WRITTEN QUESTION TO THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL SECURITY
BY CONNÉTABLE OF ST. HELIER
QUESTION SUBMITTED ON MONDAY 16th NOVEMBER 2026
ANSWER TO BE TABLED ON MONDAY 23rd NOVEMBER 2026

Question

"Further to her responses to Written Question 130/2026 and Written Question 193/2026, in relation to the review of the Long-Term Care scheme, will the Minister –

(a) explain why the review excluded analysis of care fees, despite assurances that it would analyse all matters identified in parts (a) to (d) of Written Question 130/2026, including residential care fees and provider charging;
(b) advise which matters were fully examined, partially examined or excluded, and provide the findings and recommendations concerning alternative care models, property bond arrangements and the £419,000 asset disregard;
(c) detail the evidence used to assess whether standard benefit rates adequately reflect actual care costs and the extent of additional costs borne by claimants; and
(d) state the publication date for the review and supporting evidence, and whether these will be available before the States Assembly debates the proposed contribution increases?"

Answer

(a) The review assessed the financial position of the Long-Term Care (LTC) scheme. To clarify the assurance given in Written Question 130/2026: the review considered the scheme's operation and expenditure pressures but did not analyse residential care fees or provider charging as these do not affect the costs incurred by the LTC scheme. The scheme provides benefits based on standard rates; it does not set market prices or guarantee to meet providers' charges in full.

(b) The elements that make up the LTC scheme were examined in detail. The review was not intended to review the extent of additional costs borne by claimants, and this was not reviewed.

(c) Administrative data on claimant numbers and assessed care needs informed the analysis of expenditure pressures. As stated in Written Question 193/2026, the Department does not hold provider fee records. The review therefore provides no assessment of whether standard benefit rates reflect actual charges or of the additional costs borne by claimants. Where charges exceed those rates, claimants meet the difference. The review was not intended to review the extent of additional costs borne by claimants, and this was not reviewed.

(d) The publication date has not yet been set. The report will be published before the States Assembly debates the proposed contribution increases.