

Privileges and Procedures Committee

(37th Meeting)

2nd June 2025

Part A (Non-Exempt)

All members were present, with the exception of Deputies C. S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair and T.A. Coles of St. Helier South, from whom apologies had been received.

Connétable K. Shenton-Stone of St. Martin, Chair
Deputy L. K. F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter (for a time)
Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade
Deputy S.M. Ahier of St. Helier North
Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour

In attendance -

L-M. Hart, Greffier of the States
W. Millow, Deputy Greffier of the States
Y. Fillieul, Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support
J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement
C. Fearn, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
C. Tucker, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
E. Patterson, Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat
K.M. Larbalestier, Principal Secretariat Officer, Specialist Secretariat

Note: The Minutes of this meeting comprise Parts A and B.

Minutes.	A1. The Minutes of the meetings held on 28th and 30th April and 8th and 21st May 2025, having previously been circulated, were taken as read and were confirmed.
Action list: Privileges and Procedures Committee.	<p>A2. The Committee noted the actions and outcomes arising from previous meetings as follows –</p> <p><u>Code of Conduct</u> – the Committee recalled that the Commissioner for Standards had recently attended a briefing for Members on the draft revised Code of Conduct. A further briefing was scheduled for 11th June 2025, and the Commissioner would be requested to illustrate conduct issues within a Jersey specific context.</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the guidance which accompanied the draft Code should be published as an addendum to P.35/2025.</p> <p><u>Responses to Questions</u> – the Committee noted that the States Greffe was developing a process to follow up on outstanding responses to questions, particularly where a holding response had been received.</p>
Minutes and action lists: Privileges and Procedures	A3. The Committee noted the Minutes of the meetings of the various Sub-Committees of the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the actions and outcomes arising from the same.

Sub-
Committees.

Health and
Care
Partnership
Board:
presentation.

A4. The Committee received Deputy T.J.A. Binet of St. Saviour, Minister for Health and Social Services, Ms. R. Johnson, Head of Health Policy, Health and Care Jersey and Mr. C. Rondel, Private Secretary, and received a presentation in connexion with proposals to establish a new Health and Care Partnership Board, together with the continuation of the Health and Care Services Board (formerly known as the Health and Community Services Advisory Board).

The Committee noted that P.170/2010 required Ministers to seek the approval of the States for the establishment of certain bodies. Ministers were also required to consult with the Public Accounts and Privileges and Procedures Committees and the relevant Scrutiny Panel.

The Committee noted that proposals for an integrated health and care system were currently being implemented by Health and Care Jersey (HCJ) (formerly the Health and Community Services Department). These included, among other things, the establishment of a new Partnership Board and the continuation of the Health and Care Services Board. The Committee was advised that a proposition to this effect would be lodged '*au Greffe*' for debate in September 2025.

The Committee noted the background to the proposals, the constitution of the Boards and the respective roles and objectives. The Committee was advised that Government Plan funding for the Health and Care Services Board had already been secured within the Health and Care Jersey budget, with a total of £206,000 having been allocated. Actual spend for the former Advisory Board had been £134,000 and it was intended to fund the new Partnership Board (at a cost of £70,000) from the underspend.

The Committee discussed the proposals with the Minister and noted that whilst ongoing underspends in respect of the Partnership Board could not be guaranteed, it was intended to remain within budgetary constraints.

In terms of compliance with P.170/2010, and with particular regard to consultation, Ms. Johnson advised that a formal response was not required from the Committee in relation to the proposals. However, the Minister invited informal views from Members. Deputies L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour and L.K.F. Stephenson of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter declined to express a view on the proposals ahead of the debate in light of their roles on Scrutiny Panels, while the remaining Members expressed support in principle. Deputies Doublet and Stephenson also expressed reservations as to whether a briefing on the proposals was in accordance with the spirit of P.170/2010 – this view was not supported by other Members. The Committee noted that there would be a number of opportunities for Members to comment on the proposals in the form of formal responses arising from Scrutiny reviews and Ministerial briefings before and after the proposition was lodged. Members were also at liberty to lodge amendments to any proposal.

The Committee thanked the delegation for the presentation and they withdrew from the meeting.

Social media
policy: review.

A5. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A9 of 28th April 2025, received a presentation from Ms. J. O'Brien, Head of Digital and Public Engagement (DPE) in connexion with the States Assembly Social Media Policy. The Committee's attention was also drawn to correspondence dated 12th May 2025, from the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee (SLC) in which concerns were

expressed regarding the impact of negative comments regarding scrutiny related matters on States Assembly social media accounts.

The Committee was advised that SLC believed that the current approach to social media posts left Members exposed and with little or no recourse. The President of SLC had requested that it be consulted on any policy review undertaken in this connexion and, in the meantime, had requested that the ability to comment on social media posts pertaining to scrutiny related matters be disabled to protect Members.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the existing Policy, which had been approved by the Political Awareness and Education Sub-Committee in June 2024 and was available on the States Assembly and Vote.je websites.

It was noted that States Assembly/Vote.je and Jersey Youth Assembly social media accounts were monitored by the DPE team during working hours and any issues which arose were dealt with in accordance with the aforementioned Policy. This included 'hiding' comments which breached the Policy from view. In April 2025, a human error had resulted in a failure to immediately conceal certain comments which were in direct breach of the Policy. The comments had remained visible for 2 weeks before being concealed and the incident had ultimately been reported to the States of Jersey Police. The user(s) had also been blocked from States Assembly social media accounts. One other incident of this nature had been reported to the Police in the recent past.

It was recalled that, at the instigation of Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour, the Committee had recently received a presentation from Mr. B. Mason, an Information Security Analyst from the Scottish Parliament Surveillance Unit. Mr. Mason had also addressed delegates at the Commonwealth Women Parliamentarians British Islands and Mediterranean Regional Conference in Edinburgh. Officers had contacted Mr. Mason following the Conference in order to gain a better understanding of the work of the Surveillance Unit and to draw on expertise. It was noted that the team comprised 3 officers at an annual cost of £250,000 (this included a yearly charge of £40,000 for the use of software). The software was used to monitor comments (during working hours) on the professional accounts of Members of the Scottish Parliament. The Surveillance Team programmed the software to recognise specific words and phrases, with a system generated report being reviewed each day. Over the last 2 years 7,000 abusive comments had been recorded under themed categories and, where appropriate, certain comments had been reported to Police Scotland. In such cases officers acted as witnesses on behalf of Members and there had been 2 convictions to date. The Committee noted that identifying perpetrators could often be challenging as the use of Virtual Private Networks made tracking difficult. Comments which were concerning but not deemed criminal often resulted in community policing input with recommendations being made in relation to personal safety measures for Members.

The Committee was advised that the Scottish Parliament social media accounts were monitored by the Digital Communications Team and comments were enabled on most platforms. The advice received was not to block users from social media accounts as this could result in more extreme behaviours. A more visible disclaimer was recommended to ensure that users were aware that abusive comments would be removed. It was noted that approaches to information security varied from one jurisdiction to another, with the United Kingdom Parliament employing 6 information security officers and the Dutch National Assembly adopting a 'hands-off' approach.

Whilst material policy changes were not proposed, it was intended to afford Members the opportunity of deciding whether to enable comments on posts in which they featured alone. It was hoped that this would address the concerns of those Members who had recently taken the decision not to participate in online public engagement activities unless comments were disabled. It was acknowledged that disabling comments might attract public criticism in the context of free speech. The Committee was also advised that comments could not be removed from content which was 'boosted'. This would have the effect of limiting visibility to existing followers. It was also suggested that the Committee might wish to remind Members to report any abusive comments on their professional social media accounts to DPE and the Police. DPE would maintain a record of such incidents and Members would be encouraged to add a disclaimer to their professional pages which made it clear that abusive comments would be removed.

The Committee discussed the above matter and noted a variety of views on what constituted an appropriate and proportionate approach to social media monitoring. Deputy Doublet advised the Committee that SLC had suggested that if comments on posts were disabled, information on how to contact Members directly could be added to posts. However, Ms. O'Brien highlighted the interactive nature of social media platforms and the risk associated with blocking all exchanges. Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade asked that data be shared with the Committee on the total number of users who had viewed content on States Assembly social media platforms over a specific period in order to understand overall 'reach'. Some discussion also ensued with regard to the use of the platform known as X (formerly Twitter), which some users were known to have left due to a combination of factors including changes in content quality, algorithms and controversy surrounding the owner of the platform. Reference was also made to the decentralised social media platform known as Bluesky, which aimed to offer users more control over their experience. Ms. O'Brien explained that X was still a popular social media platform and that engagement results from Bluesky had been disappointing.

In response to a question from Deputy Doublet, it was confirmed that, in the Jersey context, the monitoring of the professional accounts of Members was considered disproportionate. Deputy Doublet advised that she believed that the States Greffe should be responsible for reporting abusive content to the Police, as per the Scottish model. Whilst it was noted that officers had reported abusive content on the States Assembly website to the Police in the past and would continue to do so, additional resourcing and expertise would be required to mirror the Scottish approach. The Committee was advised that the Members' handbook included information on managing professional accounts and this could be enhanced if necessary. It was also recalled that the Chief Officer of the States of Jersey Police had delivered a presentation to Members on personal safety following the 2022 public election and that this would be repeated after the elections in 2026.

The Committee endorsed the recommendations set out in the report, to include the addition of an 'opt in' alert system for those Members who wished to be advised of abusive comments on social media posts. The Committee noted that a response would be prepared for SLC and its aforementioned decisions communicated to all States Members, together with a sample disclaimer for use on professional pages and copies of the Social Media Policy and rules.

States
Members'
activity
records.

A6. The Committee considered correspondence dated 12th May 2025, from the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee (SLC) in connexion with a request for Members' activity records on the States Assembly website to include a reference to any propositions/reports that Members had been involved in bringing forward in their capacity as a member of a Committee/Panel or as an Assistant Minister. The

Committee considered a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in this connexion.

The Committee recalled that, at present, official parliamentary business brought forward by a Committee/Panel appeared on the website under the name of the relevant body, and not individual members of that body. The request from SLC had been considered from a procedural perspective and it was noted that the current practice aligned with Standing Orders 19 and 35, which related to the lodging of propositions or amendments/the presentation of reports or comments by Ministers. Whilst the States of Jersey Law 2005 afforded Ministers the opportunity of delegating authority to Assistant Ministers for specific areas of responsibility, official business was lodged/presented in the name of the Minister. Similarly, Standing Orders did not provide for the lodging/presentation of official business by Scrutiny Panel/Committee Chairs and official business was progressed in the name of the relevant Panel/Committee.

The Committee was advised that whilst certain requests for enhancements to the website had been implemented, political sign-off was considered necessary in respect of others, such as the inclusion of training records on Members' profiles and the above request from SLC.

The Committee concluded that the current approach and procedural context was entirely satisfactory. Consequently, the request from SLC was not supported and the Committee requested that the decision be communicated.

Remote
participation in
States
Meetings: use
of cameras.

A7. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A14 of 9th December 2024, considered a report which had been prepared by the Assistant Greffier of the States, Chamber and Members' Support in connexion with a proposal to require States Members to turn on their cameras when participating remotely in States Meetings or, alternatively, install display screens in the Chamber so that it was obvious which Members were participating remotely. The aim of this was to ensure active participation and that the States was quorate at all times.

The Committee recalled that, at present, the States Greffe intermittently messaged Members who were participating remotely to ensure that the States was quorate. It was recognised that whilst Members were permitted to attend States Meetings, (which were held once every 3 weeks) remotely, there was a general expectation that Members would attend in person.

The Committee noted that it had been confirmed that it was possible to install 2 display screens in the Chamber for the intended purpose at a cost of £3,000. These could be located adjacent to the existing timer displays on either side of the Presiding Officer's desk.

In considering the above matter, the Committee recognised that, where a Member was unable to attend meetings of the States in person, there may be a valid reason for not wishing to switch on their cameras. In addition, the system was configured in such a way that the names of officers of the States Greffe who had joined the meeting via the Microsoft Teams link would also appear on the display screens. As an alternative to the proposal, the Committee was asked to consider whether it might be more appropriate for the Greffier of the States to advise States Members of the names of those individuals who would be joining the meeting remotely.

Having discussed the above matter, the Committee concluded that it would not be appropriate to require States Members to turn on their cameras when participating

remotely in States Meetings for the reasons set out above; nor was it considered necessary to install display screens in the Chamber. The Committee was satisfied with the existing arrangements whereby the States Greffe periodically messaged Members who were participating remotely to ensure that the States was quorate.

Remote
participation in
States
Meetings:
Members’
survey.

A8. The Committee, with reference to Minute No. A12 of 24th February 2025, received a report which had been prepared by the Deputy Greffier of the States in connexion with a survey which had been devised to garner opinions on remote participation in States Meetings (Standing Order 55A refers).

The Committee recalled that it had previously lodged ‘au Greffe’ 2 propositions, both of which sought to amend Standing Order 55A. The propositions had been subject to a ‘reference back’ to the Committee with a call for further consultation with Members on the subject.

The Committee had recently expressed support for revised proposals based on the comments made by Members during the most recent debate, subject to the removal of a reference to remote participation outside of Jersey being permitted in “unforeseen circumstances that could not be reasonably predicted”. Ahead of lodging the proposed amendments, the Committee had agreed that Members should be surveyed with a briefing to follow.

The Committee noted the results of the survey, which had been completed by 37 Members.

33 or more Members agreed that –

- remote participation should be possible in times of emergency or where the Bailiff determined that a quorum could not be achieved in person;
- Members should be able to participate remotely for health or wellbeing reasons;
- Members should continue to be able to be marked *malade* or absent due to parental responsibilities;
- the Minutes of States Meetings would record which Members had participated remotely;
- the Greffier of the States would retain anonymised records of the reasons given for remote participation for monitoring purposes; and,
- suspected abuse of the system would constitute a breach of the Code of Conduct for Elected Members.

30 – 32 Members agreed that –

- Members should be able to participate remotely as a result of caring responsibilities;
- Members should provide the reason for participating remotely to the Greffier;
- Members would be able to participate both remotely and in person during the course of a meeting day; and
- the Minutes of the States Meetings would record the reason in general terms for Members’ participating remotely.

25 Members agreed that –

- remote participation from outside the Island should only be permitted with the agreement of the States Assembly (through the adoption of a proposition without debate) with no requirement for prior notice of the proposition;

The following matters had not been agreed by a majority –

- Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island for reasons relating to their own health or wellbeing (23);
- Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island where caring responsibilities applied (21); and,
- Members should be able to participate remotely from outside the Island when absent on States business (14).

It was recommended that those matters which had been agreed by 33 or more Members and 30 – 32 Members should be incorporated into a revised proposition. The Committee was also asked to consider the following -

- whether to include a provision which allowed remote participation from outside the Island with the agreement of the States Assembly (through the adoption of a proposition without debate), with no requirement for prior notice of the same; and,
- whether to include the matters which had not been agreed by a majority, as detailed above, in the proposition.

If the Committee supported the inclusion of the aforementioned provisions, Members were asked to determine whether the proposition should be structured so as to allow for separate voting on the various aspects.

It was noted that Members had posed certain questions in their responses as follows –

- (a) Some Members had requested guidance in relation to the circumstances in which the Bailiff would determine that a quorum could not be achieved. Others believed that remote participation should automatically be permitted when an emergency had been declared. However, the Committee noted that no such declaration had been made during the Covid Pandemic. Consequently, remote participation had been permitted on the basis that a quorum could not otherwise be achieved.
- (b) Some Members had distinguished between “health” and “wellbeing” and supported remote participation for reasons relating to the former but not the latter. Others highlighted a preference for each term to be defined.
- (c) Some Members believed that the Bailiff should also be made aware of those Members requesting to participate remotely.
- (d) Some Members indicated that the submission of documentary evidence to the Greffier in support of long-term periods of remote participation might be beneficial.
- (e) Concerns existed with regard to the recording of such information in the States Minutes and whether this would have a detrimental impact on Members.

The Committee considered the survey results and the commentary detailed above. It was recalled that it had been agreed that Members should be briefed on revised proposals before a proposition was lodged.

In the absence of some Members of the Committee, it was agreed to defer consideration of the above matter until the next scheduled meeting.

2024.

The Committee noted that the Annual Report set out the responsibilities of the States Assembly, the Privileges and Procedures Committee and the States Greffe, with the latter supporting the work of the Assembly, its Committees and Panels and individual Members.

Having considered the content of the report, the Committee approved the same, subject to further data checking, and requested that the Greffier of the States make the necessary arrangements for it to be presented to the States.

E-petitions
system:
review.

A10. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A1 of 26th February 2025, considered a report which had been prepared by Members' Resources in connexion with the results of a survey in relation to the e-petition system review.

The Committee noted that the survey had been completed by a total of 646 individuals, with the average age of respondents being 55. Of those individuals, 58 had initiated an e-petition and 415 had signed an e-petition, with mainly positive feedback on the submission process being reported. Comments regarding the impact of the word limit on the substance of petitions were noted, together with a desire for anonymity. In terms of the overall effectiveness of e-petitions from a political perspective, the comments received were mainly negative. With regard to Ministerial responses to e-petitions, 65 per cent of respondents considered these ineffective with the view being expressed that responses merely set out the background to a particular issue without actually responding directly to the petition. The majority of comments highlighted the fact that a Ministerial response had not been received due to the number of signatures failing to meet the threshold for this. In terms of the trigger for debate (currently 5,000 signatures), this was considered excessive in the Jersey context and it was suggested that it should be reduced to 2,500 – 3,000. 55 per cent of respondents considered the threshold for a Ministerial response to be appropriate.

With reference to in-committee debates in response to e-petitions, 74 per cent of respondents did not believe that States Members gave petitions due consideration. The majority were of the view that an in-committee debate without a vote was ineffective and that a binding tangible decision was required (some confusion between in-committee and in-camera debates was noted). Comments were also noted around accessibility, with particular regard to the requirement for petitioners/signatories to have an electronic mail address and access to a device. Further work on political education was also highlighted as a means of engaging Islanders, together with awareness raising of the e-petition system. Views were split on whether only those resident in Jersey should be able to sign a petition. There appeared to be a lack of awareness of the standard a petition must meet for publication and a request for a guide and sample petitions had been made. There was also some confusion around the different approaches to paper and e-petitions and it was suggested that the 2 systems should be aligned. Finally, the ability to indicate opposition to a petition had also been highlighted.

In conclusion, the majority view appeared to be that e-petitions had no meaningful impact, particularly as no firm decisions were taken in response to the same.

The Committee discussed the survey results and concluded that the main issue appeared to be that expectations exceeded actual outcomes, with the lack of a tangible decision causing frustration. The Committee requested that the States Greffe explore alternative approaches with a view to addressing the issues raised in the consultation responses. The Committee also requested data on the number of petitions which met the threshold for a Ministerial response.

States meeting
dates for 2025.

A11. The Committee recalled that, in accordance with Standing Order 4 of the Standing Orders of the States of Jersey, it was required to present to the States Assembly, no later than the end of September each year, a list of days for meetings of the States for the first and second sessions in the following year. In this connexion the Committee considered proposed meeting dates for 2026/2027, as suggested by Deputy C. S. Alves of St. Helier Central, Vice Chair, as follows -

First Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
January 20th	January 21st, 22nd and 23rd
February 3rd	February 4th, 5th and 6th
February 24th	February 25th, 26th and 27th
March 10th	March 11th, 12th and 13th
March 24th	March 25th, 26th and 27th
April 7th	April 8th, 9th and 10th

OR

April 14th	April 15th, 16th and 17 th
------------	---------------------------------------

***proposed electoral candidate nomination week – 20th April**

May 9th (Liberation Day)

***public election – June 7th**

June 16 th	June 17th, 18th and 19th
	OR
June 23rd	June 24th, 25th and 26th

***proposed Chief Minister selection – no later than 26th June**

June 30th	July 1st, 2nd and 3rd
-----------	-----------------------

***proposed Ministerial/Committees/Panel Chair selection – no later than 2nd July**

July 7th	July 8th, 9th and 10th
----------	------------------------

***proposed inaugural sitting of newly constituted Assembly**

Second Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
September 8th	September 9th, 10th and 11th
September 29th	October 30th, 1st and 2nd
October 20th	October 21st, 22nd and 23rd
November 10th	November 11th, 12th and 13th
December 8th	December 9th, 10th and 11th

The Committee noted that Deputy Alves had also proposed meeting dates for the first session of 2027, as follows -

First Session

	<u>Continuation (if necessary)</u>
January 19th	January 20th, 21st and 22nd
February 2nd	February 3rd, 4th and 5th
February 23rd	February 24th, 25th and 26th
March 16th	March 17th, 18th and 19th
April 13th	April 14th, 15th and 16th
April 27th	April 28th, 29th and 30th
May 9th (Liberation Day)	
May 18th	May 19th, 20th and 21st
June 8th	June 9th, 10th and 11th
June 29th	June 30th, July 1st and 2nd
July 13th	July 14th, 15th and 16th

It was recalled that, as a consequence of a decision taken by the Committee several years previously, States meeting dates were arranged to avoid school holiday periods. However, due to the fact that a public election would be held in June 2026, it was likely that some States meetings in April 2026 would take place during school holidays. It was hoped that sufficient advance notice of this would allow Members time to plan ahead. Deputy L.M.C. Doublet of St. Saviour requested that alternatives to meeting dates during school holiday periods be explored and the Greffier of the States undertook to report back to the Committee on this. However, she advised that any alternative arrangements would likely involve meeting on additional days (and could possibly result in longer meetings) in order to complete the business of the Assembly ahead of the pre-election (Purdah) period. Deputy Doublet also asked that consideration be given to avoiding States meetings on school inset days. It was recalled that the Committee had previously considered this matter and had concluded that it was impossible to accommodate individual arrangements for inset days for each of the Island's schools (Minute No. A16 of 9th December 2024 refers).

Following some discussion, and in light of the fact that the candidate nomination date would be set at the inaugural meeting of the Jersey Electoral Authority on 9th June 2025, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the above matter until the next scheduled meeting.

Forthcoming business.

A12. The Committee considered propositions which had been lodged 'au Greffe' for forthcoming meetings of the States Assembly.

The Committee recalled that it had approved a comment on P.38/2025, which had been lodged 'au Greffe' by Deputy J. Renouf of St. Brelade. The Deputy's proposition sought agreement for an amendment to the States of Jersey Law 2005, to facilitate the introduction of differential pay for the Chief Minister, Ministers, Assistant Ministers and Scrutiny Panel and Committee Chairs.

Draft Elections (Electoral Registers) (Jersey) Amendment Law 202- /automatic voter registration (P.27/2025).

A13. The Committee, with reference to its Minute No. A2 of 27th May 2025, considered correspondence dated 29th May 2025, from the Comité des Connétables in connexion with proposed amendments to the draft Elections (Electoral Registers) (Jersey) Amendment Law 202-. The draft legislation amended the provisions of the Elections (Jersey) Law 2002, in relation to electoral registers to facilitate automatic voter registration.

The Committee recalled that a number of issues had been raised by Members in relation to the aforementioned draft legislation during the debate. Consequently, the legislation had been referred back to the Committee for further consideration. The Committee had subsequently considered a revised draft, which sought to address the

primary issue raised by allowing candidates access to the electoral roll after nomination/formal declaration. This also responded to safeguarding/human rights considerations. The Committee had approved the amendments in principle and noted that a report to accompany the legislation to reflect the changes would be prepared. Consideration was also being given as to how best to progress the amended legislation from a procedural perspective.

The Committee noted that the Comité des Connétables had highlighted the fact that the electoral register included only the names of those who were eligible to vote so access to the register would not completely resolve the concerns expressed during the debate regarding safeguarding. A certain element of risk for candidates who were canvassing would remain. The point had also been made that an electoral candidate could only have access to the register after the conclusion of the nomination period. Candidates were also required to register with the Office of the Information Commissioner, in accordance with the Data Protection (Jersey) Law 2018 and complete a declaration form prior to receiving the register. The declaration also covered representatives of candidates. Whilst candidates were required to declare criminal offences, this did not necessarily disqualify them from standing for election. Consequently, it was suggested that if candidates were permitted to access the full register, the electorate should also be able to opt out of having their names included on the register supplied to candidates for safeguarding purposes. This would mean that voting opportunities for those not on the register would require consideration (Article 9 refers). The Committee noted other comments in relation to Articles 6 and 12(4).

The Committee noted that a briefing for States Members on the proposed amendments had been arranged for 3rd June 2025. Thereafter, a report to accompany the proposed amendments would be circulated for approval.

On a related matter, Connétable M.K. Jackson of St. Brelade advised the Committee that he had been made aware of concerns regarding the functionality of the tirage system, which was used by the Viscount's Department to compile jury lists from the electoral register. The Greffier advised that whilst there appeared to have been an awareness of issues with the tirage system for some time, this had not been raised with the project team at the outset. However, the matter had now been added to the project's scope and the team was working closely with the Viscount and a solution had been identified.