affordability assessments.

The Government has been transparent about this position and has provided for feasibility funding within the proposed Budget to support that development work. It would not be prudent to predetermine funding allocations before the necessary analysis has been completed.

The Council of Ministers further notes that previous common strategic policies have operated in the same way. Strategic priorities were established at the start of the term and delivery was subsequently supported through annual Budget decisions, reprioritisation and policy development. The existence of future policy work or subsequent funding decisions has never been regarded as a reason to reopen or replace a CSP during the same political term.

The amendment would also create unnecessary complexity and uncertainty by requiring legislative change to facilitate a further CSP debate before the 2028 Budget. This would

impose additional demands on ministerial teams, departmental resources and drafting capacity without delivering any material enhancement to existing accountability arrangements. In fact, it would result in resources being diverted from important pieces of legislative work including the new resilience law and medicines regulation, among others, causing delay to the delivery for the community.

The States Assembly already has the opportunity to scrutinise how each Budget supports CSP priorities, and Ministers will continue to report publicly on progress against those commitments throughout the term.

The amendment does not appear to recognise that the CSP and the Budget have distinct but complementary purposes.

While the Council accepts that some priorities will require further development before specific funding decisions can be brought forward, this does not justify the creation of a new statutory requirement to prepare, lodge and debate a further CSP during the same ministerial term.

The Council of Ministers agrees that strategic priorities should remain responsive to changing circumstances. However, the existing framework already provides sufficient flexibility for policies, programmes and spending decisions to evolve over time while maintaining a stable and coherent strategic direction. Requiring a further CSP mid-term would risk undermining that stability without providing any corresponding benefit.

For these reasons, the Council of Ministers asks Members to reject this the amendment.