

# Animal Welfare & Control Review: Report

Environment, Housing & Infrastructure Scrutiny Panel

10th March 2026

S.R.7/2026



States of Jersey  
States Assembly



États de Jersey  
Assemblée des États

## Table of Contents

|                                                               |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Chair's Foreword .....</b>                                 | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Executive Summary .....</b>                                | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Key Findings and Recommendations .....</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                                     | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Part 1 – Animal Welfare.....</b>                           | <b>12</b> |
| Timeline & Development .....                                  | 12        |
| Consultation .....                                            | 12        |
| Framework & Objectives.....                                   | 12        |
| Scope and Definitions .....                                   | 13        |
| Offences Against Animals & Protection of Animal Welfare ..... | 14        |
| Enforcement & Powers .....                                    | 16        |
| Offences & Penalties .....                                    | 18        |
| Orders & Licensing .....                                      | 19        |
| Conclusion .....                                              | 22        |
| <b>Part 2 – Livestock .....</b>                               | <b>23</b> |
| Introduction .....                                            | 23        |
| Welfare Versus Control .....                                  | 23        |
| Straying Livestock.....                                       | 23        |
| Livestock Worrying.....                                       | 27        |
| Conclusion .....                                              | 31        |
| <b>Part 3 - Animal Control .....</b>                          | <b>32</b> |
| Introduction .....                                            | 32        |
| Legislative Framework .....                                   | 32        |
| Enforcement .....                                             | 34        |
| Conclusion.....                                               | 37        |
| <b>Part 4 - Public Education &amp; Awareness .....</b>        | <b>39</b> |
| Introduction .....                                            | 39        |
| Evidence .....                                                | 39        |
| Panel Commentary.....                                         | 40        |
| Conclusion .....                                              | 41        |
| <b>Conclusion .....</b>                                       | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Appendices .....</b>                                       | <b>43</b> |
| Panel Membership .....                                        | 43        |
| Terms of Reference .....                                      | 43        |

|                     |    |
|---------------------|----|
| Evidence.....       | 44 |
| Cost of Review..... | 44 |

## Chair’s Foreword

When legislation affects everyday life: farmers managing livestock, families walking their dogs, and inspectors responding to welfare concerns, it must be clear, proportionate and workable in practice.



The Panel examined the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law alongside the wider animal control framework and found strong support for modernising the Island’s outdated Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 2004.

The Draft Law introduces important preventative tools and stronger enforcement powers that will help reduce animal suffering and allow earlier intervention. That progress is welcome. However, stronger powers must be matched by stronger safeguards.

Evidence highlighted issues requiring attention: a short consultation period for legislation of this scale, uncertainty around shared responsibility for animals, broad Order-making powers that risk limiting democratic oversight, and confusion between enforcement agencies leading to mis-directed calls and unnecessary pressure on policing resources.

Reform must go beyond just passing a new law, it should clearly defined agency roles, accessible public guidance, proportionate livestock provisions and appropriate Assembly scrutiny where significant regulatory change is proposed. This is of particular importance where new licensing or regulatory requirements may affect local businesses. The Panel has therefore proposed amendments to strengthen safeguards in these areas.

Our recommendations are therefore practical and targeted. They aim to strengthen the Draft Animal Welfare Law, protect democratic oversight, propose wider government review and ensure implementation is fair, transparent and workable for farmers, small businesses, enforcement agencies and the wider public.

The Review also identified wider structural fragmentation across Jersey’s animal control framework. Multiple laws, inconsistent rules, dispersed responsibilities, limited data collection, unclear definitions and poor public signposting, make it harder for Islanders to understand their obligations and for enforcement bodies to act consistently. This undermines both compliance and public confidence.

Modernising the animal control provisions presents a significant opportunity to bring greater coherence and accountability to the overall system. Strengthening oversight, clarifying agency responsibilities, and improving public understanding are not minor technical adjustments; they are essential components of effective governance. The Panel has therefore set out a series of recommendations designed to deliver these improvements.

I thank all those who provided evidence including enforcement agencies, farming representatives, animal welfare organisations, the Comité des Connétables and members of the public. Their practical insight has shaped recommendations and amendments.

Reform is welcome, but it must be implemented carefully, transparently and fairly.

## Executive Summary

This Review has examined the Draft Animal Welfare Law, associated enforcement frameworks, and the wider system governing animal welfare, livestock protection and animal control in Jersey. The Panel found broad support for modernising the Island's animal welfare legislation but also identified significant gaps in clarity, proportionality, coordination and public understanding that must be addressed to ensure the new Law operates effectively and fairly.

Stakeholders strongly supported the principles of the Draft Animal Welfare Law, welcoming it as a long overdue update to outdated legislation. The Panel found the reforms in Parts 2 and 3 of the Draft Law introduce essential tools to prevent animal suffering, shift enforcement towards early intervention, and strengthen Jersey's ability to take proactive action. However, concerns were raised by stakeholders that the three-week consultation period was too brief.

Evidence also demonstrated that where an animal's care is shared, such as in professional settings or temporary arrangements, the legal responsibility as set out in Article 4 is not clearly understood. The Panel recommends that the Minister for the Environment publishes clear guidance explaining how responsibility is allocated in such scenarios.

The Draft Animal Welfare Law widens inspector powers and has been welcomed across enforcement bodies, particularly the ability for inspectors to act independently without police attendance. However, the States of Jersey Police highlighted a lack of internal protocols over which agency should take the lead in responding to different animal welfare incidents. The Panel found that this confusion exists not only within the agencies but to the wider public: mis-directed calls are common and place unnecessary strain on policing resources.

The Panel therefore recommends that, within one month of commencement of the new Law, the Minister for the Environment should issue formal internal guidance to the States Vet Office, the States of Jersey Police, and the Honorary Police defining lead-agency responsibilities, information-sharing expectations and contingency arrangements for inspector availability. The Panel also recommends that implementation of the new Law be supported by a coordinated public-awareness campaign to ensure the public clearly understands which agency to contact for different animal welfare and control matters.

The combined Order-making powers in the Draft Law are very broad and would enable extensive regulatory change without Scrutiny, consultation or Assembly debate. This includes Article 18, which currently allows the Minister to create licensing schemes for "any activity that requires a licence", far exceeding the intended application to commercial businesses. To ensure appropriate democratic oversight, the Panel recommends amending Article 18 so that such licensing schemes may only be introduced by Regulations rather than Ministerial Order.

The Review also found substantial stakeholder misunderstanding about the new offences relating to straying livestock. While the Draft Law introduces obligations for livestock keepers to immediately secure animals where straying has occurred and comply with improvement notices, some stakeholders feared these provisions could be applied disproportionately, particularly where keepers graze animals on land with boundaries they do not control. These concerns were compounded by the lack of any appeals mechanism for improvement notices, and so the Panel proposes an amendment to remove improvement notices relating specifically to fencing or boundary conditions and

recommends that the Minister issues operational guidance for enforcement officers for the wider provisions on straying livestock to be prepared in consultation with the farming community.

Separately, the Review found that Jersey's existing livestock worrying provisions are unclear, difficult to enforce and inadequate for protecting livestock, especially in conservation grazing areas. The Panel therefore proposed an amendment to the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 to widen the offence so that a dog not on a lead, or further than five metres from the person in charge, and present on agricultural land containing livestock, is deemed to be worrying livestock. If adopted, the Comité des Connétables should implement a coordinated public awareness campaign, including advising farmers and livestock owners to install signage in grazing areas.

The Panel also found that Jersey's animal control framework is fragmented across multiple laws, ministerial portfolios and policy instruments. There is no statutory definition of "proper control", and enforcement is largely informal, often resolved through words of advice. Evidence shows that most dog control issues arise from public confusion caused by inconsistent rules across public spaces, poor signage, and limited public understanding of where dogs must be kept on leads.

To modernise and simplify this area, the Panel recommends that the Comité des Connétables consider amending the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 to require that dogs be kept under "proper control" in all public places, with noncompliance constituting an offence subject to a Level 1 fine. The Panel further recommends establishing a shared reporting mechanism to capture animal related incidents across the parishes, including informal resolutions, to support future policy development.

The Panel also found that the animal control restrictions imposed by the Policing of Beaches (Jersey) Regulations 1959 during the summer months have environmental impacts, particularly on Sites of Special Interest, as identified within the Marine Spatial Plan. The Minister responsible for the Regulations advised that reform would not be appropriate without the support and engagement of the Comité des Connétables, which did not secure sufficient backing in 2024. While the Comité des Connétables now considers that public consultation on the Regulations would be appropriate the Panel considers that a holistic review of all Policing Regulations that contain animal control provisions should be undertaken. The Panel therefore recommends that the Comité and the relevant Ministers work together to carry out a comprehensive review, ensuring consistency across all regulatory instruments governing animal control.

A consistent theme throughout the Review was the absence of a single, accessible source of information for the public. The differing rules across parks, beaches, roads and private land creates confusion which is compounded by inadequate signage in many locations. Enforcement bodies stressed the need for clearer signposting so that the public knows who to contact when incidents occur. Accordingly, the Panel recommends that the Comité des Connétables and the Ministers responsible for the Policing Regulations develop comprehensive, collaborative guidance setting out dog control requirements across all public spaces.

## **Key Findings and Recommendations**

**FINDING:** Although the Draft Animal Welfare Law was developed over several years, the drafted legislative proposals were subject to only a three-week consultation period, which stakeholders considered too short and poorly timed.

**FINDING:** The principles of the Draft Animal Welfare Law represent a strongly supported and long-overdue modernisation of Jersey's animal welfare legislation.

**FINDING:** Evidence has shown that where responsibility for an animal is shared, the legal responsibilities in Article 4 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law may not be clearly understood in practice.

**FINDING:** The reforms contained in Parts 2 and 3 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law materially strengthen Jersey's animal welfare framework and provide the necessary tools to support a genuinely proactive approach to preventing animal suffering.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Minister for the Environment should publish public-facing guidance for how the legal responsibility of an animal is shared, particularly in professional or temporary care arrangements, within 3 months of the Draft Animal Welfare Law's commencement.

**FINDING:** The broadening of powers conferred to inspectors will allow for swifter, more targeted action in welfare incidents and is likely to reduce the need for police attendance where inspectors can now act independently.

**FINDING:** The States of Jersey Police welcomed the widened enforcement powers but believe that clearer arrangements for determining lead-agency responsibility in animal welfare incidents are needed.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Minister should publish internal guidance on agency responsibilities, information-sharing gateways, and contingency arrangements for out-of-hours inspector availability to the States Veterinary Office, the States of Jersey Police, and the Honorary Police under the new Animal Welfare Law, within one month of its commencement.

**FINDING:** The Draft Animal Welfare Law introduces a two-tier penalties framework that differentiates between minor and major offences, replacing the single-level penalty structure under the 2004 Law.

**FINDING:** The Draft Law increases the current maximum penalty of 12 months' imprisonment and a £10,000 fine to a potential 5-year sentence and higher fine, which the Minister acknowledged is "quite severe", but the Panel considers appropriate as maximum limits to be applied at the Court's discretion.

**FINDING:** The Order-making powers within the Draft Law are extremely broad, enabling significant elements of the regulatory framework to be created without consultation, Assembly debate or Scrutiny. The non-exhaustive list of proposed future Orders reinforces the open-ended nature of these powers.

**FINDING:** Article 18 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law grants the Minister the ability to create licensing schemes for "any activity that requires a licence," which, as drafted, is significantly broader than the stated policy intention for this to apply only to commercial businesses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** When introducing any new licensing schemes by Regulation under Article 18 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law, the Minister should ensure that all public communications and accompanying documentation are clear and consistent with the underlying policy intent.

**FINDING:** Livestock worrying is regulated under the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 as a matter of dog behaviour control and public safety. Livestock straying, by contrast, is treated as an animal welfare issue under the Draft Animal Welfare Law, which the Minister explained was due to the direct risk of harm to the animals themselves.

**FINDING:** The Draft Animal Welfare Law introduces new offences where livestock keepers fail to take immediate action to secure straying animals or fail to comply with an improvement notice relating to boundary conditions, which have been misunderstood by stakeholders.

**FINDING:** Stakeholders expressed strong concern that the new straying livestock offences in the Draft Animal Welfare Law are disproportionate to the realities of farming in Jersey.

**FINDING:** The Draft Animal Welfare Law places legal liability on the livestock keeper to comply with improvement notices relating to boundary deficiencies; however, in practice, responsibility for and control over boundary infrastructure typically lies with the landowner.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Minister for the Environment should ensure that operational guidance is provided to enforcement officers to support the implementation of Part 4 – Straying Livestock within three months of the Draft Animal Welfare Law’s enactment, and that this guidance is prepared in consultation with the farming community.

**FINDING:** Stakeholder and enforcement evidence demonstrates that the current legislative framework for livestock worrying is unclear, difficult to enforce and insufficient to protect livestock, particularly in conservation grazing settings.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Within 6 months of the Panel’s amendment to the Dogs Law being adopted, the Comité des Connétables should conduct a public awareness campaign of the amendment and should advise livestock owners to install signage in grazing areas to ensure dog-owners understand when dogs must be kept on a lead and the consequences of failing to do so.

**FINDING:** Animal control in Jersey is regulated through a range of independent legislative instruments and policy documents, which fall under the responsibility of three Ministerial portfolios and the Comité des Connétables.

**FINDING:** Jersey’s animal-control legislation provides neither a statutory definition of “proper control” nor practical guidance on how animals should be appropriately controlled in public spaces.

**FINDING:** Enforcement of animal control provisions is undertaken mostly by the Honorary Police, with the States of Jersey Police involvement contained to where criminal investigation is needed.

**FINDING:** Incidents of animal control are dealt with in the form of “*words of advice*” rather than formal enforcement, with Island animal-owners described as generally law-abiding and responsive to advice by the police.

**FINDING:** The statistics held by the States of Jersey Police do not provide a complete picture of animal-related incidents, as they do not include cases resolved informally by the Honorary Police.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Comité des Connétables should establish a shared reporting mechanism to capture all animal-related incidents attended to by the States of Jersey Police and Honorary Police, including those resolved informally, to support policy development and enforcement evaluation by June 2027.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Before the end of the next term, the Comité des Connétables should agree a definition of “proper control” and amend the Dogs Law 1961 to align with the animal control provisions within the Policing Regulations.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Before the end of the next term, the Comité des Connétables should amend the Dogs Law 1961 to require that a dog must be kept under “proper control” by its owner or person in charge at all times appropriate to the public place it is in, with failure to do so constituting an offence with a penalty not exceeding Level 1 on the standard scale.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Comité des Connétables, in partnership with the relevant Ministers, should undertake a coordinated review of the Policing of Roads, Parks and Beaches Regulations to identify any areas requiring further alignment across the wider animal-control framework.

**FINDING:** Dog-control issues largely arise from public confusion caused by inconsistent regulatory categories, unclear or insufficient signage, and a general lack of awareness about when and where dogs must be on leads.

**FINDING:** Public confusion and unclear responsibilities across and within the relevant agencies are causing mis-direction in the reporting and handling of animal welfare and control incidents.

**RECOMMENDATION:** A single, accessible source of guidance on dog-control requirements across all public spaces should be developed collaboratively by the Comité des Connétables and the Ministers responsible for the Policing Regulations and published by 31st December 2027.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Minister for the Environment should conduct a public awareness campaign for the implementation of the Draft Animal Welfare Law highlighting which authority to contact for different types of animal welfare and control incidents.

## Introduction

Animals form an integral part of civil life in Jersey. Whether as companions in our homes, as livestock central to our agricultural heritage, or as wildlife contributing to the Island's natural environment, animals play a vital role in the wellbeing, culture, and daily functioning of our community. Recognising this, Jersey has a long-standing and evolving commitment to protecting animal welfare and ensuring effective systems of care, management, and control.

This Review examines both animal welfare and animal control in Jersey, reflecting the interconnected nature of the Island's current legislative landscape. While the primary focus of the Review was the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202– ([P.97/2025](#)), this work also encompassed wider issues of animal control that emerged from the Panel's previous scrutiny of the Draft Dogs (Jersey) Law Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.63/2025](#)).

The Terms of Reference for the Review are appended to this report.

### **Draft Dogs (Jersey) Law Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.63/2025](#))**

Between August and October 2025, the Panel received stakeholder correspondence and conducted two public hearings with the Comité des Connétables on the Draft Dogs (Jersey) Law Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.63/2025](#)).

The Panel produced three Comments which identified structural issues within the animal-related legislative framework. In its Third Comments to P.63/2025 ([P.63/2025.Com.3](#)), the Panel found that:

*“Finally, the Panel's scrutiny of the Proposition...has highlighted that the current legislative framework governing dogs and wider animal-related matters is fragmented and lacks cohesion. The Panel will therefore be undertaking a wider review, as part of its scrutiny of the forthcoming Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202–, to examine dog-related provisions across all relevant legislation.”*

This finding directly informed the Panel's decision to review animal welfare and animal control in tandem.

### **Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202–**

The Panel conducted an in-depth review of how the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202- proposes to remedy the current legislative and enforcement gaps posed by the current [Animal Welfare \(Jersey\) Law 2004](#).

The Panel received a preliminary briefing in July 2025 with the States Vet Office. The Panel then launched its Review on 4th December 2025 and wrote to a number of key stakeholders to request written submissions. In total, 13 written submissions were received and included responses from local dog-walkers and groomers, the Jersey Society for the Protection and Care of Animals, the Jersey Farmers' Union and the Jersey Milk Marketing Board.

The Panel also met with the Chief States Veterinary Officer on 8th January 2026 to explore how the current Animal Welfare Law 2004 operates in practice.

The principle debate on the Draft Law taking place on 21st January 2026, wherein the Principles were adopted, with the support of the Panel who subsequently called in the proposition.

The Panel then held two public hearings on 29th January 2026, one with the Minister, States Veterinary Office and Natural Environment Officers (the 'Ministerial Public Hearing') and one with the States of Jersey Police and the Comité des Chef de Police as the representative body of the Honorary Police Force specifically on the enforcement of the animal related legislation and regulations (the 'Enforcement Public Hearing').

The Panel sent a number of letters to the Minister for the Environment, Minister for Infrastructure, Comité des Connétables, and Minister for Sustainable Economic Development.

The full contents of the evidence considered in this Review are appended to the report.

### **Structure of the report**

The structure of this Report reflects the review Terms of Reference and has been split into four parts Animal Welfare, Livestock, Animal Control, and Public Education & Awareness.

Each part contains a number of chapters that draws on the evidence collected, provides Panel commentary and identifies opportunities for improvement through suggested recommendations and proposed amendments. The report concludes by summarising the Panel's key findings and highlighting the main messages to inform future consideration and action.

# Part 1 – Animal Welfare

## Timeline & Development

The Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202- ([P.97/2025](#)) (the ‘Draft Law’) was lodged by the Minister for the Environment on 29th October 2025, which will replace the current Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 2004 (the ‘2004 Law’).

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Minister and Chief States Veterinary Officer (‘Chief States Vet’) explained that the Draft Law had been in development for a considerable period, with sustained work taking place over two years and the initial review commencing approximately five years earlier, though progress was intermittently delayed due to limited departmental capacity and competing priorities, including work associated with the UK’s exit from the EU.<sup>1</sup>

## Consultation

The Panel understands that a three-week consultation was conducted on the draft proposals in the summer of 2025. The Panel received submissions from stakeholders noting dissatisfaction with the consultation process as being too short and held at a particularly busy period for farmers.<sup>2</sup>

The Panel raised these concerns with the Minister during the Ministerial Public Hearing. The Minister acknowledged that, in hindsight, the three-week consultation period may have been too short and apologised for this. However, the Chief States Vet clarified that they had contacted more than 90 stakeholders as part of the process but noted that a significant number did not respond.<sup>3</sup>

**FINDING: Although the Draft Animal Welfare Law was developed over several years, the drafted legislative proposals were subject to only a three-week consultation period, which stakeholders considered too short and poorly timed.**

## Framework & Objectives

Since lodging the Draft Law, the Minister has consistently stated that its objective is to modernise and strengthen Jersey’s animal welfare framework by updating outdated legislation, enhancing preventative enforcement powers, and aligning local standards with current UK and international best practice.<sup>4</sup>

The Panel understands that the Draft Law seeks to achieve this by broadening the enforcement powers available to inspectors and police officers, introducing an “Improvement Notices” scheme, replacing the current offences against animals in the 2004 Law with a more comprehensive set of offences, and creating a new statutory duty of. These will be considered in turn in the chapters below.

Most of the written submissions received by the Panel expressed general support for replacing the 2004 Law. The Barkley Club noted: <sup>5</sup>

*“We believe the Draft Law has the potential to significantly improve animal welfare outcomes across the Island”.*

Spotted Wellies commented:<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pgs. 7-8

<sup>2</sup> [2026-01-16-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Reserve.pdf](#) & [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>3</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 5

<sup>4</sup> [2026-01-12-Letter-Response-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Principles-of-the-Draft-La.pdf](#)

<sup>5</sup> [2026-01-12-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Barkley-Club.pdf](#)

<sup>6</sup> [2026-01-11-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Spotted-Wellies.pdf](#)

*“the intention behind the Draft Law is a good one”.*

The Jersey Canine Academy added:<sup>7</sup>

*“Updating the existing legislation is necessary and the focus on reducing suffering is welcome.”*

When questioned about the objectives and overall framework of the Draft Law, the Minister stated:<sup>8</sup>

*“It is important that we put ourselves on a par with the U.K., E.U., wider communities... it is 22 years since this law has been looked at and it really is time for a bit of a catch up.”*

**FINDING: The principles of the Draft Animal Welfare Law represent a strongly supported and long-overdue modernisation of Jersey’s animal welfare legislation.**

### Scope and Definitions

Article 2 of the Draft Law sets out the “meaning of animal” to describe which types of animals are within the scope of the Law and which aren’t.

The Draft Law makes several minor refinements to the meaning of animal, the most significant of which being the ability for its scope to be extended by Ministerial Order to animals living wild in Jersey and to additional species to be brought under the Law where scientific evidence demonstrates that they can experience pain or suffering. During the Ministerial Public Hearing, Officers noted that this flexibility reflects modern expectations of contemporary animal welfare legislation.<sup>9</sup>

Article 4 defines who is responsible for animals to which the Law applies. It states that the owner of the animal is always responsible. A person who is “in charge” either temporarily or permanently also holds responsibility. If the owner is a child, their parent/guardian holds the legal responsibility.

The Panel received concern from stakeholders who noted that Article 4 was unclear on who holds responsibility for an animal and therefore would be liable under the Draft Law in settings where temporary care is being provided.<sup>10</sup> The Barkley Club’s submission reinforced this concern and questioned how responsibility would be applied in practice between business owners, supervisors and frontline staff.<sup>11</sup>

During the Ministerial Hearing, the Chief States Vet confirmed that issues had arisen during consultation on the definition of ownership particularly from the farming community. The Minister stated that he intended to continue discussions with stakeholders to explore whether wording could be refined to better reflect complex real-world arrangements of ownership and care.<sup>12</sup>

However, after the hearing, the Panel was informed that the Minister does not intend to amend Article 4, noting that the provision mirrors equivalent wording in UK legislation and is therefore considered consistent with established legal practice.

**FINDING: Evidence has shown that where responsibility for an animal is shared, the legal responsibilities in Article 4 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law may not be clearly understood in practice.**

---

<sup>7</sup> [Submission to Scrutiny Review: Animal Welfare & Control \(Draft Animal Welfare \(Jersey\) Law 202-\)](#)

<sup>8</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 3

<sup>9</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 9

<sup>10</sup> [Submission to Scrutiny Review: Animal Welfare & Control \(Draft Animal Welfare \(Jersey\) Law 202-\)](#)

<sup>11</sup> [2026-01-12-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Barkley-Club.pdf](#)

<sup>12</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 6

The definitions of “Inspectors” and “Veterinary Inspectors” remains unchanged, with only States Veterinary Officers appointed as such in practice though certain powers may be shared with or exercised by the States of Jersey Police and Honorary Police where appropriate.<sup>13</sup> The powers of enforcement officers will be considered later in this part of the report.

### Offences Against Animals & Protection of Animal Welfare

Noting that a core intention of the Draft Law is to shift Jersey’s animal welfare framework from a reactive model to a proactive one, the Panel observes that a significant part of this shift is achieved through the reforms set out in Part 2 – Offences Against Animals.

Article 5 widens the definition of offences against animals from the 2004 Law, moving beyond explicit acts of cruelty to include situations where a person fails to act and knows that such inaction would cause suffering. It also creates offences for permitting or failing to prevent suffering caused by another person and introduces a specific offence relating to attacks on service animals.

Article 5 will also apply to wild animals except for where an offence is for failure to act. In practice this will mean that it is an offence for a person to commit an act of suffering against a wild animal, but where a wild animal is suffering and a person does not intervene, no offence is committed.

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Chief States Vet explained the rationale for the expansion of offences was due to the 2004 Law containing an outdated concept of cruelty.<sup>14</sup>

Complementing these changes, the Draft Law introduces a new Part 3 – Protection of Animal Welfare. This includes a statutory duty to protect animal welfare (Article 11) and enables inspectors to issue Improvement Notices (Article 12) and take possession of animals in distress in a wider range of circumstances (Article 13). These tools are intended to allow enforcement officers to secure improvements in welfare conditions before suffering occurs.

Article 11 – Duty to Protect Animals creates an offence for a person to fail to take reasonable steps to ensure that an animal’s needs are met to the extent required by good practice.

The Panel received a written submission from the Jersey Farmers’ Union (JFU) asking how “good practice” would be defined in real-life scenarios.<sup>15</sup> The Minister responded that this would be guided by the requirements set out in Article 9(2), which include meeting an animal’s needs for:<sup>16</sup>

- food and water
- shelter and warmth
- light and ventilation
- prevention of suffering
- treatment of disease

Article 12 – Improvement Notices introduces a new mechanism enabling inspectors to issue formal notices where they believe an owner is failing to meet an animal’s welfare requirements, but where the issues identified could reasonably be remedied. Improvement notices are intended for situations where conditions fall short of good practice but do not require urgent intervention.

---

<sup>13</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 10

<sup>14</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pgs. 34 & 50

<sup>15</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>16</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pgs. 51-52

During the hearing, the Chief States Vet explained that improvement notices would typically be used for matters such as ventilation, lighting or other environmental conditions, where immediate suffering is not occurring and is unlikely to occur in the near future.<sup>17</sup>

Article 13 expands the circumstances under which inspectors may take possession of animals in distress. The Chief States Vet explained that, under the current 2004 Law, inspectors can *“only seize an animal with a warrant... and we have very limited powers of entry,”* which limits their ability to act promptly when welfare concerns arise.<sup>18</sup>

The Panel also heard that the broadened powers in the Draft Law will enable inspectors to remove an animal where there is a reasonable belief that suffering is likely if circumstances do not change, allowing intervention before actual suffering or cruelty has occurred. The Group Director further noted that this approach reflects contemporary animal welfare legislation, which prioritises early action to avoid foreseeable harm.<sup>19</sup>

### Panel Commentary

The Panel considers that the current Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 2004 is no longer fit for purpose, noting that its narrow definition of cruelty and limited enforcement powers have constrained the States Vet Office’s ability to safeguard animal welfare effectively.

The Panel further considers that the Draft Law’s objective of modernising Jersey’s approach and creating a more proactive, prevention focused system is both necessary and well justified, with stakeholders welcoming this approach.

The Panel finds that Parts 2 and 3 carry much of the substantive weight in delivering this shift, providing a package of reforms that are well conceived, proportionate and capable of materially improving early intervention capability. The broadened offences, statutory welfare duties, improvement notices and expanded powers to act before suffering occurs together form a coherent set of tools that, if supported by consistent enforcement, are likely to achieve the intended modernisation and significantly strengthen Jersey’s preventative welfare framework.

**FINDING: The reforms contained in Parts 2 and 3 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law materially strengthen Jersey’s animal welfare framework and provide the necessary tools to support a genuinely proactive approach to preventing animal suffering.**

However, stakeholders have expressed concerns about the practical application of Article 4, which outlines the legal responsibilities relating to animals. The Panel notes that while the Minister is sympathetic to these concerns, he has concluded that the practical effect of the drafting is appropriate and consistent with comparable legislation in the UK.

The Panel therefore agrees that, although no amendment is required, there remains a gap in understanding how the provision will operate in practice, particularly in professional environments where multiple individuals may share responsibility for an animal’s care. The Panel considers that clear communication and comprehensive guidance will be essential to ensure the provision is applied effectively in real-world settings.

---

<sup>17</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 55

<sup>18</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 52

<sup>19</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 53

**RECOMMENDATION: The Minister for the Environment should publish public-facing guidance for how the legal responsibility of an animal is shared, particularly in professional or temporary care arrangements, within 3 months of the Draft Animal Welfare Law’s commencement.**

### Enforcement & Powers

While Parts 2 and 3 of the Draft Law set out the substantive measures required to prevent animal suffering, their effectiveness will depend heavily on how they are enforced. This chapter therefore examines the Draft Law’s expansion of enforcement powers between veterinary inspectors, inspectors and police officers within Part 6 of the Draft Law.

The Draft Law widens inspectors’ powers compared with the 2004 Law wherein inspectors had very limited ability to enter premises and generally require the presence of a police officer or a court warrant. During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Chief States Vet explained that these limitations often prevented officers from intervening promptly in situations where animals were believed to be at risk. The Minister explained that enhancing the powers of enforcement officers was “*one of the most important things*” in developing the Draft Law allowing for the ability to “*intervene at a much earlier stage is vital*”.<sup>20</sup>

In illustrating the impact of the new powers, the Chief States Vet described a scenario in which a dog is overheating in a locked car. Under the 2004 Law, only a police officer is authorised to enter the vehicle to remove the animal. Under the Draft Law, however, inspectors would also be empowered to enter the car and remove the dog, enabling a quicker intervention to prevent suffering.<sup>21</sup>

The Chief States Vet emphasised that most enforcement actions under the Draft Law are expected to follow principles of proportionality and escalation.<sup>22</sup> In practice, officers would first provide advice or informal guidance, using statutory tools only where needed. Improvement notices would be issued in circumstances where welfare standards are not being met but suffering is not imminent.<sup>23</sup> More serious powers, such as taking possession of an animal, would only be used when the officer reasonably believes the animal is suffering or likely to suffer.

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Chief States Vet explained that, although the Draft Law also confers broader powers on the States of Jersey Police than the current 2004 Law, in practice most animal welfare incidents will continue to be dealt with primarily by inspectors. She emphasised that the Draft Law “*does not give any more requirements of the police*” but instead allows inspectors to act more swiftly and independently in situations where they previously required police intervention.<sup>24</sup>

The Panel received a written submission from the States of Jersey Police (the ‘SoJP’), within which the wider powers for inspectors were welcomed and it was noted that this would likely reduce the need for police attendance in welfare-related scenarios. It was also highlighted that joint training initiatives and clear guidance should be provided to support this process.<sup>25</sup>

**FINDING: The broadening of powers conferred to inspectors will allow for swifter, more targeted action in welfare incidents and is likely to reduce the need for police attendance where inspectors can now act independently.**

---

<sup>20</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 34

<sup>21</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 35

<sup>22</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pgs. 51 & 53

<sup>23</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 55

<sup>24</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 37

<sup>25</sup> [2026-01-15-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-States-of-Jersey-Police.pdf](#)

The SoJP's submission also raised the need for clear and formalised guidance on lead agency responsibility for responding to different types of animal welfare incidents. This included calls for greater clarity regarding the respective roles of inspectors and police officers, the development of effective information sharing arrangements, and agreed contingency procedures for occasions when inspectors may not be immediately available, such as out-of-hours periods.<sup>26</sup>

This was reinforced during the Panel's Enforcement Public Hearing with the SoJP and the Chief de Police. When asked whether existing arrangements provided adequate clarity on which agency should assume responsibility once an animal related incident is reported, the Chief Inspector responded:<sup>27</sup>

***Chief Inspector, States of Jersey Police:***

*"Chair, I do not think they are."*

**FINDING: The States of Jersey Police welcomed the widened enforcement powers but believe that clearer arrangements for determining lead-agency responsibility in animal welfare incidents are needed.**

**Panel Commentary**

The Panel considers that the widened enforcement powers granted to inspectors under the Draft Law represent a necessary, proportionate and well justified enhancement of Jersey's animal welfare framework. Evidence from the Minister and Chief States Vet demonstrated that the 2004 Law frequently prevents timely intervention, that, in the Panel's view, undermine the Island's ability to prevent avoidable harm.

The Panel further considers that the Draft Law incorporates appropriate and credible safeguards to ensure these expanded powers are exercised responsibly. The Chief States Vet emphasised that officers are expected to act proportionately, escalating enforcement only when advisory or corrective steps are insufficient. Improvement notices are intended for non-urgent cases where suffering is not imminent, while more intrusive actions require a reasonable belief that suffering is occurring or likely to occur. The Panel considers these safeguards fundamental to maintaining public confidence in the new enforcement regime.

The Panel also recognises that the SoJP welcomed the increased powers available to inspectors and acknowledged that these changes may reduce unnecessary police deployment for welfare-related incidents.

However, the Panel received evidence indicating that operational clarity remains insufficient. The SoJP highlighted the need for clearer protocols on lead-agency responsibilities, information-sharing arrangements and out-of-hours coordination, with frontline officers confirming during the Enforcement Public Hearing that existing arrangements do not provide adequate clarity about who should take the lead when an animal-related incident is reported.

In light of this evidence, the Panel concludes that strengthened interagency operational guidance is essential to ensure consistent, coordinated and effective enforcement under the Draft Law. Clear protocols will be critical to enabling inspectors and police officers to understand their respective roles, reduce uncertainty at the point of incident response, and ensure the preventative enforcement approach envisaged by the new legislation can be delivered in practice.

---

<sup>26</sup> [2026-01-15-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-States-of-Jersey-Police.pdf](#)

<sup>27</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 10

**RECOMMENDATION: The Minister should publish internal guidance on agency responsibilities, information-sharing gateways, and contingency arrangements for out-of-hours inspector availability to the States Veterinary Office, the States of Jersey Police, and the Honorary Police under the new Animal Welfare Law, within one month of its commencement.**

### Offences & Penalties

The Draft Law introduces a new two-tier penalties framework. This replaces the single level approach in the 2004 Law, wherein all offences carry the same maximum penalty of 12 months' imprisonment and a fine up to Level 3.

Under the Draft Law, offences are divided into minor and major categories:

- Minor offences carry a maximum penalty of 6 months' imprisonment and a Level 2 fine (£1,000).
- Major offences carry a maximum penalty of up to 5 years' imprisonment and a fine above Level 3 (£10,000).

Minor offences are limited to those in the following Articles:

- Article 10 – Transfer of animals by way of sale or prize
- Article 12 – Improvement notices
- Article 15 – Straying animals
- Article 19 – Licences as evidence of lawful activity

All other offences in the Draft Law fall within the “major” category.

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Panel questioned the rationale for the substantial increase in maximum penalties. While the Minister acknowledged that some of the proposed penalties appeared “*quite severe*”, it was emphasised that these represent maximum penalties only, and that it would be for the Court to determine the appropriate sentence based on the circumstances of each case.<sup>28</sup>

The Panel further notes that Article 32 provides that, where an offence is committed in respect of more than one animal, the maximum penalty may be calculated as if a separate offence has been committed in relation to each animal, meaning that multiple animals could result in significantly higher cumulative penalties.

### Panel Commentary

The Panel acknowledges that the Draft Law introduces a strengthened penalties framework compared to the 2004 Law, reflecting a clear legislative intention to treat serious animal welfare breaches with greater severity. While the Minister accepted that the proposed maximum penalties are “*quite severe*”, the Panel notes the Chief Veterinary Officer's explanation that enforcement under the Draft Law follows an escalation process, with several proportionate tools available before an incident will be escalated to an offence with such penalties.

The Panel also notes the significance of Article 32, which allows maximum penalties to be applied on a per-animal basis where an offence involves multiple animals, highlighting the seriousness with which

---

<sup>28</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 38

systemic, repeated, or large-scale welfare breaches may be addressed under the new framework. While the Law provides for offences to be recorded per animal, it remains unclear how the Courts will interpret and apply this provision in practice, particularly in cases involving large numbers of animals. Accordingly, the Panel emphasises that sentencing decisions will rest entirely with the Court, ensuring that any cumulative penalties arising from this provision are applied proportionately to the circumstances of each case.

Overall, the Panel considers it appropriate that assessments of proportionality, culpability and the application of cumulative penalties are matters for the Courts to determine.

**FINDING: The Draft Animal Welfare Law introduces a two-tier penalties framework that differentiates between minor and major offences, replacing the single-level penalty structure under the 2004 Law.**

**FINDING: The Draft Animal Welfare Law increases the current maximum penalty of 12 months' imprisonment and a £10,000 fine to a potential 5-year sentence and higher fine, which the Minister acknowledged is "quite severe", but the Panel considers appropriate as maximum limits to be applied at the Court's discretion.**

### Orders & Licensing

Part 5 of the Draft Law establishes a licensing framework and, in particular, Article 18 enables the Minister to establish licensing schemes for "any activity that requires a licence".

Separately, Article 34 enables the Minister to make Orders in relation to a wide range of matters, including (but not limited to) the creation of licensing systems, the imposition of legal requirements, the prohibition of animal-related activities, regulation of breeding, sale, import and export, expansion of inspector powers, mandatory training requirements, record-keeping or identification methods, and the establishment of advisory bodies.

The [Accompanying Report](#) to the Draft Law also sets out a list of "future proposed Orders", including prohibiting docking of dogs' tails; prohibiting the export of livestock for slaughter; microchipping requirements; prohibiting the import of certain species; protections for animals at the time of killing; and licensing livestock keepers.

Taken together, these provisions allow significant elements of the regulatory framework to be set through Ministerial Orders.

Concern about the breadth and scope of the Order-making powers was the most frequently raised issue in the stakeholder submissions.

The Jersey Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (JSPCA) raised questions as to why certain measures were proposed for subordinate legislation rather than inclusion within the primary law<sup>29</sup> and both the JSPCA and the JFU raised concerns regarding the level of democratic oversight of this approach.<sup>30</sup>

The JSPCA expressed serious concern that future Orders would not be subject to established consultation processes, Assembly debate and Scrutiny review,<sup>31</sup> while the JFU similarly noted that the

---

<sup>29</sup> [2026-01-16-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-JSPCA.pdf](#)

<sup>30</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>31</sup> [2026-01-16-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-JSPCA.pdf](#)

powers could enable significant new regulatory provisions to be introduced without primary legislative scrutiny.<sup>32</sup>

In relation to the licensing framework, a number of submissions received were in favour of the proposals to modernise the licensing of animal-activities,<sup>33</sup> however concern was highlighted on the lack of detail included within the primary law, with Spotted Wellies noting:<sup>34</sup>

*“The idea of a new licensing system could have a big impact on businesses like ours. It would be helpful to understand: which services will need a licence, what the costs might be, how often licences would need renewing.”*

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Panel questioned why the Draft Law contained such broad order-making powers. The Minister stated, “because we need to move quickly”.<sup>35</sup>

The Panel asked whether Article 18, as drafted, could permit a future Minister to introduce licensing requirements for livestock keeping where no scheme currently exists; impose licence fees without Assembly approval; extend licensing to non-commercial animal keepers; or establish licensing schemes for the ownership of any animal within the scope of the Draft Law.<sup>36</sup>

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Minister and officers accepted that, as drafted, the provision could in theory enable licensing schemes of the type described by the Panel. However, Officers emphasised that the policy intention is for licensing to apply only to animal businesses, not personal or non-commercial animal keepers.<sup>37</sup>

In relation to poultry, domestic livestock and companion animals, the Chief States Vet stated that such licensing is “not on the cards”. However, the Minister noted that he had assumed that Article 18 referred specifically to businesses, though neither he nor Officers could immediately locate the relevant wording during the hearing.<sup>38</sup>

Finally, when asked whether the presented list of future orders was comprehensive, the Minister acknowledged that although the list included those deemed highest priority, this was not an exhaustive list, and other orders might be required in future.<sup>39</sup>

**FINDING: The Order-making powers within the Draft Law are extremely broad, enabling significant elements of the regulatory framework to be created without consultation, Assembly debate or Scrutiny. The non-exhaustive list of proposed future Orders reinforces the open-ended nature of these powers.**

**FINDING: Article 18 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law grants the Minister the ability to create licensing schemes for “any activity that requires a licence,” which, as drafted, is significantly broader than the stated policy intention for this to apply only to commercial businesses.**

## Panel Commentary

---

<sup>32</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>33</sup> [Submission to Scrutiny Review: Animal Welfare & Control \(Draft Animal Welfare \(Jersey\) Law 202-\) & 2026-01-12-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Barkley-Club.pdf](#)

<sup>34</sup> [2026-01-11-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Spotted-Wellies.pdf](#)

<sup>35</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 26

<sup>36</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pgs. 30-31

<sup>37</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 31

<sup>38</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 32

<sup>39</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 33

The Panel considers that the Draft Law confers an exceptionally broad range of Order-making powers on the Minister and that, as drafted, the Law does not provide sufficient detail to define the scope or limits of these powers. While the Panel received draft versions of several proposed Orders, these were not publicly available for scrutiny, meaning that the practical operation of future regulatory schemes remains unclear to stakeholders and the public.

The Panel draws a distinction between two types of Order-making powers contained in the Draft Law:

- Orders under Article 34, which prescribe specific or technical animal-welfare measures; and
- Orders under Article 18, which enable the Minister to establish licensing schemes for “any activity that requires a licence.”

The Panel does not object in principle to the use of Ministerial Orders for technical welfare measures, for example, prohibiting particular practices or setting standards where flexibility and responsiveness are appropriate. It is concerned however, that Article 18 goes significantly further by enabling the Minister to create licensing schemes for *any* activity that requires a licence.

As drafted, there is no restriction preventing a Minister from introducing a licensing scheme for the keeping of animals generally, including domestic animal keepers. Despite Officers stating this is not the current policy intention, no wording in Article 18 limits these powers to commercial operators. The Panel views this gap between intention and drafting as a substantial risk.

Moreover, the Panel consider that licensing schemes are not minor administrative tools; they directly determine who may operate, under what standards and conditions, and at what cost. They impose substantial regulatory and financial burdens. Stakeholder submissions from animal businesses have highlighted concerns about uncertainty over the scope of licensing, potential fees, and renewal requirements, each of which could materially affect livelihoods.

Given that an entire industry of animal related services may be brought under these licensing provisions, the Panel is concerned that the Draft Law would allow such frameworks to be established or expanded solely through Ministerial Orders, without guaranteed consultation, Assembly debate, or Scrutiny review. The Panel does not consider this level of democratic oversight proportionate to the scale of potential impact on animal businesses and service providers.

The Panel’s concerns regarding the breadth of Ministerial powers were underscored by a recent example arising during this Review. In early January, the Panel became aware via a media article of an amendment to the [Animal Health \(Bird Diseases\) \(Jersey\) Order 2017](#). This amendment, made by Ministerial Order, reduced the bird registration threshold from 30 birds to one ([MD-ENV-2025-967](#)). The Panel considered that the change was not communicated effectively given that it was published with minimal publicity over the Christmas period. In response to an Oral Question on the matter the Minister acknowledged and apologised for the poor communication ([OQ.18/2026](#)).

Crucially, the Minister also confirmed that he had not fully considered the material impacts of the change when approving the Order at the request of the States Veterinary Officer.<sup>40</sup> The Panel were concerned that, under Article 29 of the [Animal Health \(Jersey\) Law 2016](#), non-compliance carries a penalty of up to two years’ imprisonment and a fine. Although the Minister stated that it was not intended to penalise individuals with only one or two birds who failed to register, he acknowledged that the statutory penalty nonetheless applied.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> [OQ.18/2026](#)

<sup>41</sup> [States Assembly | Letter - Animal Health Law and Orders \(Jersey\) Amendment Order 2025 - Response - 17 February 2026](#)

This situation demonstrated a clear example of how changes introduced by Ministerial Order may not provide a sufficiently robust mechanism for fully considering the practical impacts and wider implications of new requirements imposed on animal keepers.

The Panel concludes that while Orders are an appropriate mechanism for technical welfare standards, the creation of licensing frameworks requires stronger statutory safeguards. Given the scale of potential impact on businesses, private animal keepers, and livelihoods, such powers should not be left to Ministerial discretion alone and so the Panel proposes to amend the Draft Law to change the ability for “any activity that requires a licence” as set out in Article 18 to be brought by Regulations instead of Ministerial Order.

**AMENDMENT: To change the ability for “any activity that requires a licence” as set out in Article 18 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law to be brought by Regulations instead of Ministerial Order.**

While the Panel’s amendment will ensure greater democratic oversight of the creation of licensing schemes, the Panel emphasises that effective communication remains essential when introducing new regulatory requirements, particularly in light of the change to bird-registration requirements.

The Panel therefore recommends that the introduction of any new licensing schemes must be supported by clear, accessible and consistent communications that accurately reflect policy intent, in order to avoid confusion, poor communication and, as a result, unintended non-compliance.

**RECOMMENDATION: When introducing any new licensing schemes by Regulation under Article 18 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law, the Minister should ensure that all public communications and accompanying documentation are clear and consistent with the underlying policy intent.**

## Conclusion

Part 1 demonstrates that the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202- is a widely supported and long overdue update to the Island’s welfare framework. The 2004 Law’s limited definitions of cruelty and restrictive enforcement powers no longer meet modern expectations, and the Draft Law’s broader offences, statutory duty of care, Improvement Notices and expanded inspector powers create a more preventative and proactive system.

While the overall direction is welcomed, the Panel identifies areas needing clarification. The three week consultation period was viewed by stakeholders as too short and concerns also remain regarding Article 4, where shared responsibility for animals in professional or temporary care settings may not be sufficiently clear.

Evidence shows that the widened enforcement powers are proportionate and necessary, though the States of Jersey Police highlighted a lack of clarity in operational procedures, particularly around lead agency responsibility and outofhours arrangements. Strengthened interagency protocols will therefore be required to ensure effective implementation.

The Panel’s principal concern relates to the breadth of the Minister’s Order making powers, especially under Article 18. As drafted, these powers could allow licensing schemes of wide scope to be introduced without consultation or Assembly scrutiny, despite substantial potential impacts on businesses and animal keepers. While Orders are appropriate for technical standards, the Panel concludes that licensing schemes should instead be established through Regulations and proposes an amendment to this effect.

## Part 2 – Livestock

### Introduction

This Part considers matters relating specifically to livestock, as issues identified both in this Review and in the Panel’s earlier scrutiny of the Draft Dogs (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.63/2025](#)) encompass elements of both welfare and control.

The two main issues identified are:

- livestock straying, where livestock animals have escaped from where they are usually kept
- livestock worrying, where a dog chases, attacks, or cause distress to livestock animals on agricultural land

This part of the report outlines how livestock straying and worrying are addressed under Jersey’s animal welfare and control laws, before analysing each issue separately in full detail.

### Welfare Versus Control

Livestock straying and livestock worrying fall under different pieces of legislation: livestock straying is addressed in the Draft Animal Welfare Law, whereas livestock worrying is regulated under the [Dogs \(Jersey\) Law 1961](#).

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Panel sought to understand why these closely related issues are addressed separately and why livestock straying had been included within the Animal Welfare Law rather than the Dogs Law.

The Minister explained that the two issues fall within distinct legislative purposes, noting that the Dogs Law is fundamentally concerned with public protection and animal control, whereas the Animal Welfare Law is specifically focused on protecting the welfare of animals. He stated that the Dogs Law is about protecting members of the public from dangerous or uncontrolled dogs, while the Animal Welfare Law is about looking after the welfare of animals and preventing suffering.<sup>42</sup>

While acknowledging that livestock worrying may also create an animal welfare impact, the Minister advised that it sits primarily within the Dogs Law because it arises from the behaviour of the dog, rather than from the welfare condition of the livestock. By contrast, the Chief States Vet explained that the most common concerns brought to the States Vet Office involved pigs, cattle or horses on main roads, and that the goal is to prevent injury or distress to the animals themselves. The Minister explained that the aim was *“to get them back into an enclosure... for their own welfare.”*<sup>43</sup>

**FINDING: Livestock worrying is regulated under the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 as a matter of dog behaviour control and public safety. Livestock straying, by contrast, is treated as an animal welfare issue under the Draft Animal Welfare Law, which the Minister explained was due to the direct risk of harm to the animals themselves.**

### Straying Livestock

Part 4 of the Draft Animal Welfare Law introduces new legislative provisions for straying livestock. Specifically, the Draft Law will make it an offence if livestock stray into a public place *and* the person responsible fails to:

---

<sup>42</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 22

<sup>43</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 12

- Co-operate with an Inspector to remove the livestock to a safe place, or
- Fails to take all reasonable steps to immediately secure the livestock.

It is also an offence for a livestock owner to fail to comply with an improvement notice that has been served under Article 17 where livestock are at risk of suffering or being injured as a result of straying into a public place because of the condition of the boundaries of the premises on which the livestock is kept. A veterinary inspector must confirm that the animals are at risk of suffering or being injured before an improvement notice is served.

The penalty for an offence under Part 4 is imprisonment of 6 months and a fine of level 2 on the standard scale.

Police officers will be given the same powers as inspectors to remove straying livestock to a safe place under Article 16.

### **Evidence**

The Panel received concern from the Jersey Farmers Union, The Reserve Farm, Jersey Milk Marketing Board and Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society (RJA&HS), and The Conservation Grazing Group on the practicality and proportionality of the proposed straying livestock offences in Part 4.

The Conservation Grazing Group noted that maintaining traditional stock fencing is often not feasible on steep, ecologically sensitive conservation sites, warning that the proposals could jeopardise conservation grazing operations in “*extreme landscape types*”.<sup>44</sup> The Jersey Milk Marketing Board and RJA&HS stressed that livestock could stray for reasons outside a keeper’s control, including storm damage and that the articles, as drafted, leave too much to the opinion of the inspector.<sup>45</sup>

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, these concerns were put to the Minister and Chief States Vet who advised that boundaries would be assessed on a case-by-case basis and that what is considered proportionate would depend on the landscape and surrounding environment.<sup>46</sup> It was further confirmed that the provisions were not intended to be used where exceptional circumstances apply, like where damage has occurred from a storm or if livestock have been chased out of their enclosure.<sup>47</sup>

All stakeholders viewed the proposals as disproportionate and misaligned with Jersey’s farming context. However, some submissions highlighted confusion on what would constitute as an offence in practice.<sup>48</sup> The Panel asked the Minister to clarify this during the Ministerial Public Hearing.<sup>49</sup>

#### ***The Connétable of St. Mary:***

*Minister, can you confirm that part 4 does not create an offence for livestock straying itself but only for failing to comply with the requirements to remove or secure the animals once notified?*

#### ***The Minister for the Environment:***

*Absolutely. We are not creating an offence for the straying of livestock. The offence is when the livestock have strayed and the registered keeper does not take immediate action,*

<sup>44</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>45</sup> [2026-01-16-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-RJHS-Milk-Boar.pdf](#)

<sup>46</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 17

<sup>47</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 18

<sup>48</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>49</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 13

*especially under the direction of an inspector or officer, when they do not take action to try to secure those animals into a safe area, that is the offence.*

**FINDING: The Draft Animal Welfare Law introduces new offences where livestock keepers fail to take immediate action to secure straying animals or fail to comply with an improvement notice relating to boundary conditions, which have been misunderstood by stakeholders.**

During the Enforcement Public Hearing, the Panel sought the practical experience of the States of Jersey Police and the Comité des Chefs de Police as the representative body of the Honorary Police in responding to incidents of straying livestock.

The Comité des Chef de Police advised that the Honorary Police are typically the first responders and described straying livestock as an “*often occurrence*”.<sup>50</sup> However, the Chair of the Comité indicated that he had not encountered significant difficulties in addressing such incidents and expressed confidence in the ability of the Honorary Police to manage them effectively. He further observed that, in his experience, livestock owners are generally prompt and responsible in retrieving animals when notified.<sup>51</sup>

The Panel therefore questioned why livestock straying has been escalated to a criminal offence with a penalty of imprisonment for 6 months and to a fine of level 2 on the standard scale. The Minister advised that the purpose was to “*demonstrate that we are taking the subject seriously*”.<sup>52</sup>

**FINDING: Stakeholders expressed strong concern that the new straying livestock offences in the Draft Animal Welfare Law are disproportionate to the realities of farming in Jersey.**

The Jersey Farmers Union also raised particular concern about liability where livestock keepers do not control boundary infrastructure, arguing that offences should only apply where the owner is responsible for the fencing.<sup>53</sup>

The Reserve Farm echoed these issues, noting that they often graze land where they are not responsible for boundaries and that the offence could make grazing and conservation management on open public sites unviable. They warned that the articles could prevent conservation grazing on sites where limited livestock access to certain roads is integral to land management, thereby undermining long-term rewilding efforts.<sup>54</sup>

When questioning the liability of offences in circumstances where the person responsible for the livestock is not responsible for the land or boundaries where deficiencies may arise, the Minister confirmed that discussions with the farming community were ongoing regarding the allocation of responsibility.<sup>55</sup>

The Panel also considered the operation of improvement notices in cases where livestock stray due to inadequate fencing or boundary conditions. Under the Draft Law, failure to comply with an Improvement Notice constitutes a criminal offence, however, the Draft Law does not provide an explicit right of appeal or formal review mechanism in respect of such notices. When raised during the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Minister acknowledged that it would be reasonable for a person subject

---

<sup>50</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 17

<sup>51</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 15

<sup>52</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 12

<sup>53</sup> [Microsoft Word - Scrutiny re Animal Welfare Law](#)

<sup>54</sup> [2026-01-16-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Reserve.pdf](#)

<sup>55</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 6

to an improvement notice to have some form of recourse prior to being placed at risk of committing an offence and agreed to consider this further.<sup>56</sup>

**FINDING: The Draft Animal Welfare Law places legal liability on the livestock keeper to comply with improvement notices relating to boundary deficiencies; however, in practice, responsibility for and control over boundary infrastructure typically lies with the landowner.**

### Panel Commentary

The Panel considers the concerns raised by agricultural and conservation stakeholders to be well-founded and reflective of Jersey's varied land management practices. Evidence highlighted that livestock may stray for reasons outside a keeper's control, including storm damage or boundary failures on land not owned or managed by the livestock keeper.

While the Minister confirmed that Part 4 does not criminalise livestock straying itself and that exceptional circumstances are not intended to trigger enforcement action, the Panel notes that this intention is not clearly expressed in the statutory wording. As drafted, the provisions may not be readily understood or consistently applied, particularly in situations where responsibility for boundary/fencing maintenance is shared or ambiguous.

The Panel also notes the challenges presented by conservation grazing, where maintaining conventional fencing may be environmentally inappropriate or physically impractical on steep or sensitive sites. In these contexts, the Panel agrees that the Draft Law as written may not adequately reflect operational realities.

Moreover, evidence from the Comité des Chefs de Police indicated that the Honorary Police already manage incidents of straying livestock on a frequent basis and generally without difficulty, with livestock keepers typically responding promptly and responsibly when contacted. This calls into question the practical necessity of elevating such incidents to criminal offences, particularly where they occur infrequently or arise from circumstances beyond the keeper's control. While the Minister stated that the purpose of creating an offence was to "*demonstrate that we are taking the subject seriously,*" the Panel considers that seriousness should be demonstrated through targeted and proportionate enforcement measures, rather than through creating offences that risk capturing reasonable and conscientious behaviour.

Given these considerations, the Panel believes that clear guidance is necessary to ensure that Part 4 operates as intended. This guidance should clearly explain the scope of the provisions, how responsibility for boundaries will be determined where livestock are grazed on land not owned by or under the responsibility of the livestock keeper, and how exceptional circumstances such as storm damage or conservation land conditions will be treated. To ensure the guidance is workable and reflects practical land management realities, the Panel considers it essential that its development includes structured consultation with the farming industry, particularly conservation grazers.

Providing explicit guidance to enforcement officers to translate the legislative wording and policy purpose into consistent practice, will support fair and proportionate decision-making, and reduce the risk of uncertainty for both enforcement bodies and livestock keepers. This approach would also reinforce the preventative intent of the Draft Law by promoting shared understanding of expectations before enforcement becomes necessary.

---

<sup>56</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 56

**RECOMMENDATION: The Minister for the Environment should ensure that operational guidance is provided to enforcement officers to support the implementation of Part 4 – Straying Livestock within three months of the Draft Animal Welfare Law’s enactment, and that this guidance is prepared in consultation with the farming community.**

However, the Panel remains concerned that Improvement Notices issued under Article 17 may place criminal liability on livestock keepers in circumstances where they are not responsible for the boundary conditions that led to the straying or where straying has occurred for an exceptional reason outside of a keeper’s control, like a storm.

Evidence has shown that livestock are frequently grazed on land where the keeper does not own, control, or maintain the fencing or boundaries, meaning that an Improvement Notice could require a keeper to rectify deficiencies they have no legal or practical ability to address. In such cases, non-compliance carries a criminal penalty of up to six months’ imprisonment and a fine at level 2 on the standard scale.

This problem is compounded by the fact that the Draft Law provides no explicit right of appeal or review mechanism for Improvement Notices. As a result, a keeper who receives a notice in circumstances where responsibility is shared, unclear, or rests with a landowner or where boundary/fencing deficiencies have occurred for reasons outside of their control, they would have no meaningful route to dispute or rectify the matter before falling into criminal liability. The Minister acknowledged during the Public Hearing that this would be unreasonable in practice.

Given these structural limitations in the primary legislation, and the risk of placing criminal responsibility on individuals who are not the cause of the straying and cannot remedy it, the Panel does not consider Article 17 proportionate in its current form. Accordingly, the Panel has lodged an amendment to remove the ability to issue improvement notices in respect of straying livestock where the underlying issue relates to inadequate fencing or boundary conditions.

**AMENDMENT: To delete Article 17 - Improvement Notices of the Draft Animal Welfare Law in respect of straying livestock for issue related to inadequate fencing or boundary conditions.**

### [Livestock Worrying](#)

In July 2025, the Panel received correspondence from a local farmer raising concerns about the prevalence of livestock worrying in the context of the Government’s consultation on the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law. The correspondence expressed the view that livestock worrying was not adequately addressed within that draft and requested that livestock worrying form part of the forthcoming amendments to the [Dogs \(Jersey\) Law 1961](#) being developed by the Comité des Connétables.

During its review of the amendments to the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 ([P.63/2025](#)), the Panel wrote to the Minister for the Environment to seek clarification regarding his awareness of livestock-worrying concerns and to ascertain whether he considered this issue to fall between the existing legislative provisions.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> [States Assembly | Letter - Draft Dogs Law \(Jersey\) Amendment Regulations 202- 22 September 2025](#)

The Assistant Minister for the Environment advised that the Environment Department was aware of the concerns raised, and that P.63/2025 included an amendment to Article 9 which was intended to address the identified gaps by “*strengthening the definition of agricultural land*”.<sup>58</sup>

However, in its first set of Comments to P.63/2025 ([P.63/2025.Com.](#)) the Panel found that the proposed amendment did not address the concerns raised by stakeholders. Instead, the amendment widened the offence of livestock worrying to include damage to agricultural land that posed a hazard to the health of livestock.

The proposed amendment was subsequently withdrawn by the Comité ([P.63/2025.Amd.](#)) on the basis that livestock worrying would be reviewed separately sometime in the future. However, given the concerns raised the Panel sought to conduct its own examination of livestock worrying as part of its Animal Welfare and Control Review.

In response to this Review, submissions were received from the Jersey Farmers’ Union,<sup>59</sup> the Conservation Grazing Group<sup>60</sup> and the Reserve Farm<sup>61</sup> that argued that neither the Dogs Law or Animal Welfare Law adequately protect livestock from being chased or attacked by dogs.

The submissions highlighted a long-term and increasing trend in incidents, particularly affecting sheep involved in conservation grazing. They advised that dogs are frequently off lead in areas where livestock are grazing and that dog-owners are either unaware of or in some cases indifferent to, the impact that worrying has on livestock.

Crucially, they emphasised that existing legislation is difficult to enforce and described livestock worrying as “*the largest single welfare concern*”. Across submissions, the clarity and enforceability of the Dogs Law and the limited tools it provides to prevent incidents occurring was identified as the most urgent issue requiring reform.

In light of concerns around enforceability, during the Enforcement Hearing with the SoJP and Comité des Chef de Police the Panel sought to understand how the provisions on livestock worrying are enforced in practice.

The Comité des Chef de Police commented that “*if it is just worrying... We may just come to the point of giving a word of advice*”, whereas “*if a sheep has or an abortion or damage to the sheep*” this “*takes it over the prosecution threshold... and we would look to then send it to the court to deal with it*”.<sup>62</sup>

The SoJP confirmed that livestock worrying “*is quite a hard investigation*” and that prosecution rates are “*very low*”.<sup>63</sup> Both agencies highlighted the difficulty of securing the level of evidence required under the current law, particularly in cases where incidents are unwitnessed.

During the hearing, the Panel also learned that that while 17 reports of livestock worrying had been received in the last 5 years, the reporting statistics held by the SoJP may not include incidents responded to by the Honorary Police unless they proceed to a Parish Hall Inquiry.<sup>64</sup> The Panel notes

---

<sup>58</sup> [2025-09-26-Response-Draft-Dogs-Law-\(Jersey\)-Amendment-Regulations-202-and-Amendments-to-Animal-Welfare-\(Jersey\)-Law-2004.pdf](#)

<sup>59</sup> [2026.01.12 Written Submission, Jersey Farmers' Union](#)

<sup>60</sup> [2026.01.2026 Written Submission, Conservation Grazing Group](#)

<sup>61</sup> [2026-01-16-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-The-Reserve.pdf](#)

<sup>62</sup> [Transcript, Animal Welfare & Control Review, SoJP and Comité des Chef de Police](#), pg. 18

<sup>63</sup> [Transcript, Animal Welfare & Control Review, SoJP and Comité des Chef de Police](#), pg. 18

<sup>64</sup> [Transcript, Animal Welfare & Control Review, SoJP and Comité des Chef de Police](#), pg. 18

that this recording approach may not capture the full scale of livestock-worrying incidents, particularly where matters are resolved informally.

The Panel sought an update from the Comité des Connétables regarding progress on reviewing the livestock worrying provisions. The Comité advised that the work was “ongoing” and that the Panel would be updated “in due course”, with no further detail provided.<sup>65</sup>

**FINDING: Stakeholder and enforcement evidence demonstrates that the current legislative framework for livestock worrying is unclear, difficult to enforce and insufficient to protect livestock, particularly in conservation grazing settings.**

### **Panel Commentary**

The Panel considers the evidence received from farmers, conservation groups and agricultural organisations to be compelling and indicative of a longstanding and unresolved legislative gap. Stakeholders consistently reported that the current Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 does not adequately protect livestock from being chased, stressed or attacked by dogs, and that incidents, particularly involving sheep on conservation grazing sites, are becoming more frequent.

The Panel also notes that the [Policing of Parks Regulations 2005](#) apply certain restrictions to the control of dogs in public parks. These Regulations set out where dogs may be exercised off-lead. The Panel notes that the conservation or grazing sites referenced in stakeholder submissions that fall under these Regulations are Les Mielles and Noirmont which are designated as public parks (under Part 4). All other locations identified as areas where livestock worrying occurs, such as Plemont, Grosnez, La Coupe and other open conservation landscapes, fall outside the scope of the parks regime. As a result, the statutory dog-control provisions that apply within designated parks do not extend to the majority of sites where livestock are grazed in open, multiuser environments.

Given that submissions identified livestock worrying as “the largest single welfare concern”, the Panel considers the current legislative protections to be inadequate. The evidence demonstrates that the existing framework does not sufficiently deter or prevent incidents that cause significant emotional, financial and welfare impacts for livestock keepers.

Enforcement bodies also highlighted significant challenges in applying the livestock worrying provisions within the Dogs Law. Evidence from the Comité des Chefs and the SoJP demonstrated that livestock worrying is difficult to investigate and prosecute, especially when incidents are unwitnessed or dogs are off lead in open areas. The Panel notes that both agencies commonly rely on informal advice rather than formal enforcement, and that prosecutions under the existing framework are rare. This indicates that the current evidential thresholds and offence definitions do not provide practical tools to prevent or address livestock worrying incidents.

The Panel is further concerned by limitations in the recording of incidents. Evidence revealed that SoJP statistics do not capture reports dealt with at Parish level unless escalated to a Parish Hall Inquiry. As a result, the true scale of livestock worrying may be under-reported, impeding the Government’s ability to monitor trends or design effective preventative measures. This issue is further compounded by the fact that Jersey’s 12 parishes operate without a centralised system or consistent approach to recording animal-related incidents.

---

<sup>65</sup> [2026.01.27 Letter, Comité des Connetable](#)

Despite the issue being raised repeatedly during the consultation on the Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law and during scrutiny of P.63/2025, substantive reform of the Dogs Law has yet to materialise. While the Comité des Connétables have indicated that work is “ongoing”, no legislative changes to address these issues have been brought forward to date. Given the persistence of the problem, the legislative ambiguity identified, the uneven legislative coverage regarding dog control and the increasing welfare incidents outlined by stakeholders, the Panel considers that reform is both urgent and overdue.

Therefore, the Panel has lodged the Draft Dogs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- (P.43/2025) to widen the offence of livestock worrying to include a dog that is not on a lead or within 5 metres and under the control of the person in charge of it and is on agricultural land on which there is livestock. As set out in Article 11 – Offences of the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961, the offence carries a penalty of a fine of Level 2 on the Standard scale (£1,000).

The Panel believes that this amendment is an important first step in providing clearer and more enforceable protections for livestock and enabling both proactive prevention and proportionate enforcement.

**AMENDMENT: To widen the offence of livestock worrying within the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 to include a dog that is not on a lead or within 5 metres and under the control of the person in charge of it and is on agricultural land on which there is livestock.**

Following the lodging of the Draft Dogs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.43/2026](#)), the Panel engaged with the Office for the Children’s Commissioner for Jersey, who highlighted the importance of considering the rights and responsibilities of children within the existing legislative framework. Under Article 1 of the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961, an “owner” is defined as a person aged 16 or over, meaning that 16- and 17-year-olds already hold legal responsibilities and are subject to offences under the current Law. In widening the offence of livestock worrying, the Draft Regulations similarly extend the range of circumstances in which young owners may be held responsible. In addition, because new Article 9(1) provides that liability may also arise for a person “in charge” of a dog other than the owner, the legislation captures situations where younger children are in charge of dogs. The Panel therefore recognises the need to ensure that the rights, capacities and safeguarding considerations relating to children are appropriately reflected and therefore have published a Children’s Rights Impact Assessment screener to accompany the Draft Dogs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202– ([P.43/2026](#)).

The Panel further considers that the effectiveness of strengthening the legislative framework may ultimately be undermined by limited public understanding of where livestock are grazing and of dog owner responsibilities around livestock. This is especially pronounced in light of the evidence that dogs are routinely exercised off lead in areas where livestock are present, and that many dog owners remain unaware of or indifferent to the risk that even dogs can pose to livestock.

The Panel therefore considers improved public awareness will be essential, including the use of clear signage in areas where livestock are grazing and wider communications to ensure dog owners understand when and where dogs must be kept on a lead.

**RECOMMENDATION: Within 6 months of the Panel’s amendment to the Dogs Law being adopted, the Comité des Connétables should conduct a public awareness campaign of the amendment and**

**should advise livestock owners to install signage in grazing areas to ensure dog-owners understand when dogs must be kept on a lead and the consequences of failing to do so.**

### Conclusion

Livestock matters have exposed a clear structural divide between Jersey's welfare and control legislation, and while the Minister for the Environment has articulated distinct policy purposes for each framework, their practical interaction reveals areas of complexity, ambiguity and operational tension.

The Panel has proposed two amendments to ensure that the legislative framework functions fairly and effectively. First, to remove the ability for improvement notices to be issued for livestock straying where the underlying issue relates to inadequate fencing or boundary conditions, and second, to strengthen the definition of livestock worrying so that dogs off lead and not within 5 metres of their owner or person in charge constitutes an offence in the presence of livestock.

While these provisions sit within separate legislative regimes, the Panel considers that these amendments will help ensure that both welfare and control-based protections operate in a more coherent and practical manner, reflecting the realities of livestock management in Jersey. Together, these changes form an initial but important step toward a more proportionate, enforceable and preventative approach to livestock protection.

## Part 3 - Animal Control

### Introduction

This Part sets out the framework governing the control of animals in public spaces in Jersey and examines how the various laws, regulations and enforcement arrangements operate in practice.

It considers the statutory responsibilities of the different Ministers and the Comité des Connétables, the requirements placed on dog owners and other animal keepers, and the mechanisms available to address poor animal control, nuisance and public safety concerns. The Part also reviews how enforcement is carried out by the relevant bodies and explores the practical challenges arising from the current system.

### Legislative Framework

The framework governing animal control in Jersey sits across various laws and regulations that are under the statutory responsibility of different Ministers and authority bodies.

The [Dogs \(Jersey\) Law 1961](#) provides a legal framework for the regulation and control of dogs in Jersey and sits under the responsibility of the Comité des Connétables. However, the Minister for the Environment is delegated Order-making powers under Articles 1B, 5B(5), and 5C.

The [Policing of Beaches \(Jersey\) Regulations 1959](#) sit under the responsibility of the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development and include the following offences related to animal control:

- To ride a pony or horse or permit a dog off lead on beaches between the hours of 10.30am and 6pm during the period of 1st May and 30th September.
- To permit a dog to rush at, worry or otherwise interfere with the safety, comfort or convenience of any other person on the beach.
- To fail to remove and bin any faeces deposited by a dog on a beach.

However, in correspondence to the Panel, the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development confirmed that, while the Policing of Beaches (Jersey) Regulations 1959 fall within his statutory responsibility, enforcement and operational management sit with the twelve Parishes. The Minister further advised that reform would not be appropriate without the support and engagement of the Comité des Connétables. Following a public petition in 2024, options for reform were explored but did not secure sufficient support. The Minister also noted that he remains open to legislative change should the position of the Parishes shift.<sup>66</sup>

The [Policing of Roads \(Jersey\) Regulations 1959](#) sit under the responsibility of the Minister for Infrastructure and include the following offences related to animal control:

- To permit any animal to foul a footpath.
- To fail to remove any faeces deposited by a dog on a road.
- To permit a dog to stray on the road or allow the dog off lead within the area enclosed by and including the Esplanade, Peirson Road, Cheapside, Elizabeth Place, Rouge Bouillon, Springfield

---

<sup>66</sup> [2026-01-23-MSED-Response-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Policing-of-Beaches.pdf](#)

Road, Janvrin Road, St. Mark's Road, St. Saviour's Road, Pleasant Street, Clarence Road, Don Road, Colomberie, Grenville Street, Green Street, Route du Fort and Weighbridge.

The [Policing of Parks \(Jersey\) Regulations 2005](#) also sit under the responsibility of the Minister for Infrastructure and include the following animal control provisions:

- In Part 1 parks, dogs are permitted but they must be kept on a lead and must stay on the established paths.
- In Part 2 parks, dogs are permitted but they must be kept on a lead at all times while in the park.
- Dogs are permitted into a Part 3 or Part 4 parks without restrictions.
- Horses and ponies can be taken into a Part 4 park, but they must be ridden or led only on designated roads or riding paths created by the park authority.
- It is an offence to destroy, injure or take an animal, a bird (including an egg) or a fish in a park.
- It is an offence for a dog owner to fail to remove and bin any faeces deposited by their dog in a park.

The [Animal Welfare Codes](#) sit beneath the Animal Welfare Law and are administered by the States Veterinary Office under the responsibility of the Minister for the Environment. The Codes provide guidance and set out good practice expectations for the care of animals in Jersey and include specific provisions for professional dog walkers in relation to animal control. While the Policing Regulations are linked on the same webpage, there is no equivalent guidance for domestic animal owners on the general control of animals in public places, leaving a gap in accessible advice for the wider public.

**FINDING: Animal control in Jersey is regulated through a range of independent legislative instruments and policy documents, which fall under the responsibility of three Ministerial portfolios and the Comité des Connétables.**

During its scrutiny of the Draft Dogs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- ([P.63/2025](#)), the Panel examined how the Dogs Law addresses the general control of dogs. It found that Article 1C sets out provisioning where a dog's behaviour has given rise to "reasonable alarm or apprehension" on the part of a person for a person's safety or the safety of a domestic animal or livestock.

However, during a public hearing with the Comité des Connétables on [P.63/2025](#), the Panel learnt that the only formal mechanism to address issues of control is through an application to the Magistrate's Court to seek a Court order, under Article 11B.<sup>67</sup>

While the provisions provide sufficient clarity and scope for addressing behaviour that arises from poor control, the available remedy sits at a high evidential and procedural threshold, that may create practical barriers to enforcement of more routine control issues.

**FINDING: Jersey's animal-control legislation provides neither a statutory definition of "proper control" nor practical guidance on how animals should be appropriately controlled in public spaces.**

Within the Minister for Infrastructure's response to the Panel's letter, it was confirmed that the Parks Team has been reviewing the suitability of current designations under the Policing of Parks Regulations in response to rising dog-ownership and ongoing monitoring of park use. The Minister advised that two amendments are actively being considered: designating the newly extended

---

<sup>67</sup> [Jersey-EHI-Panel-Public-Hearing-Draft-Dogs-Law-\(Witness-Comité-des-Connétables\)-24-10-2025.pdf](#)

Coronation Park playing fields as a Part 2 park, and reclassifying Millennium Town Park from Part 1 to Part 2 to allow dogs on leads throughout its green spaces.<sup>68</sup>

He further indicated that signage across all Government-owned parks is being reviewed to ensure clarity and consistency, and that additional locations require further assessment to ensure a proportionate and uniform approach across the island.<sup>69</sup>

### Enforcement

During the Panel's Enforcement Hearing, the evidence demonstrated that the enforcement of animal control legislation is also divided between multiple bodies, each with distinct but sometimes overlapping roles.

The Honorary Police are the primary responders for animal control issues occurring on roads, beaches, parks, and other public spaces, as well as for minor or non-criminal incidents. In contrast, the SoJP are responsible for criminal offences and for undertaking investigatory work where an offence is met.<sup>70</sup>

The SoJP explained that their involvement in animal control predominantly concerns dogs that are dangerously out of control, which became a criminal offence in early 2025.

**FINDING: Enforcement of animal control provisions is undertaken mostly by the Honorary Police, with the States of Jersey Police involvement contained to where criminal investigation is needed.**

In 2025, the SoJP received 124 dog-related reports in 2025, an increase of around 20 incidents from the previous year: an increase thought to be linked to the rise in dog ownership following COVID-19. Of these reports, approximately one-third proceed to investigation, and around one-third of those continue to prosecution via either a Parish Hall Inquiry or the Magistrate's Court. The SoJP emphasised that although these numbers have risen, they remain low overall, and that public compliance is generally very good.<sup>71</sup> However, as mentioned in Part 2 – Livestock, the statistics held by the SoJP on animal-related incidents may not capture those resolved informally by the Honorary Police.<sup>72</sup>

**FINDING: Incidents of animal control are dealt with in the form of "words of advice" rather than formal enforcement, with Island animal-owners described as generally law-abiding and responsive to advice by the police.**

The Honorary Police reported that the most frequent animal issues they encounter are:<sup>73</sup>

- dog fouling
- dogs unrestrained or out of control on road, beaches and in parks
- straying livestock

In relation to enforcement of the Policing Regulations, the Honorary Police highlighted the practical difficulties in securing evidence, particularly for dog fouling. They reported that attributing the offence to a specific owner was almost impossible and that the Chair of the Comité des Chefs de Police had never seen a fine issued for fouling.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> [2026-02-04-Letter-MINF-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Policing-of-Parks.pdf](#)

<sup>69</sup> [2026-02-04-Letter-MINF-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Policing-of-Parks.pdf](#)

<sup>70</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pgs. 2-3

<sup>71</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 5

<sup>72</sup> [Transcript, Animal Welfare & Control Review, SoJP and Comité des Chef de Police](#), pg. 18

<sup>73</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pgs. 3 & 7

<sup>74</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 22

The Panel heard consistently that, for most lower-level animal control incidents, enforcement is carried out through education and advice rather than penalties.

The Honorary Police explained that, in the majority of cases, they rely on “*words of advice*” to resolve issues. It was argued that this approach was rooted in both practicality and proportionality given many incidents do not meet an evidential threshold for prosecution, and informal engagement is often sufficient to secure compliance.<sup>75</sup>

Generally, the Enforcement Hearing highlighted that members of the public are generally law abiding and responsive to warnings, and that repeated problems are relatively rare.

However, it was highlighted that the inability of Centeniers to compel payment of compensation acts as a barrier to effective enforcement at Parish Hall. Where compensation is not paid voluntarily, the only available option is to escalate the matter to the Magistrate’s Court, a response he considered disproportionate for what is often a low-level incident.<sup>76</sup>

When asked about underlying causes of common animal control issues, the Honorary Police cited poor knowledge of dog owners as the key factor.<sup>77</sup> This shall be considered in full in Part 4 - Public Education & Awareness.

**FINDING: The statistics held by the States of Jersey Police do not provide a complete picture of animal-related incidents, as they do not include cases resolved informally by the Honorary Police.**

#### **Panel Commentary**

The Panel recognises that, notwithstanding the serious issues relating to livestock worrying identified in Part 2 of this Review, Jersey’s wider animal control framework is generally well-regulated.

However, the system lacks structural coherence. Responsibilities are dispersed across multiple legislative instruments and Ministerial portfolios, with the Comité des Connétables holding legislative responsibility for the Dogs Law, exercising enforcement powers through the Honorary Police under the Policing Regulations, and as set out in the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development’s correspondence, holding authority in practice over legislative reforms to the Policing of Beaches Regulations.

At present, incidents handled informally by the Honorary Police are not routinely captured in SoJP data, meaning policymakers lack an accurate picture of prevalence, repeat offending and geographic patterns. This gap is particularly concerning in the context of rising dog ownership and increasing reports of poor control, as it undermines the ability to monitor trends, target resources, and evaluate legislative effectiveness. The Panel notes that the absence of centralised, consistent data collection on dog related and livestock related incidents may materially weaken the deterrent effect of the current system.

The Panel therefore recommends that, as the body with the most authority over the animal control framework, the Comité des Connétables should establish a shared reporting mechanism to capture all animal related incidents attended to by the SoJP and Honorary Police across all Parishes, including those resolved informally, to support policy development and enforcement evaluation by June 2027.

---

<sup>75</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pgs. 12 & 19

<sup>76</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 23

<sup>77</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 20

**RECOMMENDATION: The Comité des Connétables should establish a shared reporting mechanism to capture all animal-related incidents attended to by the States of Jersey Police and Honorary Police, including those resolved informally, to support policy development and enforcement evaluation by June 2027.**

The evidence gathered during this Review and the Panel's previous work on P.63/2025 demonstrates that enforcement thresholds vary significantly across regimes and that there is no unified statutory concept of "proper control" within the animal control framework.

This omission creates practical confusion for both dog owners and enforcement bodies. Different laws impose different expectations, ranging from "reasonable alarm or apprehension" under the Dogs Law to varying lead requirements across beaches, roads and parks, yet none provide a clear, overarching definition of the standard of control required in public places. As highlighted throughout the evidence, this leads to inconsistent enforcement, uncertainty for the public about what is legally required, and preventable incidents arising from poor knowledge.

Accordingly, the Panel recommends that the Comité des Connétables introduce a clear definition of "proper control" into the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961, aligned with the standards currently applied under the Policing Regulations. The Panel considers that a consistent Island-wide definition will improve clarity for dog-owners and remedy the current absence of alignment.

**RECOMMENDATION: Before the end of the next term, the Comité des Connétables should agree a definition of "proper control" and amend the Dogs Law 1961 to align with the animal control provisions within the Policing Regulations.**

Building on this definition, the Panel further recommends that the Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961 be amended to insert a new Article within Part 3 – Control of Dogs, establishing that:

- a dog must be kept under proper control by its owner or person in charge at all times when in a public place; and
- failure to do so constitutes an offence, with an appropriate penalty to be levied by the Connétable of the parish in which the offence occurred.

The penalty for such lower-level offences should not exceed a fine of Level 1 on the standard scale.

The Panel considers that pairing a statutory definition with a corresponding enforceable duty would fill a significant gap in the current framework. Evidence demonstrated that many of the most common issues encountered by the Honorary Police fall below the high evidential threshold required to pursue a "dangerously out of control" offence. As a result, such incidents are routinely resolved only through informal advice, even when behaviour is repeated or presents clear risk.

The Panel further notes that creating an offence for failing to keep a dog under proper control would introduce a lower threshold for intervention without requiring escalation to the Magistrate's Court, which is appropriate for more serious behaviour only. A general statutory duty of proper control, backed by a proportionate parish-level enforcement mechanism, would provide a practical and preventative tool to address irresponsible dog behaviour before it escalates into more serious harm.

**RECOMMENDATION: Before the end of the next term, the Comité des Connétables should amend the Dogs Law 1961 to require that a dog must be kept under "proper control" by its owner or person in charge at all times appropriate to the public place it is in, with failure to do so constituting an offence with a penalty not exceeding Level 1 on the standard scale.**

As part of its review, the Panel also notes that Sites of Special Interest (SSIs) experience significant dog-walking pressures during the summer in response to the beach restrictions set out by the Policing of Beaches Regulations. The Minister for the Environment provided evidence that increased dog activity on SSIs contributes to erosion, nutrient enrichment from dog waste, and disturbance to sensitive wildlife. Monitoring undertaken by Natural Environment identifies substantial dog presence at sites such as Les Blanches Banques, Noirmont and La Mielle de Morville, including high levels of professional dog-walking activity.<sup>78</sup> These environmental concerns are contained within the Marine Spatial Plan, which identifies the need to review dog-management measures in ecologically sensitive coastal areas.<sup>79</sup>

In noting the Minister for Sustainable Economic Development's comments that no changes to the Policing of Beaches Regulations would be taken forward without the approval of the Comité des Connétables. The Panel questioned the Chair of the Comité des Connétables during the States Assembly sitting on 3rd February 2026 on the comments. The Chair explained that the Comité's role in the Minister's inquiry was as a consultee rather than a decision-maker, but agreed that initiating a public consultation would be the most appropriate next step.<sup>80</sup>

The Panel agrees that a public consultation on the Policing of Beaches Regulations is necessary not only in light of the environmental impacts identified and public interest in reform, but also because the current division of responsibilities for policing, environmental protection and public spaces creates barriers to coherent and timely change.

Moreover, to ensure a consistent and aligned approach across Jersey's wider animal-control framework, the Panel recommends that the Comité des Connétables work with the relevant Ministers to identify any further areas where alignment or reform may be required, including within the Dogs Law and the Policing of Roads, Parks and Beaches Regulations.

**RECOMENDATION: The Comité des Connétables, in partnership with the relevant Ministers, should undertake a coordinated review of the Policing of Roads, Parks and Beaches Regulations to identify any areas requiring further alignment across the wider animal-control framework.**

## Conclusion

The evidence considered in this Part demonstrates that Jersey's animal-control framework is dispersed across multiple legislative instruments, administered by several Ministerial portfolios and the Comité des Connétables, and supported by varied parish-level enforcement arrangements. While these provisions collectively provide the statutory basis for managing dogs and other animals in public spaces, the framework lacks structural coherence and offers no unified concept of "proper control".

Enforcement practice further reflects these structural limitations. The Panel heard that most lower-level incidents are resolved through informal advice rather than formal action, due both to evidential constraints and the practical challenges of attributing offences such as dog fouling. The lack of centralised, consistent data across parishes and SoJP may also limit the ability to monitor trends or evaluate the effectiveness of existing controls.

---

<sup>78</sup> [2026.02.09 Response - Animal Welfare and Control Review - Public Hearing Follow-up.pdf](#)

<sup>79</sup> [JMSP Priorities and Actions Plan.pdf](#), Priority RT5

<sup>80</sup> [Edited-Hansard-2026-02-03.pdf](#)

The Panel's recommendations therefore seek to introduce greater clarity, proportionality and alignment across the control framework. Establishing a statutory definition of "proper control", creating a lower-level offence for routine control failures, improving cross-regime consistency, and enhancing shared data capture will provide a more workable, enforceable and coherent system.

However, the Panel also recognises that legislative reform alone will not resolve all the challenges identified. Evidence from both enforcement bodies and stakeholders highlighted that many animal-control issues arise not from deliberate non-compliance, but from a lack of awareness or understanding among the public.

## Part 4 - Public Education & Awareness

### Introduction

This Part considers the evidence gathered related to public education and awareness of animal welfare and control and examines opportunities to strengthen public awareness and understanding.

### Evidence

Within the written submissions submitted to this Review, a few responses noted that the increasing number of dogs in Jersey combined with a lack of understanding of the Policing Regulations has contributed to more frequent incidents of dogs being under poor control.<sup>81 82</sup>

The Panel also noted that during the States Assembly debate on the most recent amendments to the Policing of Parks Regulations ([P.90.2025](#)), States Members raised concerns regarding non-compliance.<sup>83</sup> In subsequent correspondence, the Minister for Infrastructure attributed this to the fact that different parks fall within different regulatory categories, resulting in materially different rules regarding dog access and control in parks. For example, some parks permit dogs on leads throughout, others restrict dogs to designated pathways, while certain protected parks like Howard Davis Park prohibit dogs entirely.<sup>84</sup>

This was reinforced during the Enforcement Public Hearing, wherein the Comité des Chef's commented that many incidents arise from a lack of knowledge or awareness of the requirement for dogs to be on leads in designated areas.<sup>85</sup>

Moreover, during the Enforcement Hearing the Comité des Chef de Police highlighted that insufficient or unclear signage, particularly in parks and beaches, was a major contributor to non-compliance under the Policing Regulations. By contrast, it was explained that new signage at the Les Quennevais Sports Centre, for example, had already improved compliance by making restrictions more visible and understandable.<sup>86</sup>

During the Ministerial Public Hearing, the Chief States Vet reinforced these concerns, explaining that many issues relating to dog control arise from a lack of public awareness and that responsible dog ownership depends on people knowing where they may walk their dogs, when leads are required, and how to exercise appropriate control.<sup>87</sup>

**FINDING: Dog-control issues largely arise from public confusion caused by inconsistent regulatory categories, unclear or insufficient signage, and a general lack of awareness about when and where dogs must be on leads.**

During the Enforcement Public Hearing, it also became clear that the division of responsibilities between the Parishes, the States of Jersey Police, the States Veterinary Service, the JSPCA and other agencies for animal reports is not clearly defined within the relevant legislation or regulations, leading to inconsistent public expectations and inefficiencies in how incidents are handled.

---

<sup>81</sup> [2026-01-11-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Spotted-Wellies.pdf](#)

<sup>82</sup> [2026-01-12-Written-Submission-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Anonymous-2.pdf](#)

<sup>83</sup> [States Assembly | Official Report - 21st January 2026](#)

<sup>84</sup> [2026-02-04-Letter-MINF-Animal-Welfare-Control-Review-Policing-of-Parks.pdf](#)

<sup>85</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 9

<sup>86</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 12

<sup>87</sup> [Ministerial Public Hearing Transcript](#), pg. 47

The Chair of the Comité des Chefs de Police observed that “*people are not cognisant...of who is the lead,*”<sup>88</sup> while the Chief Inspector noted that the Police and Honorary Police “*may not be the right agency to call for animal welfare,*” with some matters more appropriately handled by the JSPCA or the States Vet.<sup>89</sup>

Both agencies reported that they are frequently contacted about welfare-related issues for which they are not the responsible authority. This mis-direction places unnecessary demand on policing resources and demonstrates a wider lack of clarity among the public about where responsibility lies.<sup>90</sup>

In addition to the public uncertainty surrounding where responsibility lies, the Panel also heard that this ambiguity persists within the agencies themselves. Earlier in the report, evidence from the States of Jersey Police highlighted the need for clearer and more formalised internal guidance on lead agency responsibilities, including clearer distinctions between the roles of inspectors and police officers, improved information sharing arrangements, and agreed contingency procedures for periods when inspectors are unavailable, such as out-of-hours. The Panel has already made a recommendation to address these internal clarity gaps.

**FINDING: Public confusion and unclear responsibilities across and within the relevant agencies are causing mis-direction in the reporting and handling of animal welfare and control incidents.**

#### Panel Commentary

The evidence received demonstrates that a lack of clear, accessible information is a central factor contributing to noncompliance with animal control requirements in Jersey. Although the Policing Regulations and the Dogs Law set out detailed provisions for dog behaviour, lead requirements and access restrictions, this information is communicated to the public primarily through on-site signage.

There is not a single, public facing source of information meaning that dog owners must navigate multiple pieces of legislation to understand their obligations, and the Panel heard repeatedly that many are unaware of basic requirements such as lead restrictions in certain parks, beaches or road areas.

In the Panel’s view, ensuring that the public can easily understand and access information about dog control requirements is fundamental to achieving consistent compliance and reducing reliance on informal advice. The Panel therefore considers that clear, collaborative guidance is needed, setting out, in one accessible place, the rules that apply across beaches, parks, roads and other public spaces.

Given that the Dogs Law governs the control and ownership of dogs, the Panel considers that this guidance should be developed by the Comité des Connétables in collaboration with the Ministers responsible for the Policing Regulations. The Panel does not seek to prescribe where this information must be hosted; however, it considers that it could appropriately sit in accessible public-facing locations such as Parish websites alongside dog-licensing information, on a central Government of Jersey webpage, or within the Animal Welfare Codes should that be deemed the most effective means of communicating consistent guidance.

**RECOMMENDATION: A single, accessible source of guidance on dog-control requirements across all public spaces should be developed collaboratively by the Comité des Connétables and the Ministers responsible for the Policing Regulations and published by 31st December 2027.**

---

<sup>88</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 11

<sup>89</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 4

<sup>90</sup> [Enforcement Public Hearing](#), pg. 4

The Panel also identified broader confusion about which authority is responsible for responding to different animal related incidents. Enforcement bodies reported being routinely contacted about matters outside their remit, such as welfare incidents directed to the Police or Honorary Police instead of the States Veterinary Office or the JSPCA. This misdirection places unnecessary demand on policing resources and reflects the wider structural fragmentation explored in Part 3. Evidence from both the Comité des Chefs de Police and the States of Jersey Police highlighted the need for clearer signposting so that the public knows when, how and to whom an incident should be reported.

Given that the Draft Animal Welfare Law will be accompanied with Island-wide communications about the updated provisions, the Panel deems that this provides an opportune moment to clarify which organisations should be contacted in specific animal-related scenarios. Therefore, the Panel recommends that the Minister for the Environment should conduct a public awareness campaign highlighting which authority the public should contact as part of the communications for the implementation of the Draft Law.

**RECOMMENDATION: The Minister for the Environment should conduct a public awareness campaign for the implementation of the Draft Animal Welfare Law highlighting which authority to contact for different types of animal welfare and control incidents.**

### Conclusion

Taken together, these findings indicate that greater clarity and coordination are required to ensure the public can understand and comply with Jersey's animal control and animal welfare arrangements. Legislative provisions and enforcement mechanisms will be effective only if supported by clear, accessible communication. The Panel therefore considers that a coordinated approach across responsible authorities is essential to improving public understanding and supporting responsible dog ownership.

## Conclusion

Across all four Parts of this Review, a consistent picture emerges: while Jersey's animal welfare and animal control arrangements contain many well-intentioned and necessary provisions, the overall framework is fragmented, unevenly implemented and in need of greater coherence, clarity and oversight.

The Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202– represents a significant and widely supported step forward, modernising an outdated 2004 Law and introducing preventative tools, broader offences and strengthened enforcement powers. However, weaknesses in consultation, areas of legislative ambiguity particularly around shared responsibility and the breadth of the Minister's Order making powers mean that key safeguards and clearer guidance are required to ensure the new regime operates fairly and effectively.

Part 2 has demonstrated that longstanding tensions between welfare legislation and livestock control provisions create practical challenges for farmers, inspectors and enforcement bodies. The proposed amendment to remove improvement notices for livestock straying issues related to boundary conditions and refining the definition of livestock worrying, represent targeted steps to better align these overlapping systems and to deliver more proportionate and workable protections for livestock keepers.

Part 3 highlighted structural fragmentation across the wider animal control landscape, where multiple pieces of legislation, dispersed enforcement responsibilities and inconsistent data collection undermine clarity and reduce public compliance. The absence of a statutory definition of "proper control," variations in enforcement and a lack of coordinated public facing information have contributed to confusion among dog owners and unnecessary pressures on enforcement agencies. Improvements in cross regime consistency, shared data capture and clearer public guidance are therefore essential. This was reiterated in Part 4, which further highlighted the need for greater clarity and coordination of public communications to support effective enforcement and compliance with Jersey's animal control and welfare arrangements.

The Panel's Review overall has demonstrated that, while legislative reform will provide important new tools to strengthen animal welfare and control in Jersey, it must be accompanied by clear communication, improved inter-agency coordination, and stronger mechanisms for democratic oversight. A more coherent and accessible framework is essential to ensure that the Island's approach to animal welfare, livestock protection, and the control of animals in public spaces is effective and practical for all who depend on it.

## Appendices

### Panel Membership



Deputy Tom Coles

Vice-Chair



Deputy Alex Curtis

Member



Connétable David  
Johnson

Member



Deputy David Warr

Member

### Terms of Reference

1. To examine whether the *Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202-* is fit for purpose and how it will meet its intended aims of:
  - a. replacing the *Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 2004* to shift from a reactive enforcement model towards a proactive, prevention-based system,
  - b. aligning with modern scientific understanding of animal sentience and current UK and EU welfare standards, and
  - c. granting the Minister with greater flexibility to respond quickly to new scientific developments or welfare guidance.
2. To identify any effects, resource implications and/or unintended consequences of the *Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202-* on enforcement officers, animal welfare organisations, animal-activity operators, pet-owners and the wider public.
3. To assess the structure of the *Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202-*, including the provision for order-making powers and the role of secondary legislation.
4. To examine the coherence, clarity and effectiveness of the existing statutory framework governing dog ownership, behaviour and control.

5. To evaluate the coherence and compatibility of the *Draft Animal Welfare (Jersey) Law 202-*, the *Dogs (Jersey) Law 1961* and *Policing of Beaches, Parks and Roads Regulations* as a combined framework, including:
  - a. gaps, overlaps or inconsistencies between the regimes,
  - b. alignment of enforcement powers across relevant bodies,
  - c. the effectiveness of the combined model for welfare, ownership and public protection, and
  - d. whether consolidation is desirable.

#### Evidence

The written submissions received to this Review can be viewed [here](#).

The correspondence sent and received as part of this Review can be viewed [here](#).

The correspondence sent and received in regards to the Draft Dogs Law (Jersey) Amendment Regulations 202- can be viewed [here](#).

The transcripts for this Review can be viewed using the following links:

[2026-01-29-Animal-Welfare-and-Control-Review-Minister-for-the-Environment.pdf](#)

[2026-01-29-Animal-Welfare-and-Control-Review-SoJ-Police-Comité-des-Chef-de-Police.pdf](#)

#### Cost of Review

The costs of this review totalled £443.63.

