

STATES OF JERSEY



Jersey

DRAFT WATER LAW (JERSEY) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 202- (P.26/2026): AMENDMENT (P.26/2026 AMD.) – SECOND AMENDMENT

**Lodged au Greffe on 20th March 2026
by Deputy T.J.A. Binet of St. Saviour
Earliest date for debate: 14th July 2026**

STATES GREFFE

DRAFT WATER LAW (JERSEY) AMENDMENT REGULATIONS 202- (P.26/2026):
AMENDMENT (P.26/2026 AMD.) – SECOND AMENDMENT

PAGE 2, AMENDMENT –

In the Amendment, for the table substitute –

37.	Per and polyfluoroalkyl substances	10, from 31 October 2027	ng/l	<i>i</i>
-----	------------------------------------	--------------------------	------	----------

DEPUTY T.J.A. BINET OF ST. SAVIOUR

REPORT

I bring this Amendment to the Minister for Treasury and Resources' [Amendment to P.26/2026](#) in light of additional information that has come into my possession since January, when, as a member of the Water Quality Board, I voted in favour of a new 4 nanogram per litre (ng/l) statutory PFAS limit.

The information to which I refer concerns the fact that, deciding upon a new limit at this time could well mean committing to expenditure of anything between [£140m-£210m](#), before the results of trial work by Jersey Water can provide appropriate guidance on the most appropriate methods and equipment to employ.

It also involves making that extraordinary commitment, at a time of exceptional global instability, when international scientific guidance remains incomplete, including pending work by the World Health Organisation (WHO).

Introducing a 4 ng/l requirement at this stage risks locking Jersey into a costly and potentially suboptimal long-term pathway. At the same time, Jersey faces significant water resource pressures requiring investment.

In light of these two key issues, this amendment refines the Amendment to [P.26/2026](#) by removing the requirement to introduce a 4 nanogram per litre (ng/l) statutory PFAS limit completely and instead provides for the introduction of a single statutory limit of 10 ng/l from 31st October 2027, for the sum of four PFAS compounds.

As stated, while there is broad support for regulating PFAS and for the direction of travel towards lower concentrations over time, the evidence base, funding arrangements and delivery requirements are not yet sufficiently mature to justify committing to very low statutory standard at this time.

This amendment therefore supports a more measured, phased approach: introducing a statutory 10 ng/l limit from 31st October 2027, while allowing time for further scientific advice and developments, pilot trials, funding decisions and alignment with international guidance before any consideration of lower limits.

Prematurity of a 4 ng/l statutory limit

The introduction of a 4 ng/l limit at this stage would be premature. Key work streams have not yet concluded, including the work of the [Independent PFAS Scientific Advisory Panel](#), the [Hydrogeological PFAS Steering Group](#) and, importantly, Jersey Water's investigations and pilot trials. The findings of these workstreams will directly inform:

- the most appropriate treatment technologies for the Island's water sources;
- the scale, design and location of infrastructure required; and
- the most effective long-term approach to managing PFAS across the wider environment and water catchments.

Committing now to one of the lowest statutory standards in the world risks significant over, or mis, investment and also limits Jersey's ability to respond to emerging standards. Retaining a 10 ng/l limit from 31st October 2027 provides a clear regulatory signal without foreclosing future options.

Absence of World Health Organisation guidance on PFAS

The WHO is still developing its drinking water guidance on PFAS and has confirmed that it is [expanding and strengthening](#) its assessment of PFAS occurrence and human health risks. Final guideline values have not yet been published and are not expected until 2027 or possibly 2028.

WHO guidance carries significant international weight and often informs national regulatory standards. Proceeding now with a 4 ng/l requirement risks Jersey diverging from the eventual global evidence-base and potentially adopting a standard or regulation that is not aligned with final international guidance.

By contrast, a 10 ng/l limit from 31st October 2027 provides an appropriate interim position, allowing Jersey to benefit from future WHO guidance and further scientific advice, before considering any future reduction.

Financial risk and affordability

Jersey Water's analysis indicates that consistently achieving a 4 ng/l limit would require major new treatment infrastructure that does not currently exist in the Island. Early estimates place capital costs in the range of £140-£210 million, with ongoing operating costs predicted to be in excess of £1 million per year.

These costs:

- cannot be funded by Jersey Water alone;
- have not been fully appraised or agreed by Government; and
- could result in significant increases (with a possible doubling) in water bills for Islanders.

Introducing a 10 ng/l limit from 31st October 2027 is materially more achievable and reduces the immediate financial risk, while still delivering improved water quality. It also allows time for funding mechanisms and customer bill impacts to be properly assessed before further consideration of tighter limits.

Deliverability and timescales

Delivering infrastructure capable of consistently meeting a 4 ng/l standard would require extensive pilot trials, planning, procurement, construction and commissioning. [Evidence provided by Jersey Water to the Environment, Housing, and Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel](#) indicates that period of no less than seven years from enactment would be required.

A statutory requirement that cannot realistically be delivered risks:

- increased costs from compressed or reactive delivery;
- non-compliance through no fault of Jersey Water; and
- poor long-term outcomes for customers and the environment.

A 10 ng/l limit from 31st October 2027 represents a realistic and more deliverable milestone, while longer-term solutions are properly developed.

Water resources and long-term supply security

PFAS regulation cannot be considered in isolation. Jersey faces increasing pressure on its water resources due to climate change, limited storage capacity and rising demand. Without significant investment, projections show the Island could face [material daily water shortages of 8.6 million](#)

[litres in the coming decade in a severe drought](#), which is a third of the Island's current daily supply.

Critical investment is required in areas such as desalination capacity, water efficiency and leakage reduction, and future water resource option development, for example a new reservoir.

If investment is disproportionately directed towards meeting a low PFAS standard prematurely, not only will the cost of water to consumers rise, significantly, but there is a real risk that these essential projects will be delayed or made unaffordable.

Water quality standards will be meaningless if Jersey does not have enough water. This amendment ensures that PFAS regulation supports, rather than undermines, long-term water resilience.

Household treatment solutions

The proposal set out in Deputy Moore's Amendment report ([P.26/2026 Amd.Amd.](#)) would move responsibility for drinking water safety away from a regulated public system and onto individual households. This would undermine the principle that all Islanders should receive the same level of protection from risks to public health. A decentralised approach would make it difficult to provide consistent oversight, protection for customers or ensure that standards are maintained. It would also mean that both water quality and costs could differ significantly from one household to another.

The quality, effectiveness, and cost of these types of home based treatment solutions would also vary between properties, depending on the systems installed and how they are maintained. As a result, this approach would be likely to lead to variable levels of protection across the Island, which is neither equitable nor sustainable.

In addition, it would create a multitude of installation problems, given the nature of the work involved.

Review and report back to States Assembly

This amendment does not preclude consideration of lower PFAS limits in the future. Once Jersey Water's pilot trials are complete, relevant international guidance (including from WHO) has been published and the costs, funding arrangements and deliverability implications are properly understood, it is proposed that the future Minister for the Environment brings forward a report to the States Assembly setting out the evidence and options for any future revision of the statutory standard.

Conclusion

There is no disagreement about the importance of managing PFAS or protecting public health. Jersey's drinking water is currently safe, and the introduction of a statutory PFAS limit is a future proofing measure rather than a response to any issues with the quality of the current water supply. Addressing PFAS effectively requires a holistic, Island wide approach. Treatment of drinking water alone cannot be the sole solution. Long term protection of public health depends on preventing PFAS entering the environment and water catchments in the first place, alongside remediation where contamination already exists. This includes continued work on source control, land management, regulation of potential future sources.

Jersey Water has made it clear that it is taking reasonable and proportionate steps to minimise PFAS concentrations in drinking water, using existing operational controls alongside monitoring and the ongoing optimisation of treatment processes. That work is intended to continue regardless

of the statutory limit that is ultimately adopted and reflects the company's stated commitment to providing islanders with high quality, affordable drinking water.

This amendment to the amendment provides a balanced and proportionate approach. It preserves the ability for Government and the States Assembly to return to the question of tighter limits once Jersey Water's pilot trials and detailed feasibility assessments are complete and once final international guidance, including that of the World Health Organisation, has been published.

This approach ensures that future decisions on PFAS standards can be made on the basis of robust evidence, proven technical solutions and a clear understanding of costs and wider impacts.

It is a pragmatic refinement that protects Islanders from unaffordable water bill increases, supports evidence led policymaking and safeguards Jersey's long term water security.

Financial and staffing implications

This amendment seeks to ensure that the approach to implementing new PFAS limits is as cost-effective as possible for the Island. This amendment does not, in itself, give rise to any immediate requirement for major new capital investment or additional staffing. It maintains a statutory PFAS standard that is materially more achievable within existing operational and regulatory arrangements, while allowing time for the costs, funding options and wider implications of any future tightening of the standard to be properly assessed and considered by the States Assembly before further commitments are made.

Children's Rights Impact Assessment

The amendment has no direct or indirect impact on children. Accordingly, a Children's Rights Impact Assessment is not required under the [Children \(Conventions Rights\) \(Jersey\) Law 2022](#).