STATES OF JERSEY

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

GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCIES

Lodged au Greffe on 19th November 2026
by Deputy M.B. Andrews of St Helier North
Earliest date for debate: 8th December 2026

STATES GREFFE

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

1 PAGE 3, PARAGRAPH (l) –

After the words "Appendix to the accompanying Report" insert the words -

", except that, on page 30 of the Report after the words "opportunities to reprioritize existing budgets." there should be inserted the following new sentence –

"In preparing the Proposed Budget 2028-2031, the Council of Ministers will aim to ensure that in each financial year covered by the Budget, the total value of recurrent savings proposals will be no less than the total value of revenue expenditure growth, unless the Council of Ministers states in the Budget Report that exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach."".

DEPUTY M.B. ANDREWS OF ST. HELIER NORTH

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 Tables 3 of the Report;

(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 except that, on page 30 of the Report after the words "opportunities to reprioritize existing budgets." there should be inserted the following new sentence –

"In preparing the Proposed Budget 2028-2031, the Council of Ministers will aim to ensure that in each financial year covered by the Budget, the total value of recurrent savings proposals will be no less than the total value of revenue expenditure growth, unless the Council of Ministers states in the Budget Report that exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.".

REPORT

I am lodging this budget amendment to ensure the total amount of savings proposed in Budget 2028 exceed the total growth allocation.

For the avoidance of doubt, I believe that it is important to provide a definition for the terminology as used within this report at the outset –

> ***Recurrent savings proposals*** *(referred to as "savings" in the report)*: measures identified in the Proposed Budget that reduce recurring expenditure and are assessed by the Council of Ministers as delivering a recurring cashable saving to the General Revenue Fund; the values of the recurrent savings proposals shall be those set out in the tables accompanying the Proposed Budget.
>
> ***Revenue expenditure growth proposals*** *(referred to as "growth allocations" in the report)*: proposals identified in the Proposed Budget supported by a business case that increases recurring expenditure from the General Revenue Fund; the values of the revenue growth proposals shall be those set out in the tables accompanying the Proposed Budget.

Given that some services are funded within the General Revenue Account via the withholding of the States Grant, the Council of Ministers must endeavour to secure extensive savings to improve public administration. Alongside this, and where possible, the Council of Ministers must consider tax rises to address the current funding imbalance within the General Revenue Account.

Should the Council of Ministers bring forward growth allocations then investments should be prioritised in productive capacity. If the total amount of growth allocations exceeds total savings, then we risk increasing the amount withheld from the States Grant. It also impacts the Council of Ministers ability to achieve surpluses in the General Revenue Account. To replenish the Stabilisation Fund and the Strategic Reserve, we require the General Revenue Account to operate consecutive surpluses to ensure transfers materialise.

As some States Members will be aware, across the last six government budgets, the States Assembly approved £334 million in growth allocations. Such increases in government expenditure have been exacerbated by funding day-to-day services via reserve drawdowns. Increasing recurring expenditure cannot continue otherwise tax rises will be necessary. As much as I appreciate the difficulties the new Council of Ministers face. The amendment lodged ensures that the Council of Ministers make a firm commitment to ensure the total amount of savings exceed the total growth allocation proposed in Budget 2028.

Financial and staffing implications

Government officers will undertake work to secure savings across government departments. The total amount of savings will exceed the number of growth allocations proposed for each year in the Government Budget. The calculation should exclude changes arising solely from inflation, changes in demand-led and formula-driven expenditure assumptions. Should savings be secured then the Council of Ministers could potentially reduce the amount withheld from the States Grant. Furthermore, the

amendment does not prohibit growth allocations; the report recommends that growth allocations are only proposed to increase productive capacity.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

I consider 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.