

Privileges and Procedures Committee

(14th Meeting)

1st December 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present with the exception of Deputy L. K. F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter, from whom apologies had been received.

Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North, Chair
 Deputy C. S. Alves of St. Helier Central
 Deputy M. R. Ferey of St. Saviour (via Teams)
 Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South
 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (via Teams)
 Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade (via Teams)

In attendance -

L-M. Hart, Greffier of the States
 J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement (item No. A? only)
 K.M. LARBalestier, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
 E. Patterson, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
 C. Tucker, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat

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

Minutes. A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 5th, 10th and 20th November 2025, having previously been circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.

Risk-based exclusion policy. A2. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A5 of 10th November 2025, received a report prepared by the Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members Support in connexion with the draft risk-based exclusion policy.

The Committee recalled that, following consideration of the aforementioned draft policy, it had considered feedback from Members and staff and had agreed the following –

the guidance which supported the policy should strongly recommend against excluded Members participating in constituency drop-in sessions. To inform the approach, it was agreed that advice should be sought in relation to safeguarding practices/pathways in the context of staff convicted of offences covered under the Policy;

that the Policy should apply irrespective of whether the Member concerned had pleaded guilty or not guilty;

that the scope of the Policy should not be extended to cover offences other than those listed;

that the Bailiff should not be required to adjudicate on whether to exclude Members in accordance with Policy;

that Members should be required to report offences committed overseas; and

that the Policy provisions would apply irrespective of who the offence was alleged to have been committed against; Some discussion followed around prioritising safeguarding when the alleged victim was an elected Member. It was accepted that enabling excluded Members to participate remotely presented the only viable option. However, it was suggested that practical arrangements could be determined on a case by case basis by individual Committees or Panels and that the Scrutiny Liaison Committee might also wish to consider this matter.

Having noted that the Policy had been updated to reflect the above, the Committee approved the same and requested that it be circulated to all States Members.

States
Members' data
protection
obligations.

A3. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. B4 of 10th November 2025, received a report in connexion with States Members' data protection obligations.

The Committee recalled that it had recently received Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade, who had addressed the Committee on a number of matters, to include States Members' data protection obligations. The Deputy had expressed dissatisfaction with the information provided in this connexion during the States Members' induction. She had also suggested that a generic/common data protection notice should be devised for use by States Members. This approach was consistent with work being undertaken by the States Greffe Constituency Support Team.

The Committee recalled that elected Members were required to register in their own right as data controllers with the Office of the Information Commissioner, with the States Greffe being able to do this on their behalf if required. It was noted that work was underway in relation to the production of a generic privacy statement that could be used by elected Members and a consent form for use by Members who were acting on behalf of constituents. The Committee was reminded that the States Greffe also supported Members with their responsibilities in relation to subject access requests.

Finally, the Committee noted that, following the 2026 public election, the induction programme for States Members would include clear information in relation to data protection obligations and the support which could be provided by the States Greffe.

The Committee requested that Deputy Scott be made aware of the work being undertaken by the States Greffe in connexion with States Members' data protection obligations.

Negotiating for
better success
in politics
programme.

A4. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A5 of 11th November 2024, of the Committee as previously constituted, considered a report which had been prepared by Mr Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support in connexion with the 'Negotiating for better success in politics' programme, a bespoke professional training programme for States Members which had been developed and delivered by the Resolution Centre.

The Committee recalled that the programme, which had been designed in conjunction with Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh, comprised 10 sessions, and additional catch-up sessions. 27 Members had enrolled on the programme and 9 had been awarded a Certificate of Achievement for attending the main sessions during 2023/24. Overall feedback from Members on the content of the programme had been positive.

Although it had not been possible to run the programme in its entirety again during 2025, Members who had not previously participated had been invited to attend a condensed tutor led programme in 2025. A practical peer-driven pathway for Members who had participated in 2023/24 had also been offered and 6 Members had initially signed up for this, with one Member later withdrawing. Feedback on the 2025 programme would be included in the 2026 Members' survey.

The Committee noted that the total cost of designing and delivering the programme was £38,400. Following the public election in 2026, States Members would be offered the opportunity to participate in the 2027 programme.

The Committee noted the position and agreed that the training programme had been most beneficial and represented good value for money.

On a related matter, Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair suggested that consideration be given to the allocation of funding from the States Assembly budget for Members who wished to undertake a degree level qualification in a relevant subject or consider postgraduate study options. The Greffier of the States advised that, whilst the benefits of continuous professional development were well recognised, it would not be appropriate to fund degree or postgraduate studies from the States Assembly budget. However, the Committee was reminded of the wide range of training opportunities offered by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Hansard/
transcripts of
Scrutiny
Hearings:
improved
search
functionality
on States
Assembly
website.

A5. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A2 of 6th October 2025, received an oral report from Ms. J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement in connexion with options for improving the search functionality associated with Hansard and transcripts of Scrutiny Hearings on the States Assembly website.

The Committee recalled that it had considered the results of a survey designed to gauge the opinion of Members in relation to Hansard in its current format and had noted a general dissatisfaction with the existing search functionality and a desire for improvements. Some Members preferred to use a new website known as digitalStates.je, which had been developed by Deputy A.F. Curtis of St. Clement. It was understood that digitalStates.je aimed to improve accessibility and included transcripts of States meetings with enhanced search functionality and breakdowns of Members' contributions. The Committee had also noted requests for a more user friendly format for mobile devices; breaking up speeches for easier reading and linking speeches and subjects to individual Members.

The Committee noted that the cost of providing an automated transcript of States Meetings with enhanced search functionality was estimated at approximately £30,000. This involved using artificial intelligence to transcribe parliamentary sessions from audio to text. However, 100 per cent accuracy could not be guaranteed and a disclaimer would be required (as was the case on digitalStates.je).

The Committee recognised the importance of the provision of an accurate and publicly accessible record of parliamentary debates and proceedings in the context of democracy and accountability. Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter advised that she did not support the provision of another automated version of the official record at additional cost and suggested that the automated transcript on digitalStates.je could be linked to the States Assembly website. However, some technical challenges were noted in this regard. Deputy T.A Coles of St. Helier Central asked why a searchable version of the original (and official) Hansard report, which was quality assured by the States Greffe, could not be uploaded to the States

Assembly website, as opposed to creating an automated version at additional cost. The Committee agreed that, in the first instance, this option should be explored and Members requested an update at the next scheduled meeting.

On a related matter, Deputy Coles noted that transcripts of Scrutiny Hearings sometimes contained inaccuracies, with comments often being wrongly attributed. The Greffier of the States undertook to ensure that transcripts were quality assured in future.

Management
of electronic
mail messages
to all States
Members.

A6. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A7 of 16th June 2025, of the Committee as previously constituted, received an oral report from Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade in connexion with the position of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee in relation to the process for managing correspondence addressed to all States Members.

Members were advised that the previous Committee had received correspondence dated 11th June 2025, from Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade regarding the above matter. 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.

As the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey were effectively the rules and procedures which governed the States Assembly and its Committees and Panels, the previous Committee considered it inappropriate to establish a Standing Order which related specifically to the management and receipt of electronic mail messages from members of the public. However, the Committee had been minded to support the development of a set procedure for the management of such matters in the form of guidance. In the first instance, it had decided to consult the Council of Ministers and the Scrutiny Liaison Committee (SLC).

The Committee noted that a written response from the Chief Minister had been received on 22nd July 2025, in which reference had been made to internal guidance which had been developed for use by Executive Members on the matter. Whilst the Chief Minister supported the development of guidance for all Members, he cautioned against being overly prescriptive, with particular reference to the suggestion that a failure to respond could constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct, as suggested by Deputy Scott. The establishment of a new Standing Order was not supported on the basis that this was considered overly bureaucratic.

Deputy Tadier advised that the matter had recently been considered by the SLC, with

concerns being expressed about duplication and inefficiencies when correspondence was received by all States Members. Deputy Tadier suggested that a form of words be devised for inclusion on the website which encouraged members of the public to contact constituency representatives in the first instance. Other Members suggested groupings such as, all Ministers/all Connétables/all Senators (after the 2026 public election). The Committee noted that some changes had already been made to the States Assembly website and that Members' individual contact details were now listed ahead of the option to contact all States Members. It was anticipated that this would result in a more targeted approach.

The Committee requested that further consideration be given to the manner in which Members contact details were presented on the States Assembly website, to include consideration of groupings, as detailed above, and more compelling messaging which focussed attention on the importance of targeted communication.

Role profiles
for elected
Members:
Machinery of
Government
Sub-
Committee.

A7. The Committee considered a document entitled 'Role Profiles for States Members', which had recently been approved by the Machinery of Government Sub-Committee and heard from Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South in his capacity as the Chair of the Sub-Committee in this connexion.

It was recalled that the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel (CSSP) had made recommendations concerning role profiles for States Members as part of a 2022 review. Separately, the Privileges and Procedures Committee and its Machinery of Government Sub-Committee had considered further developing role profiles as a useful induction tool for all States Members after the 2026 election. These profiles were intended to provide clarity on participation within the political system and develop a greater understanding of the roles and responsibilities of Members.

The Committee discussed the role profiles document and noted the view of Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair that, whilst the level of information contained therein provided a good overview of roles for prospective election candidates, new Members would require a greater level of detail to inform decisions. Deputy Coles advised that the information provided sought to strike a balance between an overly concise summary and a granular level of detail. The Greffier of the States reminded the Committee that Government would also provide information for new Members on roles within the executive. Deputy Coles suggested that consideration could also be given to the publication of elements of the States Members' handbook.

The Committee endorsed a recommendation from Deputy Alves that the role profiles document be circulated to the Diversity Forum and the Political Awareness and Education Sub-Committees for comment.

Standing Order
106:
declarations of
interest - draft
guidance.

A8. The Committee considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with draft guidance in relation to Standing Order 106, which related to declarations of interest.

The Committee recalled that Standing Order 106 required Members to declare an interest at the earliest opportunity and state the nature of that interest. The Standing Order applied in the States Assembly and in meetings of Committees and Panels established in accordance with Standing Orders. It was recalled that Members were required to declare certain interests in a register which was held by the States Greffe.

The Committee considered the draft guidance, which had been developed primarily for use by the Bailiff, and noted that it included examples of interests which Members were not required to declare, such as being in receipt of a State pension.

The guidance also set out the point in proceedings at which interests should be declared. Members were advised that in most circumstances a declaration of interest did not preclude a Member from voting. However, where there was a pecuniary interest or an interest which affected a Member or a Member and a ‘small number of other people’ (no more than 100 people in the Jersey context), they should withdraw from voting.

The Committee agreed that when the guidance had been approved by the Bailiff it should be presented to the States.

Standing Order
21AA:
suspension of
elected
Members.

A9. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A12 of 10th October 2025, considered a report prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with amendments to Standing Orders which related to the suspension of elected Members.

The Committee recalled that it had recently requested a review of the existing procedural context associated with the suspension of elected Members and had expressed support for an automatic suspension provision in situations where an elected Member was charged with an offence which would attract a sentence of 3 months or more. In such cases the Committee would lodge a proposition (which would be debated ‘in camera’) to suspend the Member as a neutral act. In this connexion the Committee approved a draft amendment to Standing Order 21AA as detailed in the Deputy Greffier’s report.

The Committee had also agreed that the current arrangement whereby a Member who received a suspended sentence was not disqualified was unsatisfactory and it was noted that amendments to the States of Jersey Law 2005 and the Connétables (Jersey) Law 2008 would be required to address this.

On a related matter, the Committee recalled that it had recently presented a comment in response to P.101/2025 – Breaches of the Code of Conduct – review of Standing Orders, which had been lodged ‘au Greffe’ by Deputy R.S. Kovacs of St. Saviour and adopted by the States Assembly. The aforementioned proposition requested the Committee to review Standing Orders in relation to breaches of the Code of Conduct, to include consideration of disqualification mechanisms and varying lengths of suspension (paid and unpaid); and present a report to the States no later than 31st December 2026 with its findings and recommendations.

The Committee discussed the challenges associated with disqualification mechanisms and the potential for politicisation/abuse of process. Concerns around the triggers for recall and fairness and legitimacy in the context of recall elections were also raised. The Committee recognised that further consideration would need to be given to the matter and was also mindful of an amendment to the proposition which had been lodged ‘au Greffe’ by Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade which sought to ensure that the review encompassed all Standing Orders which related to breaches of the Code of Conduct, to include disqualification mechanisms.

States
Members’ data
protection
obligations:
Deputy M.R.
Scott of St.
Brelade.

A10. The Committee received Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade and Ms. E. Blampied, Senior Policy Officer, Department for the Economy in connexion with matters pertaining to cyber security.

Deputy Scott advised the Committee that the Cyber Security Policy Framework for 2025 – 2040 had recently been presented to the States (R.168/2025) with a foreword from the Deputy in her capacity as Assistant Minister for Sustainable Economic Development.

The Committee noted that the Framework identified the unique challenges faced by Jersey in the context of cyber resilience and the cultural shift required to deliver on the policy ambitions. The Committee was advised that the Framework sought to empower Islanders and businesses to thrive in a safe and trusted digital environment; support a resilient digital ecosystem; reduce the impact of cybercrime on Islanders and build on opportunities in cyber security which supported economic growth.

Deputy Scott suggested that elected Members should be required to undertake compulsory cyber security training and sign up to specific cyber security protocols ahead of accessing sensitive Government and parliamentary information systems. The Greffier of the States advised that discussions with the Chief Information Officer in relation to States Members' IT provision and cyber security training as part of the new Members' induction programme were ongoing and she undertook to raise the matter in this context. Deputy Scott also suggested that cyber security should be prioritised as part of the States Members' induction and that an obligation to follow cyber security protocols should be included within the Code of Conduct.

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

P.70/2025 –
Proposed
Budget
(Government
Plan) 2026 -
2029: 34th
amendment -
Comité des
Connétables.

A11. The Committee considered a draft comment which had been prepared in response to an amendment to the Government Plan which had been lodged "au Greffe" by the Comité des Connétables (34th amendment) which sought to remove £130,000 from the States Assembly budget to cover additional expenditure arising from the Sunday election on 7th June 2026.

The Committee noted that whilst the report which accompanied the proposition recognised that the Judicial Greffe budget covered the cost of elections in accordance with the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002, the amendment sought to remove funds from the States Assembly budget.

The Committee was advised that, in accordance with Article 15 of the Law, a total of £57,000 had been set aside by the Judicial Greffe for the establishment of polling stations at the 2026 public election. There was no record of the Comité having expressed concerns with regard to the adequacy of this sum or requests for additional funding. Reference had been made to staff over-time costs, hospitality/refreshments and the hire of premises but no calculations had been provided. The Committee noted that overtime was not paid to States Greffe staff who worked additional hours in the lead up to the election and over the election weekend itself. Time was recouped in accordance with the Department's flexible working policy. The Committee noted that there had been no engagement prior to the amendment being lodged in the context of the impact of the Sunday election on the States Assembly budget.

On a related matter, the Committee noted that delays had occurred in respect of the Automatic Voter Registration project due to the fact that testing had not been completed by the Electoral Administrators (Parish Secretaries). It was noted that Deputy C.S. Alves of St. Helier Central was due to attend the next Project Board meeting when it would be emphasised that testing by Electoral Administrators was crucial to the success of the project.

The Committee approved the comment and requested that it be presented to the States.

Common-

A12. The Committee received an oral report from the Greffier of the States in

wealth
Parliamentary
Association
Gender
Sensitive
Parliament
Self-
Assessment
Jersey report:
provision of
family room
within the
States
Building.

connexion with the recommendations arising from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) Gender Sensitive Parliament Self-Assessment Jersey report (the CPA report).

The Committee recalled that Recommendation No. 9 of the aforementioned report related to the establishment of a designated family room for Members and their dependants which was equipped to meet caregiving needs.

The Greffier advised that she had recently been invited to attend a meeting of the Diversity Forum Sub-Committee to discuss the implementation of certain recommendations arising from the report, to include the provision of a family room. It had been agreed that the Mary Newcombe room, which was currently used by the Digital and Public Engagement (DPE) Team for media related activities, should be re-purposed for use as an informal meeting room/family room. Whilst Members could leave children unattended in the family room, they would be solely responsible for their care, safety and welfare. DPE activities would be relocated to another room within the States Building. The Committee noted that Members would be advised when the new family room was ready for use.

The Greffier advised the Committee that the CPA report also recommended a review of security provisions within the States Building. It was acknowledged that current security levels and access controls within the parliamentary estate were unlikely to meet accepted standards and that airport-style security access arrangements could be recommended. It was recognised that the creation of a designated family room for Members' dependants within the States Building could be identified as a potential security risk and might give rise to safeguarding concerns, with particular reference to unaccompanied minors.

Deputy T.A. Coles of St. Helier South suggested that Members might also be able to use the new DPE media room for press interviews and the Greffier undertook to report back on this matter.

Forthcoming
business.

A13. The Committee noted the propositions which had been lodged 'au Greffe' for forthcoming meetings of the States Assembly.

Action list:
Privileges and
Procedures
Committee.

A14. The Committee noted the actions and outcomes arising from previous meetings.

Minutes and
action lists:
Privileges and
Procedures
Sub-
Committees.

A15. The Committee noted the Minutes of the meetings of the various Sub-Committees of the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the actions and outcomes arising from the same.