STATES OF JERSEY

PROPOSED BUDGET 2027-2030 (P.73/2026): TWELFTH AMENDMENT

JERSEY CARE COMMISSION FUNDING

Lodged au Greffe on 24th November 2026
by the Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel
Earliest date for debate: 8th December 2026

STATES GREFFE

PROPOSED BUDGET 2027-2030 (P.73/2026): TWELFTH AMENDMENT

1 PAGE 1, PARAGRAPH (c) –

After the words "Summary Table 3 of the Report" insert the words –

", except that, in Summary Table 3, the head of expenditure for the Cabinet Office should be increased by £84,000 for 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030, such additional funding to be allocated to the Jersey Care Commission".

CORPORATE SERVICES SCRUTINY PANEL

Note: After this amendment, the proposition would read as follows –

THE STATES are asked to decide whether they are of opinion –

to receive the Budget 2027 – 2030 specified in Article 9(1) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019 (the Law) and specifically –

(a) to approve the estimate of total States income to be paid into the General Revenue Fund in 2027 as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 1 to the Report, which is inclusive of the proposed taxation and impôts duties changes outlined in the Budget, in line with Article 9(2)(a) of the Law;

(b) to approve the estimate of total States income to be paid into the Jersey Capital Investment Fund in 2027 as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 2 to the Report, which is inclusive of the proposed taxation and impôts duties changes outlined in the Budget, in line with Article 9(2)(b) of the Law;

(c) to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from the General Revenue Fund for 2027, for each head of expenditure, being gross expenditure less estimated income (if any), in line with Articles 9(2)(c), 10(1) and 10(2) of the Law, and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 3 of the Report", except that, in Summary Table 3, the head of expenditure for the Cabinet Office should be increased by £84,000 for 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030, such additional funding to be allocated to the Jersey Care Commission".

(d) to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from the Jersey Capital Investment Fund for 2027, for each head of expenditure, being gross expenditure less estimated income (if any), in line with Articles 9(2)(d), 10(1) and 10(2) of the Law, and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Tables 4 and 5 of the Report;

(e) to approve the transfers from one States fund to another for 2027 of up to and including the amounts set in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 6 in line with Article 9(2)(e) of the Law;

(f) to approve the proposed Changes to Approval for financing/borrowing for 2027, as shown in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 7 to the Report, which may be obtained by the Minister for Treasury and Resources, as and when required, in line with Article 9 (2)(f) of the Law, of up to those revised approval amounts;

(g) to approve for each project that is to be started in 2027 and that has not previously been set out in an approved Budget, the total cost of each such project, in line with Article 9(2)(g), and (h) of the Law and as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 8 to the Report;

(h) to approve any amendments to the proposed total cost for each project that has previously been approved in a Budget, in line with Article 9(2)(i) of the Law and as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 8 to the Report;

(i) to approve the estimated income, being estimated gross income less expenditure, that each States trading operation will pay into its trading fund in 2027 in line with Article 9(2)(j) of the Law and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 9 to the Report;

(j) to approve the proposed amount to be appropriated from each States trading operation's trading fund for 2027 for each head of expenditure in line with Article 9(2)(k) of the Law and set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 10 to the Report;

(k) to approve the estimated income and expenditure proposals for the Climate Emergency Fund for 2027, in line with the terms of reference for the Fund in Government Plan 2020 - 2023 as set out in Appendix 2 – Summary Table 11 to the Report; and

(l) to approve, in accordance with Article 9(1) of the Law, the Budget 2027-2030, as set out in the Appendix to the accompanying Report.

REPORT

Purpose of the Amendment

The Corporate Services Scrutiny Panel's ("the Panel") Amendment to the Proposed Budget 2027-2030 (the "Proposed Budget") seeks to ensure that adequate funding is available to the Jersey Care Commission ("the Commission") to fulfil its requirements under the Regulation of Care (Jersey) Law 2014 (the "Law"). The effect of this Amendment will therefore be to:

- Reinstate funds for the Commission, through the reallocation of £84,000 from the General Revenue Fund for 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030.
- Ensure that the Commissioner is adequately resourced and can fulfil its requirements under the Law.

The Amendment would reduce the General Revenue Fund by £84,000 for 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030. The Panel notes that the proposed reduction to the General Revenue Fund would not see the Fund in deficit.

Rationale for the Amendment

The Panel has decided to bring this Amendment to the Budget to ensure that the Commission is sufficiently resourced to fulfil its requirements under the Law. A submission from the Commission to the Panel states that the Commission has been requested by Government to make recurring savings of £84,000 from 2027, in addition to savings already made by the Commission.

Background and Context

The Commission is an independent statutory body established under Article 35 of the Law, which came into effect on 1 January 2019. Governed by a Board of Commissioners and supported by a professional inspection and regulatory team, the Commission is responsible for regulating and inspecting a wide range of health and social care services provided by the Government of Jersey, parishes, private providers and the voluntary sector. Its role is to provide assurance that services are safe, effective and of a high quality for both adults and children.

In addition to overseeing care services, the Commission undertakes a number of public protection functions, including the registration of health and social care professionals and the regulation of certain health-related activities. The Commission operates independently of Ministers and Government, enabling it to make impartial regulatory decisions, undertake inspections, and report on matters relating to health and social care without interference. The scope of its oversight continues to expand and includes new responsibilities in relation to the regulation and inspection of hospital services.

Funding Arrangements

The Panel notes that under Article 40(A) of the Law, the Minister for Planning and Regulation must:

> *"make an annual assessment of the funding required to ensure that the Commission is provided with the financial and administrative resources and other support, including staff, services, equipment and accommodation, necessary to enable the Commission to discharge its functions economically,*

effectively and efficiently in relation to regulated activities carried on by a Minister."

The Panel further notes that, before submitting an amount in respect of the Commission to the Council of Ministers under Article 10(1)(d) of the Public Finances (Jersey) Law 2019, the Minister must consult the Commission and consider its most recent strategic plan.

Submission from the Commission

In its submission to the Panel, the Commission outlined the discussions that have taken place regarding its allocations in the Budget. The Commission noted that the Strategic Plan for 2027 was submitted to their accountable officer and Minister on 14th September and made public on their website on 17th September 2026.

The Strategic Plan outlines the Commission's:

- strategic context;
- regulatory approach;
- priorities; and
- planned outcomes for 2027.
- The resources required to discharge its statutory functions under the Law.

In its Strategic Plan, the Commission stated that it did not consider that additional funding was required beyond the provision already identified within the Government of Jersey's current budget assumptions for 2027. The funding assumptions underpinning the Strategic Plan included Government funding of £1,693,000 for 2027, supplemented by expected fee income and funding associated with changes to professional registration.

The Commission had assessed that it would have sufficient resource to discharge its statutory functions and deliver the strategic priorities set out in the Strategic Plan during 2027, subject to the continuation of existing Government funding commitments. The Commission noted that this included the following provisions:

- provision for agreed pay awards;
- inflationary pressures; and
- funding associated with professional registration changes.

In its Strategic Plan, the Commission highlighted the more significant financial challenges for the sustainability of funding beyond 2027 as the regulatory responsibilities continued to grow and major inspection programmes entered periods of peak activity, which would require additional resource.

Reduction in Funding

On 24 September 2026 the Cabinet Office advised the Commission that its government funding would be reduced by £84,000 from 2027. The Panel understands that this was not identified during budget discussions or known before the Board approved and published their Strategic Plan. This was based upon funding levels discussed in their regular meetings with their accountable officer and the Government of Jersey finance team. Since becoming aware of the reduction, the Commission has begun considering the implications for its operating model, statutory responsibilities and service delivery.

The Panel learnt that the Commission has already delivered recurring savings of approximately £270,000 per annum, representing around 13.5% of its historic funding baseline, despite a significant expansion in its statutory remit and regulatory responsibilities.

The Panel understands that these savings have been achieved through careful financial management and targeted service redesign initiatives, including reducing the pharmacist role to 0.5 full-time equivalent and adopting a block-based approach to social care inspections. The Panel notes that these measures have enabled the Commission to protect frontline regulatory functions and maintain public assurance activities.

The Panel understands that the Commission now operates with a lean organisational structure and a small workforce, and that a substantial proportion of its remaining expenditure is either fixed in nature, required to support statutory infrastructure, or directly linked to the delivery of its regulatory responsibilities. The Panel learnt that the Commission has also commenced a number of redesign projects aimed at supporting its continued development as an effective, efficient and modern regulator.

Impacts on service delivery

The Panel was concerned to hear that the Commission is not in a position to provide assurance that a recurring cashable reduction of £84,000 from 2027 onwards could be achieved without affecting regulatory activity, organisational capacity or public assurance. The Commission advised that, having already delivered significant efficiencies and with limited discretionary expenditure remaining, further efficiency measures alone were unlikely to be sufficient to absorb the proposed reduction.

The Panel understands that savings of this size would be likely to require the reduction, deferral or cessation of certain activities, with potential consequences for the volume, frequency or scope of regulatory activity and for organisational resilience within what was already a lean operating model.

The Panel learnt that the Commission had commenced discussions with the Cabinet Office to consider how its existing statutory responsibilities and regulatory activities could be delivered within the proposed funding envelope. The Panel noted the Commission's view that maintaining current levels of regulatory oversight would be challenging if resources were reduced further.

Engagement with the Government of Jersey

The Panel understands that the Commission has engaged constructively with the Government on its role, functions and future operating arrangements.

In its submission, the Commission stated the following:

> *"A substantive resource reduction therefore calls for a shared understanding of priorities, expected outcomes and the regulatory activity that can reasonably be delivered within the available funding."*

The Commission has stated that it will continue to explore organisational efficiencies, while recognising that operational change alone is unlikely to deliver savings of this scale. The Commission has stated that it will work with the Cabinet Office to consider the following:

- whether any statutory activities should be reduced, deferred or discontinued;
- the resulting impact on regulatory assurance and oversight;
- whether legislative changes would be required;
- potential redesign of regulatory arrangements; and
- the level of organisation capacity required to discharge changes in statutory responsibilities.

The Panel is concerned to hear that the proposed reduction in funding means that the Commission will need to reassess whether it could discharge its statutory functions from 2027. The proposed reduction also follows substantial recurring efficiencies and comes at a time when the Commission is overseeing a broader range of services, several of which are experiencing increasing complexity, demand and workforce pressure. The Panel notes that the Commission is not in a position to provide assurance that a recurring, cashable reduction of £84,000 can be sustained without considering reducing regulatory activity.

Public Review Hearing with the Chief Minister:

During the Public Review Hearing with the Chief Minister on 16th October the Panel raised questions regarding the process for funding arm's length organisations ("ALOs"):

> ***Deputy C.J. Rebindaine:*** *Have any of these organisations expressed any concerns as to how 2027 is going to look for them?*
>
> ***Chief Executive Officer:*** *I have discussed it with the Chair of the Care Commission and Chief Executive of the Care Commission.* ***They have not said they cannot do it.*** *They said of course it will be a risk-based process, and we will continue to monitor on that quarterly basis.*

The Panel notes that the comments made by the Chief Executive Officer during the hearing differ from the evidence provided by the Jersey Care Commission. While the Chief Executive Officer stated that the Commission had not indicated that it would be unable to fulfil its functions and described the position as a *"risk-based process",* the Commission's submission stated that it was unable to provide assurance that a recurring reduction of £84,000 could be achieved without affecting regulatory activity, organisational capacity and public assurance.

The Panel is concerned by this inconsistency and notes that the Commission's assessment was based on a detailed review of its operational and statutory requirements. The Panel further notes that the Commission had already delivered recurring savings of approximately £270,000 per annum prior to the proposed reduction and had advised that limited opportunities remained for further efficiencies without impacting service delivery.

In the Panel's view, the evidence provided by the Commission raises concerns regarding its ability to maintain its current level of regulatory oversight and public assurance if the proposed reduction is implemented.

During the Panel's Quarterly Hearing with the Chief Minister on 18th September 2026, the Panel raised:

> ***The Chief Minister**: Reduce inward reporting and governance requirements, devolved decision-making and accept proportionate levels of … **changing our appetite to risk and regulation without compromising the safety of Islanders.***

The Panel highlights the Chief Minister's comments regarding the need to accept a *"changing appetite to risk and regulation without compromising the safety of Islanders"*. However, the Panel notes that the Jersey Care Commission has advised that the proposed funding reduction would affect its ability to maintain current regulatory activity, organisational capacity and public assurance.

The Panel notes that the Commission's concerns arise within the context of an expanding and increasingly complex statutory remit, including responsibility for the regulation of hospital, ambulance, mental health and assisted dying services. While the Panel recognises that it is the Government's objective to achieve efficiencies and maintaining 'proportionate' regulation, it is concerned that a reduction in resources may ultimately require the Commission to reduce, defer or cease regulatory activities, with potential implications for public assurance and the effective oversight of health and social care services in Jersey.

Public Hearing with the Minister for Planning and Regulation

During the Environment, Housing and Infrastructure ("EHI") Panel Budget Review Hearing, the Minister for Planning and Regulation was questioned on the potential impact of the proposed £84,000 reduction in funding for the Jersey Care Commission, particularly in light of the Commission's evidence that it could not provide assurance that the reduction could be achieved without affecting regulatory activity, organisational capacity or public assurance.

The Minister advised that the Commission's position was similar to that of other public bodies and regulators facing budgetary pressures, stating that while the Commission would like additional resources, it could continue to fulfil its core functions and would need to prioritise its activities accordingly. Referring to discussions with the Commission, the Minister stated that it could *"do what they need to do" but "not as much as they would like"*.

The EHI Panel noted that the Minister's assessment differed from the evidence provided by the Commission in their submission to the Panel, which indicated that it was unable to provide assurance that a recurring reduction in funding could be achieved without consequences for regulatory activity, organisational capacity or public assurance:

> ***The Minister for Planning and Regulation:** Again, exactly what we have said on regulation generally, we are satisfied that the statutory responsibilities can be done and that they can prioritise. They cannot do as much as they would like but they have indicated that they will get on and do it. **They have got additional responsibilities.** We have had a long discussion with them about how they are going to handle the work on the hospital, which was useful. … **They have got resources; they can do their job. They would like more.***

During the hearing, the EHI Panel highlighted evidence from the Commission's submission which stated that the proposed funding reduction would affect its ability to maintain current regulatory activity, organisational capacity and public assurance. Referring to the Commission's submission, Deputy Jeune suggested that the issue was

not simply one of limiting future activity, but whether the Commission could continue to deliver its existing responsibilities within the proposed funding.

In response, the Minister for Planning and Regulation maintained that the Commission's position was comparable to that of other public bodies and regulators facing financial pressures. The Minister stated that Government was required to prioritise spending and argued that independent regulators would similarly need to prioritise their activities. He advised that discussions with the Commission had taken place and that, based on the briefings received, the Commission would continue to undertake its regulatory functions, albeit within a more constrained funding environment.

When questioned on whether future reductions to the Commission's budget could be ruled out, the Assistant Minister for Planning and Regulation advised that no such commitment could be given. He explained that funding allocations across the public sector would be subject to ongoing review during the 2028-2030 budget period and that, while no further reductions were proposed, it would not be possible to guarantee that future savings measures would not be required.

Public Hearing with the Minister for Treasury and Resources

During the Public Review Hearing the Panel raised questions regarding the deduction in the funding of the Commission in the Proposed Budget:

> ***The Minister for Treasury and Resources:*** *As far as the budget itself is concerned, the Care Commission has a budget in excess of £2 million. I think it has been asked to make an efficiency saving, which is relatively small in comparison to the overall sum of the budget.*
>
> ***Deputy H.L. Jeune:*** *I think where this, and potentially could be examples for others, is that, and you alluded to the fact it was the last minute, being on a short timeframe, but the Care Commission really pointed out that they had already started the planning process and they had not been told that there would be this cut. We have heard from you that this is a 2026 Budget, so in a way it should be or should have been obvious that there potentially was this savings needed or this, as you have described it, a small savings, but if this had been known for some time maybe they should have been warned sooner.*
>
> ***The Minister for Treasury and Resources****: I think it is unfortunate from a timing point of view. I think they commented, if I remember correctly, that they were first made aware of the request in September, which is quite late; I accept that point. Again, when we move to multi-year Budgets, that if we get to that point I think it will be a lot easier for all organisations, particularly those receiving grants - and charitable organisations by the way also fall into that category – they will have a lot more certainty and visibility and will be able to consider what their long-term planning should and is going to be. So this was not ideal but it was a very short-term lead-in time.*

The Panel acknowledges the explanation that the late notification arose from the compressed timetable for the 2026 Budget process. However, the Panel considers that the significance of the issue extends beyond the monetary value of the saving itself. Evidence received from the Commission indicated that budget planning and work

programming had already commenced before the reduction was communicated, limiting its ability to plan effectively and adjust its activities accordingly.

The Panel further notes the Minister's acceptance that the timing was *"not ideal"* and that the Commission was first informed of the savings request in September. In the Panel's view, this demonstrates the importance of providing independent bodies with timely and predictable funding information to support robust financial planning.

Further, the Panel raised the pattern of increased responsibilities for independent bodies while also reducing their funding:

> ***Deputy H.L. Jeune:*** *Of course, there is that balance and the panel understands that there is a need for these efficiencies and savings that you are talking about, but how does the Treasury reconcile efficiency expectations while increasing regulatory and statutory responsibilities are placed on the independent bodies? So, like the Care Commission are saying that they have had increased responsibilities put on them at the same time being asked to do those efficiencies and savings. How does that balance work and how do you discuss that in a risk discussion really with the Council of Ministers and within the Treasury Department?*
>
> ***The Minister for Treasury and Resources:*** *I think one of the points around the regulation and oversight and such like, is making sure that it is proportionate. As a States Assembly and as a Government, we layer more and more on to organisations, on to businesses for that matter, in terms of regulatory oversight. I think we need to consider whether what is currently being asked is proportionate. I take the point about the Care Commission saying they are being asked to do more. I think we need to look very carefully at what is being asked. Is it proportionate? Do we actually need to be done that way? Could it be delivered more efficiently and so on and so forth? It is just really a basic reset. We cannot continue to add regulation on top of regulation that is not necessarily adding particular value, only cost. That is the case in some areas.*

The Panel acknowledges the Minister's view that regulatory requirements should remain proportionate and deliver value. However, the Panel is concerned that independent bodies may be expected to absorb additional responsibilities while simultaneously identifying savings, potentially placing pressure on their ability to discharge their statutory functions effectively.

Evidence from States Assembly

During the States Assembly sitting on Tuesday, 10th November 2026, Deputy Tadier asked an oral question of the Minister for Planning and Regulation regarding the Jersey Care Commission's reduction in budget (OQ.104/2026).

Deputy Tadier questioned whether the proposed reduction in funding for the Commission was sustainable given its expanded regulatory responsibilities. In response, the Minister stated that the Commission, alongside other Government departments and regulators, had been asked to deliver savings as part of wider fiscal measures. He explained the Government was in *"active discussions"* with the Commission to ensure it could continue to deliver its programme of work, including its new responsibilities.

Deputy Feltham questioned why assurance had not been obtained from the Commission regarding its ability to meet its statutory obligations before the Proposed Budget was agreed and published, particularly given that the Commission had already submitted its business plan to Government. In response, the Minister stated that discussions with the Commission formed part of the *"normal process"* and that he did not believe the proposed savings would have come as a "*huge surprise"*. Deputy Feltham subsequently raised concerns regarding the budget-setting process, referring to correspondence from the Commission to the Panel which suggested that its business planning had been undertaken before the funding reduction was proposed. In reply, the Minister acknowledged the concern and committed to reviewing *"what was followed this year and improvements we can make for future years"*. The Minister further recognised the importance of having the *"correct processes"* in place when determining funding for *"such an important regulatory body as the Care Commission"*, particularly in the context of a potential change to future longer-term budgets.

The Panel is concerned regarding the process followed, as the Panel notes that the requirements placed upon the Minister are set out in the Law, which provides that the Minister must consult the Commission and have regard to its most recent strategic plan. Based on the evidence received, the Panel is not persuaded that these requirements were fully satisfied during the budget-setting process. The Panel considers that adherence to the processes prescribed in law is essential to ensuring transparency and accountability.

The Panel's proposed Amendment aims to ensure that funding is available to the Commission from 2027 for the purposed of ensuring that it can fulfil its requirements under the Law, through increasing departmental expenditure for the Cabinet Office and reducing the General Revenue Fund to reinstate funds for the Commission.

Conclusion

The Panel acknowledges that the Government has requested savings and budget reductions across a wide range of Departments and sectors through the Proposed Budget. However, it does not consider that the Government's decision to propose this saving to the Commission, and the subsequent impact it will have on the Commissioner's areas of work, is in alignment with the aims of the Law.

The Panel believes that this Amendment is necessary to ensure that the Commission is adequately resourced to discharge its statutory functions under the Law. Evidence received by the Panel indicates that the Commission has already delivered significant efficiencies and is unable to provide assurance that a further recurring reduction of £84,000 can be achieved without affecting regulatory activity, organisational capacity or public assurance. The Amendment therefore seeks to reinstate the proposed funding reduction and support the Commission's ability to maintain effective and independent regulatory oversight of health and social care services in Jersey.

Financial and staffing implications

The Amendment aligns with the existing responsibilities of the Chief Minister to ensure that the Commission can obtain the resources required to discharge its statutory functions under the Law, and the Panel is of the view that the Amendment would not incur any staffing implications. The Amendment would reduce the General Revenue Fund by £84,000 for 2027, 2028, 2029 and 2030. The Panel notes that the proposed Budget, as detailed in Table 57, estimates a closing balance in the General Revenue

Fund of £5.813 million in 2027, rising to £15.830 million in 2028 and £20.928 million in both 2029 and 2030. The Panel therefore considers that the £84,000 reduction proposed by this Amendment would not prevent the General Revenue Fund from remaining in surplus over the Budget period.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

The Panel considers that this amendment has no direct or indirect impact on children and that the duty to have due regard to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child does not arise. Accordingly, a Children's Rights Impact Assessment is not required under the Children (Convention Rights) (Jersey) Law 2022.