OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION OF THE ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Wednesday, 24th June 2026

All published Official Reports can be found on the official States of Guernsey website www.gov.gg

Volume 14, No. 12

ISSN 2049-8284

Published by the States' Greffier, The Royal Court House, St Peter Port, GY1 2NZ. *© States of Guernsey, 2025*

Present:

Sir R. J. McMahon, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

M. M. E. Pullum, K.C. (H.M. Procureur)

People's Deputies

C. P. A Blin
Y. Burford
T. L. Bury
A. K. Cameron
H. L. Camp
G. M. Collins
R. P. Curgenven
H. L. de Sausmarez
D. F. Dorrity
S. J. Falla
A. Gabriel
J. A. B. Gollop
L. T. Goy
S. T. Hansmann Rouxel
M. A. J. Helyar
R. M. Humphreys
N. R. Inder
B. R. Kay-Mouat
A. Kazantseva-Miller
M. S. Laine
R. Le Brun
M. Malik
A. D. S. Matthews
L. J. McKenna
P. S. N. Montague
A. J. Niles
G. A. Oswald
C. N. K. Parkinson
T. M. Rylatt
G. A. St Pier
J. D. Strachan
L. C. Van Katwyk
S. P. J. Vermeulen
S. Williams

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives E. Hill and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

Absent at the Evocation

Deputy M. P. Leadbeater (*indisposé*) ; Deputy J. M. Ozanne OBE (*absent de l'Île*) ; Deputy S. R. Rochester (*absent de l'Île*) ; Deputy A. S. Sloan (*absent de l'Île*)

Business transacted

Evocation 6

Convocation 6

Removal of jackets and outer garments 6

Statements 6

General Update Statement – Statement by the President of the Policy & Resources Committee 6

Questions for Oral Answer 19

Guernsey Development Agency – Frustrations 19

Guernsey Development Agency – Addressing identified frustrations 21

Guernsey Prison Officers – Number of Complaints 24

Probation Officers – Conduct 26

Medical Specialist Group – Average wait time 27

Medical Specialist Group – Desired attainable target for appointment 28

Health & Social Care Board – Intervention and Oversight 29

Guernsey and Jersey Health Departments – Collaboration 31

Billet d'État X 33

Elections and Appointments 33

1. Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development – Election commenced 33

2. Election of One Non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board – Election commenced 34

3. Appointment of an Ordinary Member of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman – Ms Caroline Dutot elected 35

Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development – Election concluded – Deputy Marc Laine elected as a member 37

Election of One Non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board – Election concluded – Dr Simon Thornton elected as a non-States Member 37

Motion to Debate 37

Employment and Equal Opportunities Service – Annual Report 2025 – Motion carried 37

Legislation laid before the States 39

The Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; The Building (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; Parochial Elections (St Pierre du Bois) Regulations, 2026; The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2025; The Electronic Transactions (Exemptions) (Amendment) Order, 2026 39

Legislation for approval 39

4. The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026; 5. The Education (Governance Boards) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2026; – 6. The Alderney (Application of Legislation) (Education) Ordinance, 2026 – Propositions Carried....39

7. Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006 – Debate commenced....43

The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.....45

Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006 – Debate concluded – Propositions carried....45

8. Extension of Period of Validity of the Island Development Plan 2016 – Proposition Carried....49

9. Remediation of PFAS Contaminated Soil at Guernsey Airport – Proposition Carried....57

10. Extending the Scope of the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal – Propositions Carried....65

11. Legislative Changes to Enable Implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy – Propositions Carried....67

12. QEII Marina Gate Replacement (and the Associated Infrastructure) – Proposition carried.75

13. Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting – Proposition carried as amended....82

King's Baton Relay....89

The Assembly adjourned at 5.27 p.m.....90

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 10.18 a.m. in the presence of
His Excellency Lt Gen Richard Cripwell
Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Bailiwick of Guernsey

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS
The States' Greffier

EVOCATION

CONVOCATION

The States' Greffier: Billet d'État X of 2026. To the Members of the States of the Island of Guernsey, I hereby give notice that a meeting of the States of Deliberation will be held at the Royal Court House on Wednesday, 24th June, 2026 immediately after the States of Election convened for 9.30 a.m., to consider the items listed in this Billet d'État, which have been submitted for debate.

Removal of jackets and outer garments

The Bailiff: Members of the States, as you will have noted, the temperature is still rising and I am going to channel my Weather Girls at this point, it will be raining men in a moment, and therefore if you want to, you can remove your jackets and other outer garments.

Deputy Inder, what do you want to say?

Deputy Inder: Sir, apologies, I missed the indisposé for Deputy Leadbeater. He is indisposed today.

STATEMENTS

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

General Update Statement –
Statement by the President of the Policy & Resources Committee

The Bailiff: The first item of business is a Statement on behalf of the Policy & Resources Committee, and I will invite the President, Deputy de Sausmarez, to deliver that statement.

Deputy de Sausmarez Thank you, sir.

I will start with an update on the States' five agreed super priorities, followed by updates on External Relations, MyGov and the Revenue Service Recovery Plan.

Next month the States will discuss the 2026 Tax Reform Package; the first and most pressing of our super priorities. It will be a debate about the future of our Islands, our community and our economy, to put our public finances on a stronger and more sustainable footing.

The Committee is acutely aware of how much some people are struggling; whether they are working full time or retired, whether they rent or pay a mortgage, and whether they have young children or older loved ones to care for. We are also keenly aware of the need to provide the services and infrastructure the Islands require, now and in the future, in the context of a worsening dependency ratio and reserves that could be completely exhausted by 2031. Finding a way to raise more revenue for essential services whilst also protecting those who are financially vulnerable has been a challenge, but the 2026 Tax Reform Package meets both aims in a measured and manageable way.

This package is a balanced, pragmatic and proportionate response to the financial challenge we face. It will improve our financial position by £59 million a year, including the £20 million of expenditure reductions agreed by the States and £39 million of additional revenue. By sharing the burden between savings and taxation, this package provides a credible way to close the funding gap – crucially enabling us to protect essential services whilst also investing in our future.

There are still some unanswered questions around future sources of revenue such as from offshore wind, Pillar Two and economic growth, so we have designed in an opportunity to take stock of the financial situation when there is more clarity on those and other issues. The next States can look at the wider economic picture, as well as the savings and revenue generated by the measures in this package once they have been put into practice, so that a decision on the longer-term trajectory is firmly evidence-based.

The Island's financial position is worsening long term as demand for healthcare in particular rises, but our current position allows us to phase changes more gradually, reducing the immediate impact on our community and economy. We have also listened carefully to feedback on the previous tax package agreed by the last Assembly in 2024 and have responded to those concerns; reducing GST to 3% to help limit the impact on the cost of living and allowing more time to assess the potential impact of changes to social security, for example.

Importantly, the 2026 Tax Reform Package reduces our over-reliance on income-based taxation, giving the majority of people a significant tax break in the process, even after GST is taken into account. This strengthens and diversifies our tax base in a way that raises more income from a wider variety of sources whilst also reducing the burden on those that can least afford it.

Work continues on Leale's Yard: clearing the site and starting its development is another of the States' super priorities for this political term, and planning approval has been given for the first phase of demolition.

This will involve demolishing several buildings on the Bridge frontage as well as the other buildings on the site down to ground level. A new temporary access to the site will be created off the mini roundabout so that heavy vehicles can avoid the area immediately in front of the shops. A contractor will be appointed in the coming weeks.

While the first stage of demolition takes place, site investigations will also be carried out to prepare for a further stage of demolition, which includes the removal of building slabs, contaminated soil and below ground obstructions, the capping of utilities and more, all to provide a flat and safe site that is ready for future development. Master planning expertise is also being engaged.

While the land purchase of Leale's Yard was agreed in the previous political term, in response to some inaccurate public commentary, I will take this opportunity to advise the Assembly on some facts.

The States purchased a majority of the site in August 2025 for £4.5 million, less even in nominal terms than the £4.65 million that Channel Islands Co-Op bought the whole site for back in 1998, which index linked would be close to £9 million in today's money. It was a strategic purchase of a

site that has sat empty and derelict for decades, so that we can revitalise the area, build much-needed homes, and provide economic opportunities and more recreational facilities and green spaces for Islanders, particularly in the context of the two adjacent sites that all together provide a unique opportunity to make a sizeable and significant difference. After more than quarter of a century of frustrating lack of progress on this site, I very much welcome the activity that we can soon expect to see there.

The work to agree and advance a sustainable health and care model is rightly being led by the Committee *for* Health & Social Care, with P&R in a supportive role. My understanding is that the work is being carried out to establish the baseline service and financial metrics as the first order of business.

As the sponsoring Committee co-ordinating the work to shape and strengthen the focus on early years and families, our initial focus has been on scoping and putting in place the building blocks. We have agreed an outline brief, reallocated internal resource to lead the work, re-deployed in-house key subject matter expertise and engaged with external stakeholders and partners in this area. We are also bringing some dedicated legal resource on board.

This is very much a cross-Committee piece of work and it is complex, so as part of an integrated approach, the relevant Committees are represented on a political oversight group, which I am pleased to be chairing. The programme is still in the early stages so I am looking forward to providing further updates as it progresses over the next six months.

At our meeting a fortnight ago, the Committee considered a detailed paper in respect of the work to determine and design future harbour requirements. Having updated extant work and considered the input of the Guernsey Development Agency and a report on operational matters provided by the Ports of Guernsey, the next stage is a comprehensive economic and strategic analysis; for many, the missing piece of the jigsaw needed to make the necessary strategic decisions.

The Committee is looking to work closely with the States' Trading & Supervisory Board and the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure and is aiming to bring a policy letter to the Assembly next year.

The Bailiwick Commission was officially formed in March this year and has now begun to do its work. It consists of five independent experts with relevant experience, who by design are all external to the Bailiwick.

The Commissioners visited Guernsey, Alderney and Sark in April, with further visits planned. I was pleased to hear so much positive feedback from their engagement so far, and I look forward to reading the Commission's interim report in the autumn. The Bailiwick's community, local organisations, governments and businesses are all being encouraged by the Commission to follow, participate in and contribute to its work.

Work continues to seek to include Guernsey in relevant parts of the UK-EU Reset. Bailiwick students who are studying at UK universities and other higher education settings will be able to participate in Erasmus+ again; that has already been announced. We are also investigating how the Bailiwick's young people could be included in the proposed Youth Experience Scheme to allow easier access to work, study and travel in the EU and to allow EU youngsters to come to our Islands for the same purposes.

In May 2025, the UK and the EU agreed to form a common sanitary and phytosanitary area under an SPS Agreement, to allow the easier movement of foods and products of plant and animal origin. We are seeking inclusion of the whole Bailiwick in that agreement and the UK Government has confirmed that that outcome is a high priority. The negotiations are reaching their final stages. The Agreement is due to take effect in 2027, so we will ensure that businesses in the agri-food sector have the information they need to prepare in good time.

Turning to organisational matters now, I am grateful to the Chief Executive and Head of the Public Service for the work that is being undertaken on two critical issues; the MyGov project and the Revenue Service Recovery Programme.

The MyGov report starkly underlined the importance of getting the fundamentals right: leadership, culture and delivery. The Chief Executive has committed to strengthening these

foundations so that our major projects, and the public service more broadly, are better set up for success.

This starts with how we oversee and resource our most important projects. Too often, problems come to light too late. We need to catch issues earlier and deal with them properly before they grow. This is going to require a more hands-on and realistic approach to how projects are run.

At project level, the leaders need enough time to do the job well and give it the attention and energy genuinely required. And at a portfolio level for capital projects, we need that healthy scepticism: people willing to ask the difficult questions and challenge assumptions before issues take hold.

This will also be supported by the appointment of a voluntary portfolio board adviser. We received 20 applications, which really shows the depth of skills and experience we have across the community. This role will bring an independent perspective and some constructive challenge to how the portfolio is managed.

Alongside this, we need to be honest and transparent about how the portfolio is performing. The first six-monthly report is due out in the next fortnight: it will give a clear picture of where projects stand, what is progressing well, and where there are challenges. That is an important step in improving accountability and building confidence in how these major investments are being handled.

At the same time, the Chief Executive is also taking forward the wider challenges the MyGov report pointed to. He is working directly with a number of Committees on the move to a chief officer model, and is due to speak to all States Members next week. His objectives will be published in July as part of his mid-year review. This will include a clearer picture of operational performance and the progress being made to strengthen how the public service delivers.

When it comes to the Revenue Service, we know that many customers are still waiting for assessments, repayments or responses to enquiries. We are sorry for the frustration and uncertainty this causes. While service levels are certainly not where we want them to be, the position today is materially stronger than it was a year ago.

Following a comprehensive review of outstanding work, we have, for the first time, clear visibility of backlogs, demand and operational pressures across the service. This gives officers the information needed to prioritise work effectively, target resources where they will have the greatest impact and deliver recovery in a planned and controlled way.

We are at last at a genuine turning point. Officers are no longer focused on understanding the scale of the problem; they are actively addressing it. Recovery will not happen overnight, but we now have the visibility, governance and control needed to make steady and measurable progress.

Recovery activity is already delivering measurable results. Since March, over 13,000 work items have been processed, including the clearance of approximately 3,000 outstanding repayments identified at the end of February. The backlog of older personal tax cases has reduced by 30%, debt recovery activity has restarted in a structured manner, bereavement cases have been fully triaged, and more than 5,000 customers have already benefited from recovery actions. Assessments for 2024 will be released in a controlled and phased way to ensure that any resulting repayments can be processed promptly and customer demand can be managed effectively.

While this progress is encouraging, recovery will take time. This is not a single backlog that simply counts down; work continues to enter the system every day while historical cases are being cleared. Some queues reduce steadily; others generate follow-on work and recovery must be delivered alongside the Revenue Service's ongoing statutory responsibilities. This is a phased recovery, not an overnight fix. Customers will see continued improvement but not in every area at the same time. Alongside the backlog reduction, work is under way to improve the systems, processes and data that support the service. This includes data cleansing, system improvements, greater automation and process redesign, all aimed at increasing efficiency, reducing manual effort and preventing similar issues from recurring in future.

The first phase of the recovery plan, which is ongoing, focuses on stabilising the service, reducing backlogs, and restoring timeliness. The next phase will focus on longer-term transformation, future

proofing so that we do not find ourselves here again by looking at how the Revenue Service itself works, and considering automation, process improvement and digital enhancements, creating a more resilient and sustainable service. The objective is a stable, predictable service operating within clear and reasonable timeframes.

One of the consequences of the system challenges at the Revenue Service has been that the data and analysis team did not have the data necessary for various national statistics to be produced and published, a problem that started in late 2024. We are now in a better position. Data can and have now been provided for national statistics since the start of June, although there are still some complexities to work through. In addition, the rolling electronic census IT system needs to be adapted so that it is ready to automatically process the data it receives from the new Revenue Service system. The Committee will soon be able to confirm a timetable for the publication of fully up-to-date national statistics, so I will keep the Assembly updated.

This gives an overview of some of the main work that P&R has been focused on since the last update, but I look forward to questions on any area of the Committee's mandate.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: There is an opportunity to ask questions of the President on any matter within the mandate of the Policy & Resources Committee.

Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

I would like to go back to – I thank the President for her update – the unanswered questions which were mentioned. We are on the lookout for a new treasurer or a new CFO for this largest employer in the Island. We are banking Pillar Two income that we do not know how much it is going to be yet. We have a Revenue Service which is 20,000 assessments behind, which we have just heard about, and Deputy Parkinson yesterday told us there was nothing to worry about. I heard the same music from the Revenue Service nearly six years ago when I was the Treasury lead, so I am slightly sceptical. We do not necessarily have an accurate picture of our actual finances. Would it not now be a sensible decision to delay the tax debate?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think Deputy Helyar, because he does understand the financial position of the Island, knows very well what the answer to that is. Of course, the answer is no.

He raises a number of legitimate points but I do think I need to put them in context. As Deputy Parkinson explained in replying to debate on yesterday's accounts, we do actually have a pretty accurate idea of the tax that is coming in, most of all because the vast majority of it is automatic. It is through ETI; 90% or more is through that means and the rest of it, anything that has been over and underestimated, tends to balance out in the rounding. So we do have a fairly accurate idea of what is coming in.

The Pillar Two estimate, which has been very well-documented and, indeed, we document this in some detail in the accounts and in the tax reform policy letter, is quite a conservative estimate. We do not think that it is likely to be below that. The team has worked very closely with people on the ground, so we think that is realistic and the auditors are satisfied to that effect as well.

The key difference between now and six years ago is that we have got on top of this problem. We have brought in new leadership. We are actioning a recovery plan and it is working. So I have been completely open about the fact that we are not yet there, but we are on the way to getting there. Deputy Helyar well knows the financial position of the Island in the macro sense and he knows that we cannot afford to delay.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, your 90 seconds are up.

Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

Thank you, President, for your update. Call me old-fashioned, but a backlog of 20,000 final assessments does not reek of being on top of things. Have we considered alternative collection routes, possibly outsourcing to, dare I say it, some of the large accountants on the Island that could do a better and quicker and more efficient job of collection?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I have to correct an underlying assumption in Deputy Vermeulen's question. He seems to assume that the problem is a result of people not being competent. I can assure him that is not the case. The problems have, of course, arisen because of a systems change, a very significant systems change, that was necessary because the previous system in IT terms became redundant and could no longer continue. So it was necessary to put in place a new system and it is the implementation of that system that has caused the problems that we are experiencing at the moment.

I have been completely transparent about the fact that we still do have a backlog, but we do have new leadership and I would encourage Deputy Vermeulen or, indeed, any other Member to go and have a chat with that person if they want any more confidence in the recovery plan, if they would like to understand it better. In fact, I think I will organise a briefing on it to give Members a better understanding. It sounds like that would be a helpful thing to do. But I can assure Deputy Vermeulen that we have explored every which way. We are, as Deputy Parkinson said yesterday, putting more resources in to tackle this because it is a high priority for the Committee. The recovery plan is in place and it is starting to make progress, but it will take time.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Is the £4 million reduction in spending baked into the 2026 Budget going to be delivered?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I hope so. It is a little too early, as I think Deputy St Pier can appreciate, to give cast iron assurances on it, but I know that that work is progressing well. There has been quite a significant change in approach towards consultants and I am hopeful at this stage that it will deliver the savings that we identified.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Brun.

Deputy Le Brun: Sir, thank you.

To the President of P&R, I have seen recent comments online from retailers where the Retailers Association has organised an engagement event and the timings are not suitable for people that are running a business and having to pick children up from school. Could there be consideration to have an engagement event that fits around those times?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, absolute –

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Oh, sorry.

Absolutely. We are very keen to make sure that any support is going to work for the people that it is aimed at supporting. I know actually I have been copied into a number of emails which are

conversations exactly along those lines, so I really would encourage anyone, and I would encourage Members as well, to communicate this to anyone that is interested or affected by that to get in touch with our relationship manager, and we will absolutely do what we can to schedule sessions in a way that suits the people that would like to attend.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenven.

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

My hearing is not too good. Did the President say that GST brings in net £55 million? What I mean by net is when all associated costs are taken into account.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Deputy Curgenven, I will refer him – because obviously I am time limited at this point – to the information that is set out clearly in the policy letter and, indeed, the appendix. I appreciate he has also asked some supplementary questions and we are working on his assumptions. I have given him a preliminary response which indicates where perhaps one of the assumptions was not quite accurate, but we will be able to provide him in written form with all of the information that he has asked for. I do apologise for the delay. I am sure he appreciates that it has been a particularly busy time, but we are working on it.

The Bailiff: Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, sir.

I thank the President of P&R for her Update Statement. During last term a business case was developed for new digital systems for traffic and highway services, which identified significant efficiency savings, service improvements and additional revenue opportunities. Given the continuing pressure on Environment & Infrastructure to reduce services and budgets, will these systems now be prioritised for implementation as part of the MyGov package?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sir, may I just ask for a clarification from Deputy Cameron about the systems that he is referring to so I do not give him an answer that does not relate to his question?

The Bailiff: Okay. Can you clarify, Deputy Cameron, what systems you are referring to?

Deputy Cameron: It was the car registrations, driving licences, etc.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am still not specifically sure about the systems that Deputy Cameron is referring to, but I know, having served with him on that Committee for four and a half years, that there is certainly a range of improvements that can be made to the customer service and, indeed, the more efficient delivery of those services with greater digitisation. So if Deputy Cameron's question is around will we see investment in digital technology to enable the more efficient delivery and services, he has my wholehearted support.

The Bailiff: Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: Thank you, sir.

I thank the President for her update. Given the review of States' relocation packages was originally due to be completed in September 2025, can the President provide an update on the progress of the review?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, I can provide the information that the review has been done at officer level and it is due to come to the Committee I believe in the next couple of weeks. After that, we will be engaging with all relevant Committees, and I know Deputy Rylatt serves on at least one of those.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, during the Government Work Plan debate in January, the Assembly pretty much unanimously approved the amendment from Deputy Camp that strengthens the importance of economic growth and development within the plan and the commitment from all Committees that they would consider economic impact through their work. Could the President outline how the Policy & Resources Committee is intending to support that amendment in the spirit of what it is trying to achieve through the Budget debate specifically?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think actually the spirit, unless I misremembered it, of Deputy Camp's amendment – there were more than one to that debate – was about factoring in the economic considerations through policy development. So it was not just limited to budget building. Obviously, we have conversations with all Committees in the process of building a budget and putting forward recommendations, but I think the bigger cultural shift actually needs to come when Committees are doing their work and taking those into account. Certainly, one example, which is one that I mentioned, is in the future harbours and the economic analysis. I know Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is also close to this work through her role on the GDA Political Oversight Group. The economic analysis will be absolutely pivotal to us being able to make a better strategic decision on our future port requirements.

Certainly, I think it is something that we can all be mindful of and I would certainly be very open to any suggestions that she as the President of the Committee *for* Economic Development or, indeed, any other Member might have in furthering that particular aim. I think it is something that is cultural and widespread and not simply limited to budget building.

The Bailiff: Deputy Humphreys.

Deputy Humphreys: Thank you, sir.

Thank you for your update. As part of the 2026 tax reform you referred to the £20 million expenditure reduction, which I will remind you is to come from efficiency, not cuts. Having attended the financial leads meeting yesterday, it became apparent, if it was not already, that a significant amount of that saving needs to come from the core services under the P&R mandate. How confident are P&R that significant savings can be found in that area?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am extremely confident that we are going to put absolutely everything we can into achieving it, but I cannot guarantee that we will get there. Deputy Humphreys describes the core services as under P&R's mandate and, of course, technically she is right, but they are not by and large serving P&R. They are there precisely to support the functions of the other Committees. So any decisions that we make in that respect if we were – and I am not suggesting we would take

this approach but if, for example, a hypothetical P&R were to come in and make swingeing cuts to one or multiple of those teams, that would have a material impact on the Committees that those functions support. So it is really important that we do this work hand in glove or hand in hand with other Committees, making sure that we are cognisant of any impacts of that.

She has my wholehearted commitment to trying. I think it is ambitious. I think the other way of looking at it is that we do need to find greater efficiencies in services that we hold dear. I completely agree with her. We need to be looking and that £20 million should be coming from genuine efficiencies, not from salami slicing services. I would argue the same rationale applies to the approach that we must take with the services supporting the frontline delivery.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: Thank you, sir.

Thank you to the President for the very detailed update. Just regarding the Alderney runway policy letter that came to this Chamber, 4.4 I believe said, tender evaluation June 2026 of Alderney runway. Are there any updates on Alderney runway at all that you could share, and are we still on track for the timeline set out in that paper?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: My understanding is that that work is still broadly on track, but I can assure Alderney Representative Snowdon that he will be among the first to hear when we do have any more updates to report. He will be well aware, but I think it is probably worth reiterating for everyone else, that obviously Alderney, in terms of the operational side in particular, is well represented on that particular project board. Personally, it is one that I can assure him is a project that is very dear to the hearts of both P&R and the STSB, and it is Deputy Burford and Deputy Helyar who are leading on that work. So I will provide further updates as soon as there is an opportunity to do so.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

I thank the President for her Update Statement. In her Statement she said total reserves will run out by 2031. Did she actually mean to say the general revenue reserves of £407 million will be run out, not the £4 billion we have in total reserves?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, obviously it is the general revenue reserves. Deputy Collins will know better than most what much of the other reserves are actually there for, and that is, for example, our pension funds, etc. They are not exactly the types of funds that we can just dip into and use for capital projects. I know that he knew the answer, but it was worthwhile clarifying and I thank him for the question.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for the update. It saddens me that Deputies have to defend poor performance by government services. It is always them on the end of the microphone or in front of the camera, especially when those Departments get paid so handsomely for their failure. Deputies and the public have grave concerns about the performance of the Revenue Service. Would she

agree that an approach to restore that confidence would be a running total of the Revenue Service's performance set against their internal targets, something the public could see posted on the Government's website that shows a performance table of improvement?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: As I mentioned earlier, I will organise a briefing for States' Members so that they can have that conversation. If Deputy Inder just can be a little bit patient until I get to the core substance of his question. I think it would be very helpful in the first instance for Deputies to understand and have the opportunity to ask questions of the new head of this area so that they can properly understand the scale and nature of the problem and the recovery plan.

I think it is a reasonable suggestion that Deputy Inder has put forward. However, I cannot commit on the floor of the Assembly without having had a conversation with the operational lead as to whether that is practical or workable, and I think it is something that we could maybe explore in that meeting. So I will commit to organising the briefing. I will commit to exploring that idea. I would just caveat it with as long as we can do that in a way that does not put any additional burden on the team that diverts them from actually addressing the problems that they are busy addressing at the moment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

This Assembly explicitly resolved to adopt zero-based budgeting, yet P&R has in practice moved to a priority-based budgeting approach. Given this methodology relies upon set criteria, can P&R confirm that it has established express, objective, consistent criteria to rank and prioritise expenditure across Government ahead of commencing its pilot and share the same with all Members within the timescale permitted to respond to this question in writing?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: If Deputy Camp would like to submit her question in writing, I will definitely provide a response in writing because I am not confident I have all the details just from the three words that I scribbled down on my pad. I will quickly explain that the reason – as I explained, indeed, at the time – that priority-based budgeting is used in the public sector is because we are statutorily obliged to provide minimum service levels. So you literally cannot take it down to zero for many areas of government services.

When Deputy Camp asked whether we have established standards, I think, yes, certainly in terms of the pilot, but the whole purpose of the pilot is to really learn whether those are correct. So I would say yes, those are established and those are being used across the very different areas that we are using at the moment, but I would say that we are open to the idea that those might need to change because we do want to learn from that pilot experience.

I would very much welcome Deputy Camp's question in writing, if she would not mind, so we can respond to it as accurately as possible.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

Deputy de Sausmarez updated us in an exciting way about the progress that is now imminent at Leale's Yard. As I understand it, it does not just involve Policy & Resources. There is DPA, E&I and Economic Development in making it work. Are Policy & Resources co-ordinating efforts so that what is left of the Bridge traders' livelihood does not suffer further decline? Maybe this is an avenue

for the Guernsey Development Agency to work in partnership with Policy & Resources. So, how is Policy & Resources ensuring the transition does not further undermine the life of the area?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think there is a little bit of cause and effect that might be helpful to clarify here. My understanding is that for the large part the decline that has been experienced where it has – and there are some areas, obviously the Bridge, which are still doing very well – but where retail has been in decline in that area has largely been as a result of the inactivity, of the stagnation on that side. My understanding, having spoken with some of those retailers personally, is they are very much looking forward to the investment in the area, and not before time I might add. It has been over a quarter of a century, and it really has been an albatross around the neck of that area. It really has created the sense of stagnation. I think the fact that we are visibly investing in it and getting things moving, there will be the shot in the arm that they have been calling out for.

In a more specific answer to his question, I can assure him that the GDA is already involved. I know that there are various conversations. I know E&I, which is quite directly involved with a lot of the work that is also going on there at the moment, is in conversation. Deputy Gabriel, I think, has a conversation next week to that effect.

The Political Oversight Group, just quickly, includes also the Committee *for* Housing and the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure and P&R. We are actually hoping to pull together an appendix report to give Members much more information on this in the fairly near future.

The Bailiff: Twenty minutes is up but there are still people who want to ask questions. I will always call somebody who has not asked a question before inviting somebody who has already asked a question to ask a second question. So I am going to extend questions to the President for, shall we say, 10 minutes or so.

Deputy Laine.

Deputy Laine: Thank you, sir.

Thanks for the update. Just a quick question. We know that the Revenue Service's application overran to a cost of over £20 million, and within the recovery plan that has been outlined I wonder if it could be confirmed that the business has concluded that the Microsoft Dynamics application is, in fact, fit for purpose and it is not being sought to replace it.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: It is the kind of question that I would need to have a detailed chat with our digital and transformation adviser *(Laughter)* in the form of Deputy Laine. I am not sure I quite caught the nuance of his question. I think it probably is something that I would like to discuss outside of the Chamber but would be more than happy to share the answer with all Members in writing after that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

I thank the President for her update. Just a quick question. Yesterday in the accounts mention was made of the increase in HR headcount of 30. I just wanted assurances from the President that this is something that Policy & Resources is on top of and, although it was only halfway through the year that Policy & Resources took over, this is something that is being looked at and the efficiency of HR services, which impact all of the States, is being looked at.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

As Deputy Hansmann Rouxel alludes to, this was actually a decision taken by our predecessor's previous iteration of P&R and it was actually something that was approved through the Budget Report in 2024 for 2025, the rationale and justification being that actually the HR function had been allowed to erode over some time, and this was in order to get it back to the necessary levels to support the organisation.

There is a certain efficiency. I have to say that I know this is something that Deputy Burford, who is our lead in this area, is looking at closely, but in general terms it can be a real false economy to not be sufficiently resourced in HR because it can have material impacts on, for example, the recruitment or the timely recruitment of people to critical roles. I have been in Committees which have experienced that first-hand. I know it is something that previously had significantly impacted education, for example. So I think it is a little bit like my response to Deputy Humphreys. I think we do need to be mindful of what the HR function is there to do, but absolutely we are there to make sure it is working as efficiently and effectively as possible with only the appropriate amount of resource that it needs to in order to be efficient and effective.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Since 2024 the UK's overseas territories have had observer status at the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting through the extant chair of the UK's Overseas Territories Association. Will the President commit to seek equal observer status for Guernsey, Jersey and the Isle of Man on a similar basis?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am grateful to Deputy St Pier for bringing this issue to my attention just a few days ago or possibly even yesterday, I cannot remember. It is something he has kindly brought to the Committee's attention and he knows, but I will confirm for other Members present, that it is something that our External Relations Team is, indeed, looking into. I thank him for bringing it to the fore.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Brun.

Deputy Le Brun: Thank you, sir.

Would the President say whether it would be possible for the Leale's Yard development, for the contractor to have more focus on employing local on site, and not just for themselves but for their subcontractors as well, even if it means increasing what the apprenticeship scheme can do and working with the Job Centre with the unemployed?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Deputy Le Brun raises a really good point and it is something that is a frequent topic of conversation, certainly on the Political Oversight Group. I should clarify that the contractor that will be appointed soon is for the demolition. There are various other parallel strands of work, but in terms of the project overall it has been quite a prevalent strand of our thinking. We have also had conversations – I know Deputy Williams in particular has had conversations – with our local construction industry and actually they are really happy with the approach that we have outlined.

Because we have had a focus on making sure that where we do need to bring in any expertise from off Island or any capacity from off Island – and let us face it, with a project this size that is

unavoidable – they are, however, comfortable with our approach because we have committed to making sure, in exactly the way that Deputy Le Brun describes, that there is still work that is being subcontracted locally and, indeed, that we have those skills transfer opportunities up and running. So it is a good point to make. It is something that we are already working on and he would be more than welcome to come and have a conversation with us about it as well. I can assure him that certainly our conversations with industry have indicated that they are supportive of our approach partly because of that.

The Bailiff: Deputy Cameron.

Deputy Cameron: Thank you, sir.

With 67,000 working days lost to sickness absence across the public service last year, what new measures are being taken to reduce absence levels and the pressure placed on colleagues who remain at work?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I do not have a specific answer to this question. Deputy Cameron was good enough to put in a Rule 14 which set this information out – well, our answers set the information out – and I have to say that, looking into it, it caused quite a lot of discussion around the P&R table. I know that it is an area of focus. I think I will have to go back and have a talk with the people at the operational coalface.

I know that certainly we put a lot of focus on it politically. I do not have the specific answer to the question, but he is right to raise it. I would say that the analysis that we did in providing the Rule 14 answers showed that we are broadly in line with other public services elsewhere. It is important, especially in a community like Guernsey, that we improve the figure as much as we possibly can and not just because of making efficient use of taxpayers' money but also actually for the people themselves.

I think the public sector has had a pretty rocky road in recent years, I think it is fair to say, and I think morale has not always been the highest. I hope that we have turned a corner on that and things are now moving in a more positive trajectory, but we really need to see the proof of the pudding. So I will ask further questions and get back to him with a more specific answer.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir.

The Policy & Resources Committee manages the public service obligation for the provision of the Alderney service on behalf of the States. The PSO agreement placed the highest level of obligations on a provider, which need to be met.

To my best knowledge, there has not been any public information in terms of the performance of the provider against the PSO. Would the President commit to publishing how the PSO agreement for the provision of the Alderney service is performing and do so on a regular basis?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I will certainly take that suggestion back to the Committee. In a probably more interesting answer to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's question, the PSO is something that is a topic of live discussion at the moment with the Committee and various other stakeholders, including obviously our Alderney Representative. So it is something that we are focused on, but I will certainly take her suggestion back to the Committee.

The Bailiff: Last question, Deputy Collins.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

The President was, until recently, Chair of the Braye du Valle Redevelopment Group. For me, sir, or the question I would like to ask is, given that two of the sites are not in the States of Guernsey ownership and clearly we are spending thousands to a million pounds on infrastructure costs, would it not be urgently a good idea to get those land parcels transferred back into our ownership? Otherwise, I am sure this must be a red flag on the register, sir.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: No, I can assure Deputy Collins there are no red flags. I think he is talking about the Political Oversight Group and not just the group you talk about. Effectively, the sites in question are all, in one way, shape or form, in public ownership and, actually, I do not think we should be rushing to go through land transfers or anything like that at this particular point in time because that actually has other consequences.

It is something that everyone is very aware of, but we are perfectly comfortable with the arrangements as is, and all of those considerations and processes will happen at a point where it makes the most sense to do them. I would not say that we have had any red flags raised from any of the financial controllers or anything like that.

We have just had our accounts and we can see they are all set out there. They all are effectively in public ownership even when that is through a separate public body.

Questions for Oral Answer

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Guernsey Development Agency – Frustrations

The Bailiff: We will move into Question Time proper under Rule 11. The first set of questions is to the President of the Policy & Resources Committee. They are from Deputy St Pier, so your first question, please.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

Following the resignation of the Chair of the Guernsey Development Agency, the President of the Committee was quoted as saying:

> We understand and very much share the frustrations of the GDA.

In light of this, can the Committee detail and articulate the specific frustrations it shares with the GDA and its former Chair?

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy de Sausmarez, to reply.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Apologies. The window that I had open has closed. I am just going to need about five seconds to hopefully find the right version of the question. Many apologies.

The Bailiff: Time is running.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Time is running. Have you got a copy or has anyone got a copy? Thank you, sir. Luckily, it is quite a short answer.

The GDA has, as directed by the States, prepared a Key Infrastructure Delivery Programme setting out an approach to the delivery of development, which would result in the long-term revitalisation of the bridge.

In reviewing the Key Infrastructure Delivery Programme, the Political Oversight Group became acutely aware of the extent to which the majority of developments are dependent on key strategic decisions regarding our harbours and other critical national infrastructure which the States are yet to make. I very much share the GDA's frustrations at the complex set of interdependencies which can strain its ability to move forward at the pace it would like. This is, at its core, an issue of sequencing, timing and practicalities.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir. I have two supplementaries to each question, the first question of which is: will the President commit to set out for Members the key strategic decisions that are required by the States, together with an indicative timetable of when those matters will be brought to the States?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, that sounds, at face value, like a very reasonable request that I think we can fulfil and, in fact, there is something that the members of the Political Oversight Group will be seeing very shortly, which should enable that.

The Bailiff: The second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir; and thank you to the President for that response.

The President has been unable to articulate specific frustrations. Does she agree with me therefore that the frustrations are systemic?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I would not say I was unable to articulate frustrations (*Laughter)* and I did not but, yes, I think it is fair to characterise the majority of the frustrations as systemic because, as described in the substantive response, it is about those interdependencies. Logic dictates that, actually, those strategic decisions would be decided before any development agency goes off and delivers to that strategic direction.

We have just got a very complex situation here which involves a lot of strategic decisions. It is right that those decisions sit with this Assembly and not with any other body, and it is just a situation that we are faced with but, yes, I think I would agree that actually there is a great deal of systemic-ness *(Laughter)* in the character of those frustrations.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Specifically two frustrations that became apparent this year was a certain criticism by some Members and Douzaines about the plans at the same time as the failure to complete the new harbour analysis, which meant that there were perhaps tidal flow issues coming out of STSB's concerns that impacted upon the design.

The Bailiff: Was there a question there, Deputy Gollop?

Deputy Gollop: Well, are they two frustrations that became apparent to Policy & Resources?

The Bailiff: All right, Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Those are certainly some of the issues. They are not quite as Deputy Gollop characterised but, yes, it just underscores the complex nature of the issues that we are dealing with. We are running as many workstreams in parallel as we can.

The Bailiff: Your second question to the President then please, Deputy St Pier.

Guernsey Development Agency –
Addressing identified frustrations

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

The second question was: can the Committee outline what it is going to do differently to address the frustrations identified?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez to reply, please.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

The GDA is now considering a revised Key Infrastructure Delivery Programme, which will be discussed with the Political Oversight Group in the coming weeks. This will identify opportunities so the GDA can move forward without requiring major strategic decisions by the States. As part of that discussion, the required funding and land transfer steps will also be discussed and agreed that exist in delivering the revised plan.

Preparation of a revised plan does not signify that the originally presented Key Infrastructure Delivery Programme cannot be delivered in due course. In undertaking this work, the GDA has engaged closely with the States to ensure alignment with the principles and objectives of the relevant strategies and policies which are currently being developed.

In parallel, work by the relevant Committees continues on those interrelated strategic and policy issues. For example, the Policy & Resources Committee has agreed the outline scope for the next stage of the super priority centred on our future harbour requirements, including specific consideration on one of the GDA's concerns on bulk cargo activities in St Sampson's Harbour.

Additionally, recommendations for the delivery of additional electricity interconnection and the fuel importation and storage policy will be brought by the Committees *for the* Environment & Infrastructure to the States later this year.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

First supplementary is the revised KIDP clearly will be a scaled-down programme. Can the President give some examples of opportunities that can be moved forward without requiring major decisions by the States?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I do not want to be too specific because I do not really want to set any hares running but, yes, there are a number of specific examples that we have already discussed even before that meeting where there are things that can happen that can be taken in isolation of any wider strategic decisions that would actually just help generally.

It would help operationally in terms of the harbours. So there are some commercials in the public realm and some infrastructure projects that can progress in isolation of any broader strategic decisions. I do not want to give too many specifics now because we have not yet had an opportunity to have that discussion, so I do not think it would be fair.

Certainly we have already identified that there is potential scope to do exactly that. I would say Deputy St Pier is quite right, that it probably will be scaled back compared to the original but, as I explained in an original answer, it does not mean to say that the original cannot be fulfilled in the fullness of time as well.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, sir. Thank you.

I hope that there will be an opportunity to get that information out as soon as it is possible. The second supplementary is that it is encouraging that the Committee has agreed an outline scope for the next stage of the future harbour requirements and, given that it is a super priority, when is the output of this work to be expected?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: The short answer is next year. I cannot be much more specific at this stage, but I will keep him posted.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin, supplementary.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

Within the frustrations held on the situation of the GDA and the resignation of the director, one of the initial points created when the GDA was set up was giving a different way of doing things and giving that authority. Now the frustration is how we are going to try to find a way. One of the main things of this particular project was towards Black Rock.

Could I get a comment from the President of Policy & Resources on that aspect at least because we have lost Leale's Yard? What is your view on at least trying to keep that element of the project going; Leale's Yard Omnibus version?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I do not think the States ever had Leale's Yard Omnibus version. No deal was ever agreed there, so that is not something that we have lost. The Guernsey Development Agency was not involved in that in any case. Black Rock, of course, is still the option that we, along with STSB, are looking at in terms of future waste.

There is more data that is required. That work is very much an ongoing focus, and we will update the Assembly as soon as we can on that but, yes, we are stockpiling that waste at the moment so there is no time to put our heels up and sit on our laurels. It is obviously a high priority area of focus.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: The President mentioned in her reply the issues to do with bulk input of facilities and the interconnector with energy. Surely another constraint on the Development Agency has

been easy access to finance for long-term capital investment. Will Policy & Resources be looking at ways in which a development agency could, for the sake of argument, move ahead with smaller projects like Black Rock without necessarily having to go to the commercial market exclusively without States underwriting or support?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I do not recognise the basis on which Deputy Gollop's question is framed actually. I do not think that has been the main constraint of the Guernsey Development Agency because they are not at the point yet of being able to do that. We have established them precisely because they are better able to go and make commercial agreements.

The set of stumbling blocks that we are up against at the moment is there are not as many projects that we would like that do not first require a strategic direction from the States so they cannot get to the delivery point and, therefore, they are not in a position to be having those conversations. I have every confidence in them being the right people to have those conversations as and when is need, but I do not think that is the core issue that the Guernsey Development Agency is facing at the moment.

When it comes to Black Rock, I do not think the funding is a problem at all. We know where the funding is coming from in Black Rock in terms of the inert waste. So if anything further was to happen, then that is a separate question, but they are not yet at that stage.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Sorry about that. I phrased it wrongly. I think in order to allow what is a good idea in principle for the Guernsey Development Agency to continue its work, given the length of time it will take before some of these strategic questions are finally decided by us and other parties, is there not a need to ensure the Development Agency has sufficient finance to carry on with its provisional work and planning in order to get to that period where, as Deputy de Sausmarez said, it is in a position to move forward?

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, and that is obviously what we are doing so they are funded at the moment. We are having conversations about what funding they require based in terms of keeping them operational and in terms of project financing where required, so that is all part of the consideration. I would not say that is a particular issue.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: I believe, sir, I probably know the answer to this question anyway. Would the President not agree with me, or would she rather agree with me, that one of the problems and frustrations that the GDA had is that either Property Services or the States in general are pathologically against handing over any of their land to the private sector? And I know the answer.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think Deputy Inder might be surprised actually because the latest conversations I have had have indicated that land transfer is absolutely not a barrier at this stage. So he can characterise things how he likes, but that is not one of the pressing problems that they are up against. Again, land transfer is further down the line so, yes, anyway, we will come back with the revised Key Infrastructure Delivery Plan and he will see.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HOME AFFAIRS

Guernsey Prison Officers – Number of Complaints

The Bailiff: The next set of questions are from Deputy Curgenven to the President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs, who is not here, so they will be answered by the Vice-President.

Deputy Curgenven, your first question, please.

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

Broken down annually for the past five years, how many complaints have been made regarding the conduct of one of more Guernsey Prison officers from persons who are not inmates?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, the Vice-President of the Committee *for* Home Affairs to reply, please.

Deputy Gollop: Usually I am on the other side of this, and we all wish Deputy Leadbeater well in his recuperation.

The Home Affairs Committee thanks Deputy Curgenven for the question. The Committee accepts the interest in this matter. However, it is essential that commentary at this time does not cut across ongoing matters within the Guernsey Prison.

The Committee acknowledges that this information is not currently in the public domain. Following discussion with the acting Prison Governor, it can give the commitment that this will be published in future annual reports from 2026, so this term.

The Bailiff: Any supplementary question, Deputy Curgenven?

Deputy Curgenven: Could the Vice-President please explain to the Assembly why the Committee is now saying it will make these complaints public, yet, when asked previously, as I understand it, the Committee declined to disclose the very same information on the basis it would breach data protection laws?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: One area that I think we have come to realise, and we got help too from the Presiding Officer and the team, is there is a material difference between freedom of information requests, which anyone can do, and the privilege and honour we have as elected Members of the States of Deliberation to ask questions and have them answered. On a political level, we will answer the question in a different way, although there are rules about the public interest and confidentiality.

I think one has to emphasise here that what is a very unusual circumstance is the Prison Governor is not in full office at the moment, but it will be inaccurate to say that he has been suspended. He has stood down and, therefore, we are keen to avoid any premature commentary on these matters.

Given the importance of our mandated responsibilities for a safe prison environment – and I personally welcome and encourage scrutiny – we have requested a general briefing of complaint handling, including any themes that arise for complaints.

I think maybe we inherited a strong barrier of operational responsibility, but I think we, as a Committee, want to get to the bottom of any complaints that have been raised by Deputies or by the public and understand, not as an employer because we are technically not an employer –

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, your 90 seconds for answering has expired.

Is there a second supplementary to this question, Deputy Curgenven?

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

Given what the President, Deputy Leadbeater, has previously said about the police complaints process:

> I have already given my commitment to Deputy Curgenven, which I also give to this Assembly, that we will look at the best practice and other jurisdictions and consider the roles and responsibilities of all involved in the complaints process to ensure that accountability, transparency and fairness are to be seen.

In light of that, would the Vice-President like to take this opportunity to answer the original question?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Surely that is not entirely a supplementary, but I certainly endorse everything Deputy Curgenven said and has quoted what Deputy Leadbeater has said. We will be looking at best practice. We will be finding out more – it is still a comparatively new Committee – on what are the underlying issues of the complaints. It is not our responsibility to do human resources expeditions and, of course, employee matters come under Policy & Resources and are dealt with in a different process.

We are committed to a safe prison environment and we are committed to ongoing analysis of the themes from people who are not necessarily resident in the prison that have made complaints. We cannot, at this particular moment, cut across ongoing investigative and review processes through the premature publication of information or commentary, and we do say it is not appropriate to be drawn into speculation or premature commentary at this time while these independent processes are imposed.

We do have a commitment to public information relating to complaints and not in a way necessarily that would identify individual persons, but to see what issues about the culture and practices are being revealed so that we can work collectively to improve matters.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

So the Vice-President has made it clear why the Committee is not able to answer the question at this time, but can the Vice-President commit to publishing a response to the question just as soon as ongoing matters within the prison are resolved?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I do as an individual. We are a Committee of six people and we work according to our processes. I think we have, within our deliberations, already made a full commitment to evaluate the themes. I will reveal we have seen a draft of this year's prison report, and we very much approved it, but it has not yet been published while circumstances are as they are. We have committed to an investigation of the prison from the UK external inspector within the next 12 months or so.

I think we are going as far as we can and I, personally, wish to see more thematic understanding because we realise, as a Committee, we actually need to know what the issues are. It does not mean to say we interfere in staff matters or operational matters or get involved as quasi assistant governors, but we do need to know what resources and improvements are needed to get the best service.

The Bailiff: Your second question to the Vice-President then please, Deputy Curgenven.

Probation Officers –
Conduct

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

I previously asked this question under Rule 14, but no answer was forthcoming. I therefore ask the President to state whether it is correct that last year not less than 13 complaints, in whatever form including grievances, were made regarding the conduct of three probation officers by fellow staff members.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop to reply.

Deputy Gollop: It is a rather short answer, but I can expand in the supplementary. I am happy to confirm that the figures Deputy Curgenven has stated are not correct.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Curgenven.

Deputy Curgenven: Given that the President, Deputy Leadbeater, previously said that he would provide an answer on another subject but related, in the interests of openness and transparency, would the Vice-President like to take this opportunity to answer how many complaints were received in this context?

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: We will find out more exact figures ourselves. We are assured as a board that the numbers are not that high. It is a well-established parliamentary process that the Assembly is not a forum to talk about staff matters and, further, staffing is a matter within the Policy & Resources Committee Mandate and not the Committees. That said, like Health, we have a responsibility to good governance.

The Probation Service is a particularly small service area employing fewer than 15 members of staff. I understand they were under-resourced, but that is being improved. Staff who raise complaints and those colleagues who subsequently participate in investigations do so in good faith with the expectation that such matters are handled confidentially by their employer.

To depart from such an expectation or to share any information in a way with those small numbers that could allow individuals to be identified – whether complainants or staff and whether directly or indirectly – risks undermining that trust and could, given wider information in the public domain, constitute a breach of the Data Protection (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law 2017 in our opinion.

This informed the Committee's decision to apply an exemption to the original freedom of information. I personally would welcome more –

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, your 90 seconds have expired again.

Is there a second supplementary at all? No. Yes, there might be.

Deputy Curgenven.

Deputy Curgenven: Could the President please explain whether the Committee has been presented with a number of complaints for the prison, including all members of staff, and whether they have actually seen all of the figures in a breakdown for five years and when that happened?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: So the only supplementary that you are permitted is to ask about is Probation Officers and not about people at the prison.

Deputy Curgenven: Yes.

The Bailiff: So if you confine yourself to that answer, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I will. We are aware this is a small number, but I cannot that I am particularly aware of the specific number of complaints or what they refer to. That is a matter we, as a Board, need further information on in order to answer the question.

I also think that, bearing in mind the operational areas do bring in confidentiality issues, freedom of information issues, and maybe statutory official issues, that we do need even more advice from the Law Officers from His Majesty's Comptroller or Procureur. I hope that they will be able to assist us in moving forward with a valuation.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you, sir.

I guess the obvious supplementary question of what the numbers are, and when the answer is they are not correct, is what is the correct number? But taking all the responses so far together, as I understand it, the Committee are saying that they are confident that the number in the question is not the right answer but they do not know what the right answer is because they do not have all that information, the Committee has not received all that information. Have I understood that correctly? That is my supplementary, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Broadly, yes.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

Medical Specialist Group – Average wait time

The Bailiff: All right, so the next set of questions are being posed by Deputy Gollop himself, this time to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care. Your first question, please, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you to Deputy Oswald and the Committee for answering my questions. My first question is: across the Medical Specialist Group specialist contract, what is currently the average wait or time duration between a patient or general practitioner making a referral and an appointment with possible diagnosis, and what is the underlying trends?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald to reply, please.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir; and I thank Deputy Gollop for his question.

Firstly, I would like to emphasise that the secondary healthcare contract is not merely a contract commissioning the Medical Specialist Group to provide specialist healthcare services. The contract has been specifically designed as a joint contract with responsibilities for both the MSG as well as

the Committee *for* Health & Social Care to deliver secondary healthcare services in the Bailiwick or Guernsey.

The target response time to initial outpatient appointment under the secondary healthcare contract is eight weeks for routine appointments, two weeks for cancer referrals, one week for urgent referrals, or 24 hours for emergency cases. In 2025, 64% of patients attending their outpatient appointment did so within the contractual target waiting time. For outpatients referred since 16th February 2026, the average waiting time has been around eight weeks.

Areas with the longest average waiting times since February of this year include the specialist nursing services within HSC and ophthalmology and gastroenterology services at MSG. With an ongoing increase in demand across all specialities, efforts continue to stabilise waiting lists and reduce them where possible. However, without additional physical and clinical capacity, it will be challenging to return to the target waiting times that are set within the contract.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Maybe two supplementaries. My first supplementary is: the answer candidly says that it will be challenging to return to the target waiting times that are set within the contract without additional physical and clinical capacity. Are the Board working on what that would look like?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

The short answer to that is yes. That all comes under the sustainable health and wellbeing focus in the super priority in the Government Work Plan.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: My second supplementary is: would the specialist services that are perhaps having longer waiting times and indeed others be benefited if a higher number of Islanders sought consultation via private medical insurance or other private facilities?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: That is an interesting question. If people choose to go down the private route then that diverts away from the contract waiting times. Nevertheless, if they choose to have their care delivered locally, there is only a finite number of clinic spaces and a finite number of operating theatre spaces to cater for the demand. So it will make a difference at one end of the spectrum but not necessarily at the other.

The Bailiff: Your second question to the President then please, Deputy Gollop.

Medical Specialist Group – Desired attainable target for appointment

Deputy Gollop: What is the current specified desired target attainable time for an MSG, Medical Specialist Group, appointment after an appropriate GP referral having been formally requested?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald to reply, please.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

The target response time to the initial outpatient appointment under the secondary healthcare contract either by HSC or MSG is eight weeks for routine appointments with shorter waiting times for cancer referrals, one week for urgent referrals or 24 hours for emergency cases. It is expected that the target response time should be met in 95% of all cases.

Target waiting times are publicly available and included in the annual published secondary healthcare contract key performance indicator reports.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

We hear in social media and from constituents that there were delays. Will Health & Social Care evaluate where there are delays and in what specific areas that might need additional specialists or interim support?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald to reply.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

Waiting times are under continual review, continuous by the officers, and on an intermittent basis currently about every three months by the board itself. We look at difficult areas and we consider how we can address those areas, and in the past we have commissioned waiting list initiatives.

The Bailiff: Your third question to the President then, please, Deputy Gollop.

Health & Social Care Board – Intervention and Oversight

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much.

Across different professional specialisms and medical or surgical needs, are there significant differences in access time reflecting demand and/or resource shortages which may require additional Health & Social Care Board intervention and oversight?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald to reply, please.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

Access times, which we tend to refer to as waiting times, vary significantly between specialities, reflecting demand and known resource constraints that are already recognised and managed through the budget and contract management process. The demand pressures are common to all similar health systems, principally driven by an ageing population, results in more patients with several long-term conditions and influenced by medical advances that make more conditions treatable. This raises both demand volume and complexity even where referral numbers are stable.

The main constraints are workforce and, to some extent, space. Some specialities are hard to recruit to, for example, neurology and historically gastroenterology. Where capacity or pathways have improved so has access. A 2025 gastroenterology pathway review cut that inpatient list by 34% and a second consultant has now been funded. An ophthalmology cataract initiative and recruitment improved access. And a temporary decline in radiology performance driven by reduced ultrasound capacity have recovered by year end. These pressures are visible through the 2027 budget requests, the Hospital Modernisation Programme, and joint contract oversight.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: I might have two.

I thank Deputy Oswald and the Committee for this answer, but he has given a strong clue as to how you can improve the situation. A gastroenterology pathway review, for example, cut a list but it led to a second consultant being funded. That clearly indicates that additional consultants on the Island being funded is one way to improve quality and services.

Will that example be used in other areas? I can think of some disciplines where there is only one consultant on the Island.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you Deputy Gollop.

Those two areas to which he refers, the recruitment of the gastroenterology consultant and the waiting list review were two separate processes, one precipitated by the other. The failure to recruit a gastroenterology consultant in a difficult employment climate required the board look carefully at the waiting list and to ask MSG to perform the review that they did, which ended up with a significant efficiency reform as achieved.

There are, as you indeed point out, areas on this Island where we may only have one or perhaps two specialists in that particular area, but one has to remember that we are an Island of 65,000 people. We cannot provide 24-hour cover, seven days a week in every speciality.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Deputy Rylatt will give a clue in his questions about working in Jersey maybe, but my question is: you end that you need more physical capacity and you end the questions with the Hospital Modernisation Programme.

I know all of Health & Social Care are very committed to that but would the President reassure us and the public that HSC will be pushing for the delayed opening of the already modernised area and stage 2 or 3 to commence as soon as possible in order to get that quality capacity we need?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

I can reassure him on one aspect and that is Our Hospital Modernisation (OHM) 1, the new critical care and post-anaesthetic care unit, will be opening in 2027 DV.

Okay, in terms of phase 2A, clearly we have had a setback in terms of financing. There is active and a strong workforce working on how we are going to get around the problems which have faced us so that we can provide the sort of services that Deputy Gollop alludes to.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, supplementary.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you, sir.

To what extent has the delay in being able to open the Critical Care Unit (CCU) contributed or to what extent does it contribute to delays in referrals within the specialist service which underpins the questions that are being asked? Is it one of the active resource constraints which is contributing to the backlog in some areas?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy St Pier.

The short answer is no, because we currently have a perfectly adequate and functioning Critical Care Unit, which does not meet current NHS requirements in terms of space, privacy and all those

circumstances, but functions in its capability of providing critical care to some of our most challenged patients.

In fact, the only way where it might reduce service commitments in terms of when people need complex operating where there is no bed available in the CCU, clearly in the new phase that issue has been addressed. So there will be occasions when people are cancelled because of lack of a bed in CCU, but it is only on occasion.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HEALTH & SOCIAL CARE

Guernsey and Jersey Health Departments – Collaboration

The Bailiff: The final set of questions for today will be from Deputy Rylatt, also to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care.

So your question please, Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: Thank you, sir.

In its response to my Rule 14 questions, dated 3rd June 2026, the Committee listed 21 subject areas on which Guernsey and Jersey's health departments collaborate at an operational level. Given the breadth of this joint working, does the President agree that the Health Alliance would benefit from clear political ownership and an overarching strategic direction?

The Bailiff: The President, Deputy Oswald, to reply please.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

I thank Deputy Rylatt for his question. Deputy Rylatt will be aware that in the Committee *for* Health & Social Care's response to his Rule 14 questions dated 3rd June 2026, the Committee noted that during the previous political term there was no formal commitment to increase political alignment in respect of health and care between the States of Guernsey and the Government of Jersey.

There was, however, clear support for enhanced operational engagement, which is reflected in the range of subject areas as previously identified in the Committee's Rule 14 response. In addition, there is ongoing joint work at an operational level through the Jersey and Guernsey Public Health Alliance on issues such as pandemic plans, infectious disease management. Environmental workstream, within the Government Work Plan is the development of a sustainable health and care model.

In this context, the Committee would welcome greater engagement with politicians in Jersey. As Members will be aware, Jersey held its general election in June and is currently in the process of making ministerial appointments. Once the incoming political leadership for the Department of Health and Care in Jersey has been confirmed, the Committee intends to initiate discussions with its political counterparts.

The Bailiff: Supplementary question, Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: I am grateful to the President for his answer.

What are the specific key strategic issues that the President would like to see explored or progressed with Jersey's incoming political leadership?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

I was interested to see the debate they held in their election process in terms of the funding of their healthcare system, and of course we are facing exactly the same questions on Island. I would welcome informed debate with our Jersey colleagues as to how they are progressing in this problem which they face as much as we do here.

The Bailiff: Second supplementary, Deputy Rylatt.

Deputy Rylatt: Thank you, sir.

Once Jersey's new political leadership is confirmed, will the President commit to reporting back to the States in HSC's November Update Statement on the outcome of those initial discussions including what areas, if any, will be prioritised for deeper joint working?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Certainly, Deputy Rylatt, if we have had the opportunity to make the appropriate arrangements by that time, I will certainly make sure it is included in our feedback statement.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, supplementary.

Deputy Gollop: Recently I attended a seminar where a senior member of staff indicated on the challenge working with Jersey is we sometimes have different clients, which is the selection for buying essential equipment. On the other hand, the Chief Executive Officer in a public talk said that he would welcome looking at efficiencies for Jersey which, for example, might include everything from costs of stationery, equipment, cleansing equipment, all sorts of services and procurement issues. Would the President agree to work with Policy & Resources maybe to see whether co-operation could include joint purchasing like a trust?

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Gollop.

I have two answers to that question. First, in terms of joint procurement, I was particularly interested in things like procurement of orthopaedic prostheses, and I have raised that question on a number of occasions, but it turns out that both Jersey and Guernsey use the NHS procurement process for purchasing stuff like orthopaedic prostheses. So probably on that point, and that is probably an example of other areas where such work that is already being done probably cannot be progressed much further.

In terms of other points, in terms of strategic realisations, you may be aware that the Air Ambulance Charter, on which all of us one day might depend, has recently been renegotiated and the contract hopefully will shortly be signed. This is a joint working group between Jersey and Guernsey and, unlike other areas where we have had our differences, the area of consensual agreement approached 80% to 90% on all the decisions made. This is a very good example of a joint working relationship which we have achieved, a mutual benefit between our two Islands.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Yes, thank you.

The focus has been on some of the strategic issues. I am interested to know what are the key operational issues and opportunities which the President believes might benefit the most from greater co-operation between the two Islands?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: That, sir, is an interesting question, and I thank Deputy St Pier for it.

Throughout my clinical career, I was very engaged in operational working arrangements with my Jersey colleagues down there and encouraged us to support that and develop it at every possible opportunity.

It would be fair to say that sometimes the difficulty was not at this end of the spectrum but the other end of the spectrum. When it comes to, for instance, we have had discussions perhaps about appointing a joint position in a difficult to recruit to speciality covering both Islands, but regrettably the 21 miles of sea between us make that arrangement practically somewhat difficult, albeit there is no doubt at all that in the future, should we see an area where that could be progressed, we should do that.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Supplementary, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Related to; Deputy St Pier asked the question I was going to ask, but in any event I have not heard it said that a Channel Island health Law would be of some benefit. Would the President agree that legislation is where sometimes our problems may start where they do not match at the same time, we do have different Laws. If we could get something that looked fairly similar, would that be a good start point to work closer with Jersey for the reasons that have been expressed and sometimes the insanity that we cannot?

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, Deputy Inder, that is a very interesting point.

Clearly, both Islands have different legal backgrounds and different healthcare backgrounds, but there clearly are areas where commonality in Law would be appropriate. One of the areas may be in the cannabis regulation in terms of, because both Islands are facing the same issue about diversion of cannabis products into the general population; so that is one area where we might proceed.

In terms of the more general work to which you allude, I would have to confess that I would have to come back to you on that answer.

The Bailiff: There are no more supplementary questions. Deputy Sloan is not here to ask his question to the President of the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure but if he does appear before the end of the meeting then I will allow him to ask that question at that point.

Billet d'État X

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

PRESIDING OFFICER

1. Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development – Election commenced

Article 1.
The States are asked:-

To elect a sitting Member of the States as a Member of the Committee for Economic Development to complete the unexpired term of office, that is to 30th June 2029, of Deputy Andrew Niles who has been deemed to have resigned from that office, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation as set out in Section 1 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees.

The Bailiff: Next item of business please, Greffier.

The States' Greffier: Article 1, the Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President of the Committee, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, to make a nomination.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I would like to propose Deputy Laine.

The Bailiff: Is that nomination seconded?

Deputy Camp: It is, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much, Deputy Camp.

Are there any other nominations for the vacancy on the Committee *for* Economic Development? No. In that case there is no need for speeches and I will invite Members to decide whether they wish to vote for Deputy Laine, proposed by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and seconded by Deputy Camp, and it will be done by way of a secret ballot, which is the requirement.

Have all the voting slips been passed to the Sheriff?

PRESIDING OFFICER

2. Election of One Non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board – Election commenced

Article 2.

The States are asked:-

To re-elect Dr Simon Thornton with effect from 1st July 2026, as a voting Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board who shall not be a Member of the States, in accordance with Rule 16 of The Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation and their Committees, whose term of office shall expire in accordance with the terms of Rule 37(2).

The Bailiff: Next item of business, please.

The States' Greffier: Article 2, the Election of One Non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board.

The Bailiff: Deputy Helyar, do you have a nomination?

Deputy Helyar: Yes, I wish to nominate Dr Simon Thornton.

The Bailiff: Is that nomination seconded?

Deputy Niles: It is.

The Bailiff: It is always nice to see a good degree of co-operation between different Members who both stand at the same time. We will take Deputy Niles.

So this is an instance where it applies, and on this occasion I will invite the proposer to speak for up to three minutes in respect of Dr Thornton.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir, I shall be very brief.

This is a repeat appointment; Dr Thornton is already a member of the board and is the Chair of Guernsey Ports and Guernsey Water. He is doing a lot of very important work and we consider that it would be very useful for purposes of continuity, if nothing else, for him to continue in his role. We fully support him and together we believe we make a good team. He brings a lot of professional qualifications and experience to the role and I commend him to the Assembly.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I am going to ask you whether you are minded to vote for Dr Simon Thornton, proposed by Deputy Helyar, seconded by Deputy Niles, as a non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board. Once again, can you write his name if you want to, because it has to be a secret ballot, on a piece of paper?

Have all the voting slips been passed to the Deputy Sheriff? Okay, they can be taken off and counted.

COMMITTEE *FOR* ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

3. Appointment of an Ordinary Member of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman – Ms Caroline Dutot elected

Article 3.
In accordance with paragraph 1(2) of schedule 1 to the Financial Services Ombudsman (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2014, the following appointment, by the Committee for Economic Development, to the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman, is laid before the States of Deliberation.

The Bailiff: Next item of business please, Greffier.

The States' Greffier: Article 3, the Committee *for* Economic Development, Appointment of an Ordinary Member of the Office of the Financial Services Ombudsman.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, what do you want to say about this?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, very briefly, this appointment follows an open recruitment process undertaken jointly with our counterparts in Jersey and the Channel Islands Financial Ombudsman (CIFO), reflecting the pan-Channel Islands nature of CIFO's operations. Ms Caroline Dutot was recommended for appointment for a three-year term by an independent selection panel following interview and assessment against the requirements of the Financial Services Ombudsman Law 2014.

The Committee has satisfied itself that all statutory requirements have been met, including the receipt of the CIFO Chairman's formal nomination, the required declarations and supporting documentation and appropriate background and eligibility checks.

The Committee is also satisfied that Ms Dutot possesses the skills and experience necessary to contribute effectively to the governance of the Guernsey's Office of the Financial Services

Ombudsman. The Committee approved the appointment on 28th April and in accordance with the requirements of the Law this appointment is laid before the States, and I commend Ms Dutot for appointment to this Assembly.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I do not see anyone rising to debate the appointment of Ms Dutot. On this occasion we will use the SEV, just so you have a bit of practice today, and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on the Proposition.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	None	Burford, Yvonne	Leadbeater, Marc
Bury, Tina			Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah	Ozanne, Jayne
Cameron, Andy				Rochester, Sally
Camp, Haley				Sloan, Andy
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of the appointment of Caroline Dutot as a Member of the Office of the Financial Service Ombudsman, there voted in favour 34 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 2 Members did not vote, 4 Members were absent, and therefore I will declare that carried.

Election of a Member of the Committee *for* Economic Development –
Election concluded –
Deputy Marc Laine elected as a member

The Bailiff: Let me announce the result of the vote for a member of the Committee *for* Economic Development. Deputy Laine, proposed by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and seconded by Deputy Camp, received 33 votes, there was one blank paper and no spoiled papers, and therefore I will declare Deputy Laine elected to that Committee. *(Applause)*

Election of One Non-States Member of the States' Trading Supervisory Board –
Election concluded –
Dr Simon Thornton elected as a non-States Member

The Bailiff: In relation to Dr Simon Thornton as a non-States Member on the States' Trading Supervisory Board, he similarly received 33 votes, there was one blank paper, no spoilt papers, and I will therefore declare him re-elected to that office.

MOTION TO DEBATE

COMMITTEE *FOR* EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

Employment and Equal Opportunities Service –
Annual Report 2025 –
Motion carried

To resolve, pursuant to Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure of the States of Deliberation, to debate the Appendix Report to Billet d'État No. X entitled 'Employment and Equal Opportunities Service Annual Report 2025.'.

The States' Greffier: The Employment and Equal Opportunities Service Annual Report 2025, Motion to Debate.

The Bailiff: I am going to invite Deputy Curgenven to open in respect of this matter.

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

I am pleased to lay the Motion to Debate the 2025 Annual Report of the Employment and Equal Opportunity Service. I am grateful to Deputy St Pier for seconding and Deputy Bury for engaging with me ahead of time.

The report provides Members with a valuable overview of the service's invaluable work during the past year and highlights the important role it plays in supporting employment rights, promoting equality and opportunity, and helping to ensure that Guernsey's employment legislation operates effectively in practice. I would like to place on record my appreciation for the work undertaken by the service and for the preparation of this comprehensive report.

It is also worth noting that this debate represents one of the very few opportunities for this Assembly collectively to consider and scrutinise the work of the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service. While Members may engage with its work throughout the year in various ways, this Annual Report provides a dedicated occasion for all elected Members to reflect on the service's performance, achievements and future challenges. That scrutiny is important. It promotes

transparency, accountability and public confidence in the work of an organisation that performs significant functions on behalf of our community.

I am also encouraged that the President of the Committee has indicated a willingness to engage fully in today's debate. Such openness should be welcomed. It demonstrates confidence in the work that has been undertaken and recognition that constructive questioning and discussion can only strengthen our institutions.

For those reasons, I welcome the report, thank all those involved in the work, and respectively ask that Members support the motion before the Assembly.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier, do you formally second the motion?

Deputy St Pier: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Bury, as the President, what do you wish to say about this?

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

Just briefly, as Deputy Curgenven has indicated, the Committee is very happy to debate the report and welcomes the opportunity to discuss the work of the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service (EEOS).

The Bailiff: He used to be President of the States' Assembly and Constitution Committee. You should know that, on a Motion to Debate at this stage, there is no debate. So there is no need for a Rule 26(1). I am simply going to ask Members to vote on the Proposition that the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service Annual Report 2025 should be debated.

Open the voting please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 31, Contre 3, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	Laine, Marc	Cameron, Andy	Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne	Malik, Munazza			Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina	Vermeulen, Simon			Rochester, Sally
Camp, Haley				Sloan, Andy
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Le Brun, Ross				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				

Parkinson, Charles
Rylatt, Tom
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Williams, Steve

The Bailiff: On the Motion to Debate, there voted in favour 31 Members, 3 Members voted against, 1 Member abstained, 1 Member did not vote, 4 Members were absent, and therefore I would declare the Motion to Debate duly carried and we will return to that later in the meeting.

LEGISLATION LAID BEFORE THE STATES

The Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; The Building (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; Parochial Elections (St Pierre du Bois) Regulations, 2026; The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2025; The Electronic Transactions (Exemptions) (Amendment) Order, 2026

The Bailiff: Can we lay the legislation please, Greffier?

The States' Greffier: Yes, the following legislation is laid before the States: The Land Planning and Development (Exemptions) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; The Building (Guernsey) (Amendment) Regulations, 2026; Parochial Elections (St Pierre du Bois) Regulations, 2026; The Liquor Licensing (Fees) Regulations, 2025; The Electronic Transactions (Exemptions) (Amendment) Order, 2026.

The Bailiff: I have not received any motions to debate any of the secondary legislation that has just been mentioned, but there will be another opportunity next time around.

Next item of business please, Greffier.

LEGISLATION FOR APPROVAL

COMMITTEE *FOR* EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

4. The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026; 5. The Education (Governance Boards) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2026; – 6. The Alderney (Application of Legislation) (Education) Ordinance, 2026 – Propositions Carried

Article 4.
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

Article 5.
The States are asked to decide:-

Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

Article 6.
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether they are of the opinion to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Alderney (Application of Legislation) (Education) Ordinance, 2026" and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States' Greffier: The Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture, the Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Bill, 2025.

The Bailiff: Is there anything you wish to say about this, Deputy Montague?

Deputy Montague: Sir, there are three items coming up from the Committee; they all relate to governance. I can say a very brief thing, if you want me to package them together and call it a meal deal or three for the price of one, I am happy to do that if that meets with your approval.

The Bailiff: You can do whatever you wish in relation to this.

Deputy Montague: I do not think that has ever been said. Right, okay. *(Laughter)* Just for the Assembly, sir, the first item is merely enacting the Ordinance that was agreed by the Assembly. We have been using the anticipatory exercise of powers, and so that is to put that into place.

The other two, the second one there, is to do with certain mistakes that we remain aware of, to do with the naming of the leaders of our educational settings. We have some executive principals and principals and we needed to amend the Ordinance to ensure that they could have *ex-officio* places on the board. We also, in our primary sector, now have an executive headteacher working across two sites that we needed to amend the wording; that is the second one.

The third one is with reference to extending the Governance Board Regulations to Alderney with two minor amendments. One is to enable the States of Alderney to have a temporary member of ESC when we interview for the Chair of Governance, and the other one is to allow the Policy and Finance in Alderney to nominate a Governor for the Board.

So there are merely those three things. I am happy to respond if anyone has any issues with those.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Deputy Montague reminded me of the work that we looked at on the Education Scrutiny Panel chaired by Deputy Camp, who is on the Education Devolution & Delegation Investigation & Advisory Committee (EDDIAC) group, as is Deputy Collins who sits on our Committee, and of course Deputy Curgenven who is our Vice-President sits on the main Education.

So we were very interested in this work when it came to us and I support all of it. The executive headteacher perhaps having more than one role and the other points. Nevertheless, it is important we do not lose focus on the overall goal of these governance changes. It is not only to evolve the situation and move it forward, but it is to give a real clear way and a good approach so that schools do have much greater powers of freedom, of autonomy, of experimentation, of innovation, and hopefully the new structures will not just be conformist to what other norms that education used to have but will be quite revolutionary in a good way.

The Bailiff: Deputy Montague, do you wish to respond to what Deputy Gollop has just said?

Deputy Montague: Sir, very briefly, if I may.

I would like to thank Deputy Gollop for his comment, and I would like to remind the Assembly that for over six months now a sub-committee, an investigator and advisory committee named EDDIAC, which is being chaired by Deputy Bury and the Vice-Chair is Deputy Camp. It consists of Deputy Collins and Deputy Parkinson and myself, have been working very hard to do as much as we can to prepare for a policy letter brought to this Assembly in December to do exactly what we think needs to be done in terms of helping those governance boards improve the standards of education across all those 20 settings.

I have nothing more to add on that, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, you have to vote individually on each of the three items that have just been addressed. So the first is The Education (Guernsey) (Amendment) Law, 2025 (Commencement) Ordinance, 2026, so I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on that matter.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of the Commencement Ordinance, there voted in favour 36 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 4 Members are absent, and therefore I will declare that Ordinance duly carried.

We will now go to The Education (Governance Boards) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2026, and again I will invite the Greffier to open the voting in respect of that matter.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of the Governance Board's Amendment Ordinance, there voted in favour 36 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 4 Members are absent. I will declare that Ordinance duly carried.

Finally, The Alderney (Application of Legislation) (Education) Ordinance, 2026. I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on that Ordinance.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				

Collins, Garry
Curgenven, Rob
de Sausmarez, Lindsay
Dorrity, David
Falla, Steve
Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Goy, David
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah
Helyar, Mark
Hill, Edward
Humphreys, Rhona
Inder, Neil
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Laine, Marc
Le Brun, Ross
Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Parkinson, Charles
Rylatt, Tom
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

The Bailiff: In respect of that draft Ordinance, the voting was as follows, 36 Members voted in favour, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, same 4 Members are absent, and therefore I will declare that Ordinance also duly carried.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HOME AFFAIRS

7. Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006 – Debate commenced

Article 7.
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006' dated 17th February 2026, they are of the opinion:-
1. To agree to amend the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006 to give effect to the proposals set out in section 4 this Policy Letter.
2. Only if proposition 1 has been approved, to approve the draft Ordinance entitled "The Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2026" as set out in the Appendix to this Policy Letter, and to direct that the same shall have effect as an Ordinance of the States.

The States' Greffier: Article 7, Committee *for* Home Affairs, Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006.

The Bailiff: In the absence of the President, I will invite the Vice-President, Deputy Gollop, to open the debate.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, again, very much, sir.

I seem to have a lot to do today, but I thank you and this is a combination of things. From a strategic context perspective, a memorandum of understanding has been in place since 2013 setting out the relationship and respective responsibilities of the then States of Alderney Policy Committee, Policy and Finance Committee, the then Home Department, now the Committee *for* Home Affairs and the Alderney Gambling Control Commission in relation to eGambling.

Due to technical and commercial reasons, equipment required for eGambling transactions cannot be adequately hosted in Alderney, so it benefits Guernsey too, and the 2006 Ordinance therefore facilitates the hosting of eGambling on computer services located within its jurisdiction which are regulated by the Alderney Gambling Control Commission (AGCC).

If licensed by the AGCC, gambling transactions that will be lawful in Alderney are also lawful in Guernsey where they take place in Guernsey under certain limited and specified conditions, for instance only being in Guernsey because the computer server is located here, but it is fundamentally an Alderney issue. The relevant eGambling legislation is the aforementioned 2006 Ordinance of Guernsey and the Alderney eGambling Ordinance 2009.

The purpose of this policy letter, which in some ways is a little dry, is to seek approval from the States to amend Guernsey's eGambling legislation. namely the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006. The proposed amendments relate to technical changes to the 2006 Ordinance to ensure that the Guernsey and Alderney eGambling regimes are aligned.

These proposals follow a gap identified in Guernsey's eGambling legislation, which, unlike Alderney's eGambling legislation, does not expressly make it illegal to organise, promote, or carry out an unlicensed gambling transaction. In addition, it is proposed that Guernsey's legislation is updated to include a definition of the meaning 'promote' which has already been inserted into Alderney's legislation effective from 1st January 2026 in order to ensure consistency across the regulated regimes.

As a matter of good practice, it is recommended that the two regimes are aligned as soon as possible. The Committee sought the permission of the Presiding Officer – you, sir – and we were wary to allow the policy letter and legislation to be considered concurrently, and we are very grateful that that is happening. Indeed, two of the seven pages relate to the legislation and one of the resolutions.

The proposed draft Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance is set out in the appendix to this policy letter.

What is interesting is, wearing my Scrutiny hat in a sense, we often pull a face, or even reject on one recent occasion, if we get legislation and policy at the same time because it is not ideal. But, nevertheless, in order to have effective law enforcement, sometimes there are exceptions to the rule. As this is basically a technical matter rather than a policy matter, this falls within it. I know areas like MONEYVAL and forensic economic work has led to this smoothing of the process for this combination for this effectively to link together diverse pieces of legislation. We see this in other areas, and this is one which is useful.

I am pleased to present this policy letter and proposed amendment. As I said from the earlier executive points, the Guernsey eGambling legislation is out of step with the equivalent Alderney legislation and we were pleased to have Alderney Representative Snowdon as a full member of our Home Committee. They are technical amendments but they are ensuring the two regimes are aligned.

I set out in the policy letter that, in contrast to the equivalent Alderney legislation, the Guernsey legislation does not explicitly at the moment make it a criminal offence to organise, promote or carry out eGambling transactions without a licence from the Alderney Gambling Control Commission. There is some uncertainty under the current position, which means it could potentially be argued that not having a licence may not in itself contravene the Law. That is why we are, as I said, grateful to the Presiding Officer to get consideration today so the two regimes can be aligned as soon as practical as they interrelate.

The proposed amendments put this beyond doubt, after legal and technical advice, by clearly stating that unlicensed transactions are unlawful and those involved in organising or promoting them commit an offence.

The second proposal introduces a formal definition of the term 'promote'. This brings Guernsey into line with Alderney where this definition has already been adopted; Alderney being ahead of us. Clarifying this term ensures all relevant activities are properly captured and regulated. I would say now we have new careers like being an influencer and having a career promoting things, it is more timely than ever that we ensure that we are not breaching any rules, and this will bring consistency and alignment.

We all know that Alderney has an eGambling regime which is administered by the Alderney Gambling Control Commission, which is an independent regulator licensing and supervising. As I have said, they are able to operate physically from Guernsey, for instance, a computer server being here. As a result of this, we had some dialogue which we should have answered earlier, in all honesty, from very useful ideas from Deputy Laine who has written about Gamstop, and I hope that he will expand upon that on stopping gambling.

I used to sit on a group with a civil servant and a solicitor and a States/ Member, which looked to, not control gambling but at the problems we have as addicts. I would not say I was a gambling addict, but I have been an addict in other ways, and even investments can be a bit of a gamble at times. So his intervention is useful. From a personal point of view, I think the Island, to follow best practice in discouraging addiction and creating a safe space for customers, is to be welcomed.

Deputy Laine has raised some important issues, which he may expand on, which the Committee will consider in due course, but we are not prepared to give a definitive answer now because I believe that they might have legal and unforeseen consequences, but in principle we will look at them.

Thank you. Well, I have eaten into our lunch hour.

The Bailiff: On that basis, what we will do is we will now adjourn until 2.30.

The Assembly adjourned at 12.35 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.

Amendments to the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2006 –
Debate concluded –
Propositions carried

Deputy Laine: [Offline] outlined by Deputy Gollop, it is worth pointing out, and I will explain the reason, that if someone has their servers in Guernsey and they are doing their business promoting gambling all over the world, taking bets, that is their business. If they actively engage and take bets from local residents, that would require a different licence and, as I understand it, nobody has that licence. So what that means is e-gaming companies from all over the world, and potentially based here, but less so, are taking bets in an unlicensed way in Guernsey. It is the internet, what are you going to do about it? But that is the reality.

As I say, I am a keen supporter of the industry, however it would be wrong to not highlight some of the negative side, which is addiction. I have spoken to some other people, professionals in this space, and I have had some experience with close friends of severe addictions. It is not unusual for someone to get into debt to the tune of £80,000, £90,000, all on credit cards through e-gaming. When someone becomes addicted, it is like any other addiction that is very hard to break, and the consequences for family and individuals and everything else is really awful. That applies to a lot. I am just saying in no way am I getting at the gaming industry. It is the reality.

However, in the UK, if you are licensed in the UK by the UK regulator, you are required to pay a contribution to something called Gamstop. Gamstop is a networked, I will call it a collective, imposed by the regulator that allows people to self-ban themselves from UK-licensed betting platforms. So, if I have a gambling addiction I can go to – I will not name a company – but I can go to that company and I can self-bet or I can go to Gamstop and I can self-exclude and say, 'Look, I have a problem, do not do business with me'. That will be applied across all the licensed businesses, so in a moment of weakness, if I decide to then try to play slots or bet on a football game or something, I will be refused.

That does not apply if I want to do business with a company based in Curacao, etc., but most of the big brands that we come across, and again I will not name them, but they are licensed in the UK. But the reason I spoke to the Home Department is that if you are a Guernsey resident and you have a gambling addiction and you go to Gamstop and say, 'Can I self-ban across all of your licensed platforms?' their answer will be, 'No, because you are from Guernsey'.

So we have this anomaly where UK-licensed e-gaming firms probably do millions in transactions with local residents, but they are not afforded the same protection that they are if they were in the UK.

Simply what I was asking the Guernsey Home Department, because I do not imagine that either the e-gaming companies or the UK regulator would be that averse to extending that facility to residents in Guernsey and Jersey, for that matter. So my suggestion, seeing as Deputy Gollop brought it up, was that perhaps the Home Department in Guernsey approach the Home Office in the UK to encourage consideration of Gamstop being extended to local residents. It will not solve the problem because that person could then find a platform in Curacao or someone else and do business with it. But it would make a little bit of a difference; how much I could not say. But it also does not seem to me like they would have to make a tremendous effort to try to make that happen.

So I wrote to the Home Department a month ago today on that subject and just asked them to look into it and consider going to the Home Office in the UK and trying to apply pressure, because after all these businesses are doing a good trade in Guernsey, they are doing it, no one has licensed them to do it here, and it would not be too much to ask to extend this facility to Guernsey.

But overall I support both these proposals and what the industry is doing and has done for both Alderney and Guernsey.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon:. I thank the last speaker for raising those points, they are valid points and it is very important those are on record.

Also, potentially, I am not speaking on behalf of the Alderney Gambling Control Commission, but it would be helpful if they probably gave a presentation because they give quite a lot of presentations to the Alderney States Members, I believe Policy & Resources, but maybe that should be opened up to everyone.

But what we have today in front of us is more of a tidying up from Home Affairs, and it puts us in line, and it is important to say that the Alderney Gambling Control Commission, we recently had a meeting with them, and the economic benefit to the Bailiwick that they are telling us they can prove and they understand is over £50 million, which is a tremendous amount of money; 200 jobs in Guernsey as well. But this is tidying up from Home to make sure that we are in line, but I do think in future – there are valid comments that were made by the last speaker, and Home does need to look into it. I am sure we are going to put it on to our agenda. Also Alderney Gambling Control Commission should do a presentation for all of the Deputies as well so they understand a little bit more detail.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Before we go to the vote, sir, I need to make a declaration under Rule 17(15), my son is a Deputy Director of Compliance at the AGCC.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.
Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank Marc Laine and Deputy Gollop for your comments. Of course gambling addiction is a very serious issue and a problem. However, Alderney Gambling Control Commission has had very – how should I put it – favourable MONEYVAL reports, and indeed there were some fines handed out to various companies over the last two years who did not safeguard their clients, or were perceived not to be safeguarding their clients against addiction. But I would like to reiterate what Deputy Snowdon said, was that in fact if you wish to find out more we can organise a presentation to you and you can see exactly what controls are in place.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: No one else is rising, so I will turn back to the Vice-President to reply to that debate. Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you very much, sir.

We were reminded on Home Affairs to realise this is important to do in a timely manner, including the resolution for legislation. But at the same time, it is really a technical matter. Nevertheless, it does raise some broader issues.

I warmly thank Deputy Laine for his contribution today and in the letter, and we must consider his points in greater depth. He very much strongly made the issues of Gamstop. I had a look at the website, I could not see that it did not apply to the UK, but then that does apply to a lot. It was very much self-referring, but clearly Gamstop are doing excellent work and helping people, not just break addiction, but break up families with excessive money and all of that.

It is interesting when one looks at this that, yes, the gambler has got, 'Block yourself from online gambling. Register now'. How it works, take a break from gambling, support a loved one. It is very much user friendly but there are issues that it does not quite apply to Guernsey. I suspect Deputy Laine is right that the UK Home Office would not resist us being a part of it, and reputable organisations would not and the Alderney Gambling Control Commission – I did not realise it employed Deputy Gabriel's son – but we know that it has an extremely high reputation, and Deputy Laine would recognise that. He also obviously has experience of the industry from different perspectives.

He did raise a second point, he did not go into detail here about levies, which might require some thought. But we can again take those points on board. They go slightly beyond the scope of this policy letter, but in the process of updating and improving what we do, it is useful. He mentioned Curacao. I used to have a liqueur called Curacao, but now they are a World Cup Football squad that are doing extremely well despite a tiny population of 150,000.

I found too there is not only Gamstop, but there is Gam ... which is all about helping people break addictions, and that is important. There are other aspects that have been mentioned. There is a contribution, Alderney Representative Alex Snowdon sits on Home and of course a longstanding Member of the States of Alderney, so he appreciates the great work of the Alderney Gambling Control Commission and I agree with him and Mr Hill, the Representative, that a presentation to us at Home, and maybe all States Members, would be useful.

Because Alderney Representative Hill, who I believe sits on the Economic Development Committee in Alderney, very actively, has made the point that the Alderney industry does not just benefit some of the possibly less affluent parts of our Bailiwick, although there are very successful people in Alderney, it benefits Guernsey as well because it gives us income, it gives us technical

work to do, it increases our connectivity, our resilience as a promoter of technology and servers, and everything else. So there clearly is a knock-on benefit to Guernsey and we would all benefit from knowing more about how the industry works and how things will shape up in the future and that degree of understanding will assist us.

But, apart from perhaps increasing our knowledge of methods, we can reduce addiction for the future. I do not think there is anything further to say on this except it is in all our best interests to vote for both the resolution of the Proposition and the Law today.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we will take a vote on Proposition 1 first, because Proposition 2 says it is only if it has been approved. So we will just do Proposition 1 in isolation and then, assuming it is approved, we will move on to Proposition 2.

I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on Proposition 1 please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	Gabriel, Adrian	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect to Proposition 1, there voted in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, 1 Member abstained, 4 Members were absent, and therefore I will declare Proposition 1 carried.

Which means we can move on to Proposition 2, which is whether you are minded to approve the draft Ordinance the Alderney eGambling (Operations in Guernsey) Ordinance, 2026, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 35, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	Gabriel, Adrian	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of Proposition 2, there voted in favour 35 Members, no Member voted against, 1 Member abstained, 4 Members were absent, I declare the Proposition then carried.

DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING AUTHORITY

8. Extension of Period of Validity of the Island Development Plan 2016 – Proposition Carried

Article 8.
The States are asked to decide:
Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Extension of Period of Validity of the Island Development Plan 2016' dated 28th April 2026, they are of the opinion:-

1. To agree to extend the effective period of the Island Development Plan until 31st of December 2030 or such earlier date when the States formally adopt a revised Development Plan replacing or amending the Plan in question following a full review.

The States' Greffier: Article 8, Development & Planning Authority, Extension of Period of Validity of the Island Development Plan 2016.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Inder, to open the debate please.
Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.
I promised Deputy St Pier I will not mumble. How am I doing so far?
Sir, Members, this policy letter seeks the agreement of the Assembly to extend the effective period of the Island Development Plan (IDP) until 31st December 2030, or until such earlier date as a revised development plan is formally adopted by the States following a full review.
At its heart, this is a practical and necessary proposal. It is about ensuring continuity, certainty and stability in our planning system, while important ongoing work is completed and while the foundations for a comprehensive review to the Island's planning framework are properly put in place.
Members will be aware that the current IDP was approved by the States on 2nd November 2016 with a 10-year life cycle. Under the provisions of the Land Planning and Development Plans Ordinance, a development plan remains in effect for 10 years unless that period is extended by resolution of the States. It must be reviewed at least once every 10 years.
The current plan therefore reaches the end of its statutory lifespan in November of this year. Ordinarily, a full review would have been completed by that point. However, as set out in the policy letter, that has simply not been achievable within the available timeframe. The Authority is currently concluding the focused review of the IDP. That work has been extensive and complex. Members will recall that the review was originally delayed by the COVID pandemic and subsequently involved significant public engagement, additional research, multiple consultation stages, and a full planning inquiry. You will also be aware that that is now complete.
Indeed, the focus review has now progressed through consultations, representations, further representations and a public hearing. The Independent Planning Inspector has issued his report and the Authority is now considering the recommendations before bringing the amendment plan to later this year. That work remains our immediate priority because it will update the Island's planning policies on housing, land supply, employment, land supply, and a number of other important policy matters. It is essential that these amendments are completed and implemented effectively.
However, even once the focus review is concluded, there is still insufficient time to undertake a full review of the entire IDP before 2026. There is a further and equally important consideration. The IDP does not sit in isolation. It is guided by the Strategic Land Use Plan (SLUP), which provides the high-level planning framework for the Island. The Committee *for the* Environmental & Infrastructure has identified consideration of a potential review of the SLUP as a priority during this political term and intends to consider, as we understand, in 2027 whether review is required and, if so, what its scope should be.
It would make little sense to commence a full review of the IDP before that process has taken place. Any review of the SLUP may provide updated direction and guidance from the States, and it is only sensible that a future comprehensive review of the IDP should reflect the most current strategic direction available. For that reason, the Authority believes that consideration of the SLUP should come first, followed by the full review of the IDP. The proposed extension to the end of 2030 provides sufficient time for those processes to occur in a logical and orderly sequence.
Perhaps the most important point for Members is to consider what would happen if the extension were not approved. Without an extension, the Island would effectively be left without a development plan after November 2026. The Authority would have no overarching planning policy

framework against which to assess planning applications and development proposals. That would create uncertainty for applicants, landowners, developers, businesses and the wider community. It would inevitably result in delays to decision-making and would likely increase the number of appeals and legal challenges. In short, it would create precisely the kind of uncertainty that a planning system is designed to avoid. The IDP, by contrast, provides continuity and certainty while the necessary review work is undertaken.

Members should also be reassured that extending the plan does not mean freezing planning policy in time. The Authority continuously monitors the performance of the IDP through quarterly and annual monitoring reports. That monitoring demonstrates that the policies of the current plan are generally performing as intended and continue to deliver the priorities and objectives established by the States. Importantly, from notes that I have here, at the moment, if we are in the middle of a housing crisis, if we do believe that we need to build more homes, we have something like, since the start of term, 150 new applications across the Island, most of which are coming through. They may not be getting built, but certainly getting through to a full planning permission. That is not an indication that we have a problem with the IDP. I think we will find the problem is probably elsewhere.

Furthermore, the focus review will shortly bring forward significant updates to the plan. The local planning brief for St Peter Port and St Sampson's Harbour action areas, adopted by the States in April 2025, already provides an up-to-date policy framework for development in and around the harbours. Supplementary planning guidance continues to provide detailed interpretation and guidance where required.

In addition, the Authority has been progressing work on streamlining the plan amendment process, subject to States' approval of the associated legislation, more proportionate and efficient mechanisms will be available to amend planning policies where necessary. This means that, even during the extension period, the Authority will be able to respond more quickly to changing circumstances and emerging needs, most of which, or in fact all of which, will come through the States, subject to you approving the streamlining policy letter.

Taken together, these measures ensure that the planning framework remains robust, relevant and responsive throughout the proposed extension period.

Sir, Members, the Proposition is not about postponing important planning decisions, rather it is about ensuring that those decisions are made in the right order, on the basis of the best available evidence and strategic direction, and without creating a damaging gap in the Island's planning framework.

The Authority believes, and we hope you will agree with us, Members, that extending the validity of the IDP until the end of 2030 is both reasonable and necessary. It will allow completion of the focus review to provide time for consideration of the Strategic Land Use Plan, enable a full and properly informed review of the Island Development Plan, and ensure the planning applications continue to be considered within a clear, transparent and legally defensible policy framework.

For those reasons, sir, Members, I commend the Proposition to the Assembly and ask Members to support it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Maybe it is too hot for people to speak, but I would support this. I remember Deputy Inder got sick of seeing me at the planning review that we had in January when the inspector was very patient listening to many members from Committees, but I found it helpful and await with interest hopefully meaningful changes to social and other housing allocations, environmental protection and so on. But Deputy Inder has done a lot of good work so far with the planning from solar panels to revitalising 'the widow's third' and all sorts of areas.

But I have a little bit of caution in supporting this, although I will, because having been not necessarily successful, but I was there for three years, Planning President, between 2016 and 2019.

It was under my watch, it was Deputy Burford who kicked everything off, but it went through the States with the 32 amendments, however many there were. We did it on the basis that you have a 10-year life, which would be more or less this autumn. COVID came along and delayed things and other elements, but I perceived that I used to ask my successors as Presidents, including Deputy Oliver and Deputy Inder, did they have enough resources. I always felt possibly not, because I know we do need a resilient planning force and a forward planning team.

If Members or the wider community or the developers or architects or environmentalists want updated plans every decade, then we have to have more resources to deliver on that. Deputy Inder mentioned, I think I understand, that the right order would be to revise the SLUP, the Strategic Land Use Plan, and then complete the work on the development programme. But unless that SLUP work is done this term, before June 2029, we risk having a further delay because, once the SLUP is approved by the States, maybe the next House, you would then have to go to consultation with the new vision for the next stage of the development plan.

I suppose what shook me a bit was the new deadline is December 2030. Now that is not towards the end of this term, it is in the middle of the next Deputy's term virtually. So it is a little bit of a long way off and I just hope Deputy Inder proves to be right that he and the Committee, along with other States organisations in our Economic Development, P&R, can make realistic changes to planning, not just cutting red tape, but improving areas from everything from tree and field protection to allowing small developments of houses on suitable sites for all structures as quickly as possible, and that we do not hear from Planning, 'We cannot do anything because we do not have the framework.'

The DPA is moving in the right direction and they need the support of other Committees, especially Housing, to get on with it. But I think it would be useful to hear back as to whether we are meeting the new deadline of 2030 and whether that could not be sped up a bit so that we could at least see a draft plan towards the end of this term, say for completion by 2029, which would be three years away.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, the principle embedded currently in legislation is that a brand-new plan is required every 10 years. I want to challenge the fundamental principle that we need a fundamental review of plans like this every 10 years, because the previous plan took three political terms to complete. It is stranded over three – I repeat three – political terms. The current narrow review that is being undertaken by the IDP, by the DPA, started under the previous political Committee, which I was lucky to be involved with, will be about four years in the making, assuming this Assembly will approve this plan.

These processes take an incredible – right now, the way the process is structured –amount of time, resources, etc., and the key is that what outcomes do they deliver? Why do we have to think we need fundamental reviews of such substantial plans?

My point is that we already have enough levers today through which we can today try to progress development or preservation of environmental protection, etc., through some of the levers we have embedded in the IDP making process. That includes the ability to undertake local planning briefs, which we have done in the last political term for the harbour action areas. It has the policies around S5, development of strategic importance, the policy of S6, larger scale development of strategic importance.

Very importantly, as Deputy Inder mentioned, again the last political Committee undertook the process to streamline how the changes to the existing plan are being made. I am very grateful that the new DPA is bringing those proposals for debate hopefully at the next meeting, if not, depending how tax debate goes.

We need to be focused, not on theoretical need for reviews, but what practical changes do we need and problems we need to solve, and what is the best way to be able to solve them. I feel being

too focused or focusing on what needs to be done to progress action today rather than being engaged in that theoretical plan review.

This brings me to the concern I currently have, which is outlined in this policy letter, but in relation to the potential requirements to review the SLUP, which is an even bigger piece of work. My question to Deputy Gabriel and the Committee *for the* E&I is that: do we really need, have you identified the need, what are those urgent priorities, what are those urgent issues that currently we are not able to solve today through the existing SLUP and through the existing IDPs that merit a fundamental SLUP review?

I would really urge the Committee to very carefully consider whether this monumental piece of work, which is going to take a huge amount of time, which they are unlikely to complete given the experience I have seen just going through a narrow IDP process, whether that even merits engagement rather than progressing the many workstreams we, as the Assembly, have under our mandates today that can deliver action today.

I obviously will be supporting this proposal, but really urge Members to avoid embarking on these monumental theoretical reviews, which take years, take a huge amount of resources and time, which fundamentally potentially do not deliver the outcome we need today for the Island community. My real plea to the Committee *for the* E&I is very carefully consider the needs, if there is any need, to undertake a SLUP review this political term. From my optics from outside is that I do not think this is necessary.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

First off I want to state that I welcome Deputy Inder's Proposition and that my Committee supports the extension of the validity, basically because it does bring it into line with any potential review of the SLUP and there would be no point to reviewing the IDP or creating a new IDP when it expired in relation to the current SLUP if the current SLUP is going to be reviewed, which we have forecasted that we will be reviewing it.

Whether that review is necessary or not or what the outcomes may be, if the outcomes are that there are a few tweaks around the edges, because let us remind ourselves what the SLUP does, it guides land use, it guides housing provision, it supports economic development by ensuring there is land and infrastructure available, it protects our natural environment by restricting development to main and local centres, it supports infrastructure planning, which I am a very big fan of, of which that could be a future harbour. It does many things of which then the IDP falls out of that and does the localised version, which Deputy Inder has explained.

So it is all around the timing for me, and if we can get this validity sorted out and a short extension by five years, then buy us some time and put us in a consistent timeline with the SLUP, which is our overall land use planning tool and guides everything that we do in the Island around land use, infrastructure provision, biodiversity and protecting our natural environment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: I support this policy letter and the comments made by the President.

I would just like to pick up on a few points made by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller. In saying that the previous IDP took three terms – it was straddled across three terms to be more accurate as to what the Deputy said – we started on this review when I joined the States in 2012. I was on Environment. It may have been mandated in the previous term, but the review commenced at the start of 2012 and we hoped to finish it in that term, which is still a long time, but it was an issue where we were fundamentally changing how we looked at land use. We moved to the system of main and local

centres, and I cannot see us moving away from that in the future because it would rather go against everything that we have done in the eight years since then.

But we did not get it through at the very end of the 2012-16 term because there was a shortage of planning officers and it just fell into the very start of the next term, so that maybe puts it in a little more context , but I do not think anything we are voting for today is really committing us to the size of any review of either the SLUP or the Island Development Plan IDP.

There is going to be a lot of pragmatism. We were starting with a blank slate with the SLUP pretty much. It started with the whole – it was called 'Guernsey Together', which I think means something else now, but that is what it was called at the time. It was the most comprehensive public consultation that had ever been undertaken on this Island.

I do not think that level is going to be necessary again. I do have confidence that both environmental infrastructure and the DPA will look at this pragmatically but also in the context of realising that when it comes to planning, this is something that affects the lives of every single person and which pretty much every single person probably has an opinion on, so there is a balance to be struck.

Thank you for this policy letter. I will be supporting it.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Hill.

Alderney Representative Hill: Thank you, sir.

It is not often here that I agree with Deputy Inder on very much. *(Laughter)* However, I do feel that it is slightly relevant because we are talking about the Guernsey Island Plan, but we have just been through this process with the Alderney Land Use Plan. I would just like to urge – because some of the arguments used for us for why we had to do it was because there could be a legal challenge if we had not. Our Land Use Plan was last reviewed in 2017 and there was a possibility that somebody could legally challenge us on the grounds that we had not renewed our Land Use Plan.

I would also like to say that if I had known it was that easy to extend it, I would have certainly voted for that. But we did not, and we have landed ourselves with a £398,000 project based over three years with Arup. These things are very expensive. I dread to think what it is going to cost Guernsey to do it, bearing in mind that we are three miles by two miles and you are five miles by eight miles.

I would really recommend that you do support this because at times of cost-cutting and everything, this could be a very expensive piece of work that does not need to be done. Had I known that I could have done this, I would not have voted for it in Alderney.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

It is in response to some of the comments about resource. I am deeply glad for Deputy Gollop's speech because having been the President of the Development Planning Authority at the beginning of the 2016 term that brought in the IDP, his knowledge is very valuable and his intervention.

I just wanted to allay his concerns, or put them to rest, because he did mention that he felt in his term that there was a lack of resource. Certainly, that is something that we feel across all States' Departments that things could be done more efficiently.

Since being in the DPA this term and seeing the development since the changeover from Agilisys and how quickly they have started to realise the gains that they will get when they go fully digital, it cannot be stressed enough how much extra work has to be done because they have been working with a data system that is not fit for purpose. Once this new system comes into place, it will allow real-time, active monitoring and streamlining. That is why we are able to then bring forward a policy letter.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller mentioned that in the previous term they brought forward the concept of reviewing while the plan is active. Instead of having a big four-year review, you are constantly able to be more adaptive because the bones and the structure of the IDP is strong enough and flexible enough to do what needs to be done. That is the key. We do not need to rewrite the whole plan, but we are facing a deadline, and we are facing a cut-off for November.

Having said that, I just wanted to reassure Members that absolutely the work is being done. We are seeing the results, getting more streamlined, being more efficient and working within the resources that we have. We are not asking for more resources, but we are deploying those resources more effectively, and that can only be improved by the new implementation of the paperless system. I just wanted to make sure that I put that on record.

Obviously, I am a member of the Committee, so I will be voting for this policy letter and supporting it, but I just wanted to explain that and that Members, particularly because it is only the land planning wonks are those who have been in the cauldron of fire of being in the DPA or the previous Environment Board, who have given some input into this debate.

Just to liven Members up, towards the end of this year we will be debating the focused review of the IDP. If I can say to Members, that is going to be the most frustrating debate you have ever experienced, although it will not be, but it can be because of the nature of planning with the SLUP and the IDP and how you cannot just put an amendment in for anything. You have to really think about how things fit together. Hopefully you will all get enthused – the Members will all be enthused to start learning all about planning Law and the SLUP and the IDP before the debate, which will be before the end of the year.

The Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

I speak as someone who has not been in the cauldron of the excitement of the DPA and as a complete layperson. I suppose hearing when people say, 'The SLUP review is essential. The IDP review is essential', to the outside person, that is probably cold comfort when there seems to be no real activity going on in construction. There is still no new housing.

We are in a housing crisis, so I have a lot of sympathy with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's point, which is we constantly run the risk of Government creating the industry of review and therefore of doing nothing. I would support the idea of in future – why is this so hard-coded? Why can it not be more flexible? Why do we commit ourselves to these crazy timelines which, as we are seeing, cannot be met?

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

I was just standing to declare an interest, the extent of which is that I am co-owner of a site which is included on the preliminary list of the focused review of the IDP.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Brun.

Deputy Le Brun: I would just like to ask if there would be any possibility of looking at GP15 or even removing it? The current framework allows incremental loss of agricultural land for exemptions and changes of use. We have lost 75 football pitches worth of agricultural land into domestic curtilage. It is just worth thinking about with future food resilience programmes and things like that that we are losing too much land.

The Bailiff: I invite the President, Deputy Inder, to reply to that debate.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, Members, for that short debate.

To answer Deputy Le Brun's question directly, in terms of this policy letter, the answer is absolutely no because we are here to agree the extension of the IDP. Having said that, to give him some comfort, as cold as it may or may not be, if we successfully bring the streamlining through the States, it is the general policies that we can look at by virtue of bringing these back to the States. He can make the argument then but today is not the day for it.

Deputy Camp – well, okay, there is a bit of a theme about Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's great fear of everything starting from zero and us starting again and taking 10 years but Deputy Burford, Deputy Gabriel, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel have said that we do have a base SLUP and we do have a base IDP. We are not suddenly going to magic up a new St Peter Port or a new main centre. Having said that, who knows what STSB might come up with a new harbour. If we have got one in Vazon then of course we will have to do something there.

The point remains that there is a fear in Government, and I can understand with Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, that if we start everything from scratch we create an industry of review by itself. We really do that and, at the end of it, everyone has still got a job, we have got another report, there is another bookshelf and nothing has been built. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In reality, I do not think it is going to be as bad as Deputy Kazantseva-Miller suggested it could be. I am encouraged at the side quest debate between Deputy Burford and Deputy Gabriel. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller flattened that out a bit, so that is something I do not really need to respond to.

I know it is a bit of a trope that Government is not doing anything. I am afraid Government, unfortunately I know it does not sit well in the great media world, but I will remind people that over the past year that this DPA, whilst Deputy Burford is in place, we have 150 new homes coming through the books at the moment. That is what progress looks like. That is what the private sector does when Government does not talk.

Confidence is entirely back in the industry. Planning applications are coming in through left, right and centre. Our revenues are the same as they were – in fact, they have improved somewhat and I will not overstate that. Our revenue streams are holding up well. I could assure Deputy Camp if I thought there was any problem, I would have seen it already because people are talking to me on a regular basis.

Who else? I have mentioned – yes. Deputy Gollop is generally supportive of the policy letter as far as I understand. He mentioned resources. I think I have somewhat responded to that. I am not seeing any great bottlenecks. Things seem to be coming through. We are hitting our eight-week and 13-week commitment to getting our planning applications through the line. I regularly get the planning list and again they are holding up. It is about 17 or 18 applications a week.

To answer his question about more resources, at the moment I do not think there are – we are just not getting those complaints. Yes, of course, every now and then someone might go on holiday, the planning officer might be involved in something and that is just the nature of the business, but in the main I am relatively happy with this.

In short, thank you very much for what I hope is going to be your vote. I spoke well at the beginning, but I do not think I spoke too well at the end. Hopefully I have still got your support and I have not – yes. *(Laughter)* Yes, I am just going to sit down but hopefully I will get your support for this policy letter.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, this is a single Proposition, so I am going to ask the Greffier to open the voting in respect of it.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 1, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	Matthews, Aidan	Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

2210

The Bailiff: In respect of the Proposition to extend the time for the Island Development Plan, there voted in favour 34 Members, no Member voted against, 1 Member abstained, 1 Member did not vote, 4 Members were absent. Therefore, I will declare the Proposition carried.

STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

9. Remediation of PFAS Contaminated Soil at Guernsey Airport – Proposition Carried

Article 9.
The States are asked to decide: -
Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Remediation of PFAS Contaminated Soil at Guernsey Airport' dated 24th April 2026, they are of the opinion:-
1. To direct the Policy & Resources Committee to increase the existing capital vote for the removal and disposal of PFAS contaminated soil at Guernsey Airport, funded from the Capital Reserve to a maximum of £16.54 million to fund the excavation, transportation and off-island treatment of PFAS contaminated soils at the airport in accordance with the remediation solution of soil washing including the professional fees and contingencies, as described in paragraphs 4.5, 4.10 - 4.14 and section 6 of the policy letter.

The States' Greffier: Article 9. States' Trading Supervisory Board, Remediation of PFAS Contaminated Soil at Guernsey Airport.

The Bailiff: I invite the President, Deputy Helyar, to open the debate, please.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir.

The STSB seeks, via this Proposition, authority to increase the capital vote for the removal of per- and polyfluoroalkyl (PFAS) contaminated soil at Guernsey Airport to a maximum of £16.54 million funded from the Capital Reserve.

This is not a new problem. PFAS contamination from historic firefighting foam use was known and identified at the airport as far back as 2007 when Guernsey Water detected in St Saviour's Reservoir and in groundwater around the airfield. During the Airport Pavement Rehabilitation Project, approximately 14,000 tonnes of heavily contaminated soil was excavated from four hotspots and placed into a temporary containment bund. A second cell was added in 2014 following excavation at the Forest Road crash site.

That temporary containment was always intended as an interim measure with a possible 20-year anticipated life, but that life is now ending. The geotextile membrane is failing. Monitoring samples taken in September 2025 recorded perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) concentrations of up to 24µg/l in the surrounding wells, which is 24 times the legal maximum of 1µg/l permitted under the provisions of the Water Pollution Ordinance. Leachate from one bund tank has been recorded 94µg/l of perfluorooctane. The containment is therefore becoming compromised and the risk of pollution to the environment is unfortunately rising with it.

The Office of Environmental Health and Pollution Regulation (OEHPR), as Regulator, has determined that removal and off-Island treatment proposed in this policy letter is required to comply with the Environmental Pollution (Guernsey) Law 2004 and has confirmed it meets the legal standard of best available technique. The waste management licence is being extended only in six-month increments underscoring the urgency.

The board commissioned Arcadis, one of the leading subject matter experts in this field, to access and assess all available options. That process has been thorough: 'bench scale' trials, a full feasibility study, a competitive tender process and a post-tender reassessment. The conclusion is consistent. Off-Island soil washing is the only option that fully and permanently eliminates the contamination and extinguishes any future liability on the part of Guernsey Ports and the States. High temperature incineration has insufficient sector capacity at present and would cost Guernsey more. On-Island containment simply defers the problem and unfortunately the liability. Only exporting the soil by removal and washing it resolves this problem permanently.

A confirmed cost following a competitive tender is £16.54 million inclusive of project management, contingency and contractor fees. Two bids were received and the figure now before the Assembly reflects what is considered to be the most cost-effective, fully compliant solution. The tender outcome exceeded earlier high-level estimates, which is why States' endorsement is now required as the project now exceeds Policy & Resources' delegated authority from the original project.

The process is straightforward in concept: excavate the estimated 8,500m^3 of soil, transport it by road to St Peter Port Harbour, ship it to a UK facility, wash it to remove the PFOS and treat the residual material appropriately. The sand and gravel will be cleaned and reused, and the States' liability will end permanently.

I am always unhappy in this role when presented with a *fait accompli* so I will understand fully the reluctance of those amongst us who might like another turn of the options. The current STSB was delivered this policy at the latest possible stage and has examined very thoroughly what further room for manoeuvre we might have. I am also grateful to Members for the significant engagement we have received in examining and questioning the very same things and also to the Regulator for being so open in answering questions on the issues involved.

I am afraid we have reached the end of the line on this particular problem, as we will in due course on many others which the States has been putting off. Doing nothing is not an option. Whilst this proposal is not the only solution, all the other options are either just as or more expensive, represent significant risk or simply delay dealing with the issue and kick another can down another more expensive road into a future, which we currently cannot afford. The containment membrane is failing now so expensive remedial work will be required one way or another. The Regulator is extending the licence only under sufferance. Deferral increases cost, increases environmental risk and maintains a liability that this Proposition seeks to extinguish permanently.

Sir, for all these reasons, the STSB commends this Proposition to the Assembly.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, there is an amendment that has been circulated. Is it your wish to move that amendment now?

Deputy Gabriel: It is, sir.

The Bailiff: Then please do.

Amendment 1.
To insert an additional proposition as follows:
'2. To direct the States' Trading Supervisory Board and the Policy & Resources Committee to explore the utilisation of land made available from the removal of PFAS contaminated soil at the Guernsey Airport for a transport hub.'.

Deputy Gabriel: Members will see the amendment in front of them. It is to direct the STSB and P&R together to investigate an opportunity to create a transport hub at the airport once the land freed up from the removal of the bund is created.

It is a fairly simple Proposition. The explanatory notes are just that, very explanatory and basically it is about creating opportunity. Do we want to put in swathes of tarmac for the airport to allow its passengers to park on or do we want to make transport a little bit more relaxed, a little bit easier for passengers to arrive and depart from our only airport? It could help seamless transport options, commuting up to the airport on bike. It could have all sorts of things that are available there and that is up to the STSB and Ports about what they could put in there for their passengers. We have got a congested taxi rank at times, congested pick up and drop off area.

This new bit of land creates the opportunity for them to do something different. Why should we not just think a little bit different about our passengers? I am not directing the STSB to spend any money or anything unfunded. It is all about giving people, our travellers, more travel choices on land before they either arrive or depart at the airport.

We know Ports are under pressure for revenue. Perhaps if passengers were arriving in a more relaxed method, or even departing, certainly when they are arriving at the airport, then perhaps footfall could increase and revenue from air passenger duty or duty free sales, again, could increase. It is just the opportunity to do something different rather than parking all over land.

The Bailiff: Deputy Cameron, do you formally second Amendment 1?

Deputy Cameron: I do, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.
Deputy Helyar.

Deputy Helyar: Sir, could I seek a ruling as to the application of Rule 24(6) to this amendment, please?

The Bailiff: Any amendment that inserts an additional Proposition is necessarily one that goes further than the original Proposition. To that extent, are you asking that the amendment should not be debated and no vote taken thereon?

Deputy Helyar: Yes, please, sir.
Could we have a recorded vote in that regard?

The Bailiff: Yes, because there has been a request for a recorded vote, you have got a Proposition about it on your screen, or you will have shortly. I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on a Rule 24(6).

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 17, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 4, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	Bury, Tina	Burford, Yvonne	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Camp, Haley	Cameron, Andy	de Sausmarez, Lindsay		Ozanne, Jayne
Collins, Garry	Falla, Steve	Hill, Edward		Rochester, Sally
Curgenven, Rob	Gabriel, Adrian	Snowdon, Alexander		Sloan, Andy
Dorrity, David	Gollop, John			
Goy, David	Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah			
Helyar, Mark	Humphreys, Rhona			
Kay-Mouat, Bruno	Inder, Neil			
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha	Le Brun, Ross			
Laine, Marc	Matthews, Aidan			
Malik, Munazza	McKenna, Liam			
Montague, Paul	Parkinson, Charles			
Niles, Andrew	Rylatt, Tom			
Oswald, George	St Pier, Gavin			
Van Katwyk, Lee	Strachan, Jennifer			
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of the motion under Rule 24(6), there voted in favour 17 Members, there voted against 15 Members, 4 Members abstained, 4 Members were absent. Therefore, I will declare the motion successful, which means the amendment cannot be debated. Who wants to speak in general debate now?
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I want to speak briefly because this project, this capital project, was on the agenda of the Ports when I was member of the Ports Board in 2019, same as the QEII Marina, which is the next policy letter that we will be debating.

The point I want to make is that if we do not deal with the capital expenditure projects at the time when they are required and needed, the cost that we are facing down the line just escalates completely exponentially to a point where we just cannot afford to make those choices. The two policy letters in front of us today show exactly that. It is the cost of delayed action on investment into our community, into infrastructure, into our economy and specifically into our trading assets.

I would like to suggest that this is exactly the type of situation we have got to avoid at all costs. The cost of not making a decision, this is exactly what it translates into, tens of millions of additional capital expenditure we could have avoided (**A Member:** Hear, hear) if the decisions on infrastructure investment were made at the time when they were needed.

I urge the Assembly to avoid putting ourselves and the taxpayers in those positions going forward this political term.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just following on from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I wonder if it is not actually worse than that. This is not out the door of Deputy Helyar. I do not know if it is custom, I do not know if it is system, but again, we have got another gun to our head.

Effectively, Deputy Helyar has said, 'You have to vote for this because it is going to run out of licence and you have hit a wall'. You are going to get the same thing on the next policy letter on the marina. Effectively, if you do not fix the marina gates now, the liability for a collapsed gate means – this goes to the core of how you, as elected Members, are actually managed by your civil servants. This is often a dirty trick by civil servants to put you in a position where you have got no choice at all, and this is where you are again.

As a point of principle, again, even though I understand that the PFOS has to be managed in some way and I understand the marina, I am just going to abstain because I am sick and tired of having a gun put to my head by civil servants. You will hear again time and time again – and this will not be the only time over the next three years. Something else will come up. You will be told that the OEHPR have decided to take away a waste licence or some other licence. You are going to get the same over a quarry. You are probably going to get the same over Black Rock. This will come to you time and time again.

As a point of principle, I will not vote against it because of the danger if it will lose, but I am abstaining from this vote because I have had enough of it.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

Just picking up on a couple of points. To the point that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller made, as a general rule I very much agree that so often we see examples where we refer decisions and the costs escalate. I am not entirely persuaded that this is the best example of that because my understanding of this is that the technology has been developing for some time. We all knew what the problem was, but we did not necessarily know the full extent of the solutions way back then and they might not have been effective, as, indeed, the temporary solution has shown.

On the point of the amendment that never was. I would encourage E&I to do the policy work around the transport hub because STSB are policy takers. If there is a case to be made on policy ground, I think that E&I can instigate that themselves. I personally am very interested and supportive in principle of the idea, and I would very much like them to lead on that work if they can fit it into their Committee Work Plan.

Yes, I will be supporting this. I was one of the people merrily drinking well water while in very near range of this contamination for many years. I feel like it is something quite close to my heart possibly in a literal and biological sense.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kay-Mouat.

Deputy Kay-Mouat: Under Rule 17, I would like to declare an interest. I am involved in a company that might be offering logistics.

The Bailiff: Okay. Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you, sir.

I have followed the 3M debate for a number of years and the failings, and we are today here. We are exactly where we are. I watch it in Jersey where residents of the affected area are having blood tests taken. This forever chemical, which is nicely described in the paper, and I feel no gun to my head here, but we have got to do what is best for the residents. I would be appalled if we had to start taking blood tests and that level of hell. It is carcinogenic, I believe.

Whilst I would have liked to have extended the runway for a similar amount, I am going to support this. I really like the way that this has been explained by Deputy Helyar because it is not a normal thing that I would do but this is a very serious contamination which we have got. (**A Member**: Hear, hear.)

I have moved tonnes of soil myself, so I know the costs involved in just re-bagging it with geotextile and all the rest of it, but the paper read well. It did say as time has progressed, they have developed a way to neutralise it and deal with it. I am slightly uncertain about re-importing the treated sand and soil back in as I do want to get rid of the problem, but I am going to support this, and I would urge others to do the same, even though it has got a big price tag.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

When I first saw this Proposition and the large amounts of money concerned, I did have my worries about whether this is an appropriate use of public funds. I took some considerable time to look at the literature, consult with my colleague in Public Health, Dr Nicola Brink, and look at the reports from Jersey. I came to the conclusion that despite the large sum required to get rid of this stuff, this is a necessary proposal.

I will be supporting the Proposition.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenven:

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you, sir.

Just to let you know I will be supporting this Proposition. I was not sure, but listening to the people speaking, especially in your capacity as a doctor, Deputy Oswald, there, I will be supporting it. I would ask the President, given that when we agree to a sum and then give it to the Civil Service to carry out, whether he will be watching capital expenditure like a hawk to make sure we do not have any overruns and any potential issues like we have done recently.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin:

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

I accept the central case that this work needs to be done. I also agree that the way that STSB and Deputy Helyar, not only in the policy letter but in the presentation before, gave us the time to really analyse and look at the other opportunities, use all the research and there really is not any other way. That is very clear. However, it would be interesting to hear from Deputy Helyar more about the financial strategy behind this because following this we also have the urgent capital pressure coming on with the marina gates.

There has to be some way of choosing. If it is out of the two with public health and our community, there is no doubt that I will be supporting this policy letter, but I would like to hear what the plan is. We have not even had the tax reform policy letter to see how this is going to happen, but this is a situation, as Deputy Inder has pointed out, it is the gun. We have to do this. There is no way we cannot.

It is also how we are going to project and sequence these projects. This is going to be part of it. I do want to see how this is going to be prioritised and funded rather than considered in isolation and that will have a bearing and an impact with the work I have done personally looking at both the marina gate and this. I will have more questions on the timing because the detail of what the consequences are of not doing the marina gate as urgently as this, as I say, this takes priority.

I suppose what I would like to see is a clearer financial rollout plan covering the project. I will be 100% supporting this but also the cumulative call. Is it on reserves? Where are we going to be taking this from? How it will impact – I know it is a separate policy letter for the marina gate.

Subject to those points, it remains that the PFOS remediation is not only necessary, it is essential and it bears more direct importance on the whole of the Island community. The consequences of not doing it, as the President of HSC has also said, the impacts could be far more far reaching.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

I would ask the President when he responds to the debate to comment on whether it will be necessary to install granular-activated carbon filters at the three water treatment works in Guernsey and, if so, what he thinks the cost of that might be?

The Bailiff: Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

At risk of sounding like I am repeating Deputy Blin, he has really spoken about my concerns here. Having gone through a GWP, having gone through a major project portfolio, I still do not really understand how we are prioritising capital spend. It seems to me that if you are first in the list, you might get some money.

What I worry about is what are we sacrificing further down the line? We can say things are urgent, and I have some sympathy with Deputy Inder's view that if we are constantly told everything is urgent, how are we possibly going to meet all of our obligations this term? There simply is not a magic money tree, as much as some of us might wish it.

Yes, I want to understand really how this is fitting into a prioritised action plan of Government when, like I said, money is not an abundant thing for any of us.

The Bailiff: I invite Deputy Helyar to reply to the debate.

Deputy Delyar: Thank you, sir, and I thank Members for their contribution.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller, I completely agree with you; this is long overdue. In normal circumstances, we would deal with these things as programmes, and we would do them in sequence one after the other in order of priority. Because we have done nothing everything is now a priority. That is one of the problems that we have and why we have got such a big capital programme to pay for.

I have some sympathy with Deputy Inder's comments. I will say more on the Treasury process when we come to the QEII gates policy letter. I do not want to spoil my jokes by saying them now so I will leave them until then. *(Laughter)*

Deputy de Sausmarez, completely agree; this is policy work which should be done by E&I. As things stand at the STSB at the moment, I think the public would be quite upset if we started building a transport hub whilst we still have scaffolding on the roof and buckets on the floor collecting rainwater at the airport. That should be a priority first.

Deputy Vermeulen will support it. I thank him for his support and, likewise, Deputy Oswald. Thank you for the time that you did indeed spend and invest in looking into that. It was very helpful. I found it quite reassuring as well.

Deputy Curgenven, again, thank you for your support. In terms of overruns, absolutely. There is less risk of that, I would say. I am not going to put my hand on my heart and promise because that is always a fool's errand unfortunately, but this is a fixed tender. We should not have any unexpected – and there is a provision in here for an overrun as well already. If it goes beyond that, I would be quite surprised and very upset.

Deputy Blin, I did not really understand the point that he was trying to make. He talked about financial strategy. These projects were already in debates that we have already had. They will be coming out of capital, which is why the STSB has to come to the States to ask for the money. If Ports had the money to pay for it itself, it would do it itself. It cannot afford to do that.

The PFAS contamination is not an insurable risk and not an insured risk so we cannot claim on insurance for it. It just has to be paid for, and that is where we find ourselves. As you know, because we did the accounts yesterday, Guernsey Ports is under water from an income perspective. All of our focus is on trying to generate sufficient revenue to ensure that it does not need to call on the taxpayer to fund everyone's transport.

Deputy Parkinson, I do not have a number to hand for that treatment, but I am aware that in Jersey figures like £200 million have been estimated for the amount of capital required for their own treatment works to deal with that. Not dealing with this, if that was his intention to imply, has a probably much longer-term cost to our water and our risk to public health, as Deputy Oswald pointed out. I do not have a number for that but there is a detailed capital programme that has been developed by Guernsey Water. I will find the figure for him that that represents and circulate it to Members.

Deputy Camp, as well, some questions about capital and priorities. Unfortunately, as I said, if you look at what the States has spent on building, or on a lot of the things that were in the list that we debated recently, they have been hanging around for years and years and years and they are just concatenating. One of the reasons they are concatenating is because we did not want to spend any money because then it looks like we have still got plenty. Things eventually just start falling apart if you do not maintain them and that will come soon in the QEII gates policy letter.

Thank you, again, to Members for their contribution and I would ask you please to support the policy letter.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition, and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting in respect of it.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 2, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	Inder, Neil	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne		Kay-Mouat, Bruno		Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				

Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Parkinson, Charles
Rylatt, Tom
Snowdon, Alexander
St Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

The Bailiff: In respect of the Proposition, there voted in favour 34 Members, no Member voted against, 2 Members abstained, 4 Members were absent. Therefore, I will declare the Proposition carried.

COMMITTEE *FOR* EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SECURITY

10. Extending the Scope of the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal – Propositions Carried

Article 10.
The States are asked to decide:
Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Extending the Scope of the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2005 to Include Alderney', dated 27th April 2026, they are of the opinion:
1. To amend the extent of the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal (Guernsey) Ordinance, 2005 to include Alderney to enable the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal to hear minimum wage cases arising in Alderney.
2. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decision.

The States' Greffier: Article 10. Committee *for* Employment & Social Security, Extending the Scope of the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Bury, to open the debate, please.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

The Employment and Discrimination Tribunal Ordinance, we are doing what it says on the tin, looking to extend the scope of that to Alderney.

The Employment and Discrimination Tribunal is formed of three Members from a panel drawn up and maintained by the States on the recommendation of the ESS Committee. The Tribunal hears and determines complaints under relevant employment and discrimination enactments. These cases can involve issues such as unfair dismissal, discrimination or failure to be paid the minimum wage.

The enforcement of a future minimum wage in Alderney relies on the extension of this legislation. There is currently no minimum wage legislation in Alderney as the Minimum Wage Law 2009 has force only in Guernsey, Herm and Jethou.

Alderney's Policy and Finance Committee has informed the Committee *for* Employment & Social Security that it has directed the drafting of legislation to introduce a statutory minimum wage in Alderney. It will be necessary to ensure that employees and employers in Alderney can access impartial information and advice about Alderney's minimum wage requirements. It will also be

necessary to ensure that complaints made by employees in Alderney regarding failure to pay the minimum wage can be investigated and enforced.

While Policy and Finance Committee and the Committee envisage that minimum wage complaints in Alderney will be infrequent, it would be difficult for the States of Alderney to develop and maintain the necessary infrastructure to investigate complaints and enforce minimum wage requirements in Alderney. This is due to Alderney's size. It might be more difficult for officers to avoid possible conflicts of interest due to the small population, and the estimated small number of minimum wage complaints would not maintain the necessary skills.

In Guernsey, the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service, which we will discuss later on, and the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal undertake services relating to the provision of the advice and information consideration and enforcement of, among other things, minimum wage legislation.

At Policy and Finance Committee's request, ESS has liaised with the Convener of the Tribunal and the Director of the EEOS to see if they would be willing to have their remits extended in order to provide infrequent services in respect of minimum wage enforcement in Alderney, subject to the introduction of minimum wage legislation. Both the Director and the Convener were amenable to this proposal.

It is not necessary to amend the Employment and Equal Opportunities Service Law to enable EEOS to provide services in Alderney as, if desired by all parties, the Director of the EEOS can be appointed to certain functions and roles under the new Alderney minimum wage Law. However, the Employment and Discrimination Tribunal Ordinance does not extend to Alderney so, as things stand, it would not be possible for the Tribunal to hear cases under future Alderney minimum wage legislation. Therefore, in order to expand the scope of the Tribunal's remit to include minimum wage complaints in Alderney, this Ordinance needs to be amended.

For the avoidance of doubt, the proposal is cost neutral to the States of Guernsey. Alderney's Policy and Finance Committee (P&FC) has allocated funds to cover any costs incurred for the enforcement of future minimum wage legislation for the services rendered by both the Tribunal and EEOS. It is narrow in scope.

The States of Alderney will be responsible for the introduction of their minimum wage legislation. This proposal does not seek to ask this States the merits or drawbacks of that. That is for the States of Alderney to decide, just so we are clear. As I have said, it would enable the Tribunal to hear the minimum wage cases in Alderney, but that does not mean that the Tribunal will hear any other complaints arising in Alderney.

I know it is a little bit complicated and dry, but I hope that explains it, and I will leave anything to my Alderney colleagues if they wish to back up the argument.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Alderney Representative Snowdon.

Alderney Representative Snowdon: I will be very quick. You have highlighted what this policy paper says very well today. The Alderney States' Members are very supportive of this, and they would just like to put on record their thanks that this policy paper is here. I know Mr Gentle, one of Alderney States' Members, has been spending a lot of time over a number of years to try and get minimum wage. This is a step in the right direction and hopefully the States of Alderney will be able to take their steps a bit quicker to bring in minimum wage. Thank you for bringing this policy paper here today, which we support.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: No one else is rising. Do you wish to reply, Deputy Bury, to what Alderney Representative Snowdon said? Okay. In that case, there are two Propositions. They are interrelated so I am going to put them to you together and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on both Propositions.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 36, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	None	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of both Propositions, there voted in favour 36 Members, no Member voted against, no Member abstained, 4 Members are absent. Therefore, I will declare both Propositions duly carried.

COMMITTEE *FOR* HOUSING

11. Legislative Changes to Enable Implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy – Propositions Carried

Article 11.
The States are asked to decide:-

Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled 'Legislative Changes to Enable the Implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy' dated 23rd April 2026, they are of the opinion:

1. To agree to amend the Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 to confer on the Committee for Housing regulation-making powers to specify how it will determine applications submitted under section 3A of the Law and award new Part A inscriptions in circumstances where the number of submitted applications exceeds the number of available inscriptions in a specified period, as set out in section 2 of the policy letter.

2. To agree to amend the Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 (and any relevant subordinate legislation made thereunder) regarding the transfer of Open Market Part A inscriptions to development properties, as set out in section 3 of the Policy Letter.

3. To agree to amend the Open Market Housing Register (Guernsey) Law, 2016 to confer on the Committee for Housing regulation-making powers to impose fees in respect of applications to transfer properties from Part D to Part A of the Open Market Housing Register that are consistent with existing fees charged under that Law in relation to the inscription of properties in Part A, as set out in section 3 of the policy letter.

4. To direct the preparation of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the above decisions.

The States' Greffier: Article 11. Committee *for* Housing, Legislative changes to enable implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Williams to open the debate, please.

Deputy Williams: Thank you, sir.

I am afraid this might be a little bit dry as well for a hot afternoon. In March last year, the States approved some changes to the Open Market Housing Register Law to allow for the implementation of the Open Market Part A Inscriptions Policy. There are three areas that the Committee *for* Housing now wish to refine, which we will require your support for progress the policy.

You may recall the Inscriptions Policy allows the Committee to award three new Part A inscriptions a year, or more than three, provided it does not award more than 15 in a five-year period to prospective new build or one-for-one replacement dwellings. Secondly, it also permits the transfer of Part A inscriptions from existing Part A properties to properties on a new development provided certain criteria are met.

Members will recall that they approved an Ordinance commencing the majority of the provisions endorsed by the States in March 2025. What remained uncommenced were the provisions that would have enabled the Committee to receive and determine applications for new Part A inscriptions for prospective new build and one-for-one replacement dwellings. These provisions remained uncommenced whilst the Committee was determining a fair and transparent application process for awarding those limited number of Part A inscriptions, should the number of applications exceed the number of inscriptions available.

The Committee has decided that it will use a ballot to issue these types of application should that occur. Unless there is a specific mechanism in place to cover this scenario, the legal default is to award them on a first come, first served basis, something the Committee did not want to do, given the costs of developing an IT system to handle the applications and the risks that some people could game the system and automate their applications.

Using a ballot to award inscriptions removes these risks and ensures the process for applying for new Part A inscriptions is fair, transparent and equitable for all those who wish to apply for one, something which is of utmost importance to the Committee and the industry stakeholders we consulted with. Any applications will, of course, have to comply with the Inscriptions Policy before they can be entered into the ballot.

For the Committee to specify how it will award new Part A inscriptions for prospective new build and one-for-one replacement dwellings in this scenario, it needs regulation-making powers. The ballot is the first refinement. Secondly, in addition to providing the Committee these regulation-making powers, the Committee has agreed to alter the criteria to transfer Part A inscriptions to development properties.

As with the ballot mechanism, the Committee is proposing changes to the legislation to allow it to implement the refinements. This is something the stakeholders we consulted with had requested towards the very end of the Inscriptions Policy's development, which we committed to look into. We have listened to our stakeholders, and this represents a refinement of the existing policy and legislation so that it will be much more effective in practice, as we all want this to work successfully. This is feedback from the industry.

The award mechanism and amendments to the process for transferring Part A inscriptions to new development properties were developed iteratively and were very much shaped by a group of relevant stakeholders, including the Open Market Forum, which represents residents, estate agents, architects, developers and Locate Guernsey. That process took many months, not least because there were some very different positions represented in that group. Through individual meetings, collective discussion and written input, these changes evolved to secure broad support.

I would like to put on record the Committee's thanks to all those that contributed to the policy development, for their time, expertise and collaborative goodwill. What all stakeholders strongly agree on is the need for these changes implementing a mechanism for awarding new Part A inscriptions for prospective new build and one-for-one replacement dwellings. It will mean the remainder of the provisions of the amendment Law considered in 2025 can commence.

Without this award mechanism, applications for new Part A inscriptions cannot be accepted or determined. I respectfully remind Deputies that they have already agreed the primary legislation which sets these principles. This amendment of legislation is only required so that legislation and the policy can be fully implemented and so that it is as effective as it can be.

The third refinement the Committee is making is to the application process for transferring Part A inscriptions to new developments. Under the current provisions, a Part A inscription is not transferred from the donor Part A property to the development property until construction of the new development has completed. As up to eight Part A inscriptions can be transferred to any one development, subject to all necessary approvals of course, this would restrict the cashflow of a development as it means a developer would be expected to own up to eight Part A properties at the same time as they are funding a development of much needed housing stock.

Through the changes in this policy letter, the Committee is allowing for a developer to submit separate but concurrent applications under two distinct parts of the Law to allow them to apply to delete the Part A inscription at the same time as they apply to transfer it. This would mean that the Part A inscription is deleted from donor Part A dwelling before construction of the development is completed, with the acknowledgement that it will be transferred if the new construction is completed within six years. This change will allow the developer to sell the donor Part A property on to the local market much sooner than they would have otherwise been able to, thereby freeing up cashflow and improving viability for the new development and making a local market dwelling available much sooner.

Another important assurance that this policy gives us to the Open Market community, this does not in any way affect or alter residency rights in any part of the Open Market, nor does it affect or alter inscriptions already on the Open Market Housing Register. While the primary aim of the Inscriptions Policy is to improve the quality and availability of Part A properties enhancing and protecting the stability of our housing market and supporting the economy, it also introduces the potential for the States to raise additional revenue in a time where public funds are under acute pressure.

Sir, I would remind the Assembly it is vitally important that this policy letter is not seen as a review of the Open Market. No fundamental changes to it are being proposed. This is simply establishing the process through which Part A inscriptions will be awarded to prospective new build

and one-for-one replacement dwellings and seeking to amend the provisions for transferring Part A inscriptions to development properties to make that process less restrictive for property developers. These are necessary refinements to make the previously approved policy more workable following industry feedback.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I just wanted to bring to life a little bit more what we were trying to do in relation to Proposition 1. At the time when the previous primary legislative changes were approved, the method of choice for allocating the new inscriptions was through a first come, first served basis through an IT system. When the new Committee was formed, we had quite significant concerns that this could create issues. First of all, we were dependent on an IT system that we had no idea when it would materialise, because it was also linked to the development of a wider IT system that the regulator was using. We had no timeline for that. From what I understand, that system still has not materialised. So, if we went with that, we would not have been able to be here today to actually go ahead with this.

The second was that if you use an IT system with a first-come-first-serve basis, you literally could be looking at milliseconds of difference between when an application is made. I certainly know that some such systems have been gamed through bots and AI to actually be able to be there as soon as something is opened and really game the system to come in first. So it is on that basis that the Committee thought there was too much risk because those three applications per year are extremely high value. We did not want to be in a situation where, due to an IT configuration, someone who was well-versed with how you could hack an IT system could get in with applications first. So to avoid that, we thought of this concept of a ballot system, so only applications that meet the criteria would be put into a ballot system where effectively it becomes a random process who then gets selected from that field.

But I think what is interesting is that we are also asking that the method of selection is amended to be powers through regulation making, so in that case we will trial the process, we will see how it works for a couple of years. If it does not, we could come up with a new process. So it gives us more flexibility to be agile, nimble and to respond to making sure we can meet the demands of the economy. So I just wanted to bring it a little bit more to life.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

Yes, I am very supportive of this. I am delighted to see it finally get to the point where it is going to become a reality. It has been a very long time in the making. Just to put a little bit more colour around what Deputy Kazantseva-Miller was saying, I have to say the reason we did not go for a ballot system originally was actually because I think there is a certain amount of self-limitation in terms of the likely number of applications, because this is high value, yes, but it is also high cost. There are various criteria that need to be met, and there are certain situational criteria as well.

So all in all, I think year one might not be representative, there may well be a bit of pent-up demand, but I think going forward it is unlikely that we are going to see – well, I might be wrong, but certainly the feeling when this was first discussed was that we were not likely to see very high numbers of applicants and therefore I do not think the situation of the bots or AI is necessarily very relevant.

The downside of a ballot system is the potential delay it introduces into the system. But I had a chat with Deputy Williams about this recently, and I am reassured that the Committee intends to give short deadlines to make sure that we do not have delay. The problem is, if there is not an oversubscription, which is what the policy letter says, the ballot system would be used in the event

of there being an oversubscription. If there is not, then there is a balance to be struck between the amount of time that you need to give people to apply and the delay that applicants who are ready to go then have to sit there waiting for other applicants to come forward. I think it is resolved. Deputy Kazantseva-Miller may well be able to provide that reassurance herself, and I am happy to give way.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: I do not want to speak on behalf of the rest of the Committee, but I think we are intending to give very short deadlines for application, about maybe two weeks; we are not talking about months. The point is that it is not one second when you have to get in basically, so yes.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller would be pleased to hear she is singing from the same song sheet as her President. That was the reassurance that I was given. I thought it was worth reiterating to the Assembly, because that was the original reason we did not go down this route, was because we were concerned that actually if you needed to wait, for example – extreme example – for the entire calendar year, then obviously developers could be held up and indeed potential homeowners could be held up for the best part of that year.

So I was really pleased to hear that this was coming forward on a very short time basis and could be repeated if the number of applications had not been – the quota had not been used up. So I was really pleased to see that come forward. But as a general rule, yes, this has been a long time in the making and I am just delighted to see that we are finally at the point where we can get it over the line.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

I am very supportive. I am really pleased this is coming to fruition and especially because my view of this is it has been a sensitive area but it is something that is going to be very enabling for us. I can see how we can use those Open Market descriptions in this controlled way – very controlled way – to help deliver more Local Market homes, which is the benefit I look at from this.

I can also understand why the ballots system may be needed and I will ask, but I am sure I will be reassured by Deputy Williams, on the points of the transparency and fairness. This gaming, it does not matter if it is not a large number, there is always that risk, especially when monies are involved, against connected parties or speculative bids, etc.

But it would be nice to see how that success will be measured and then particularly the response of how those Local Market homes are delivered, the donor properties released and the revenue raised. Of that projected income, based on the limited numbers, the potential of £1.5 million, it would be good to have it clearly explained so that it really is transparent to know what we are getting back.

So subject to those assurances, I am very pleased that this has been brought today and I would just like to hear some commitments over the scheme, and that obviously for a reasonable period, and take the time to establish it.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Inder: 26(1), sir

The Bailiff: Can I invite those Members who wish to speak in the debate to stand in their places? Is it still your wish, Deputy Inder, that I put a motion pursuant to Rule 26(1)?

Deputy Inder: It is, but it is pointless, so I will not. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Okay. I will call Deputy Camp because she is the only one left standing now.

Deputy Camp: Excellent, I like that way of doing it.

Yes, so my point really is, I suppose, head-scratching the randomness of a ballot process and how that squares with transparency and fairness and matches together. So I would like to ask the President of the Committee, are there other examples of jurisdictions that use this method or have you done any simulation modelling to understand how this might actually work? Because I think we are talking about remote chances, but however remote a chance, something could always happen and trip us up along the way. So I just wonder if the President could address that question.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kay-Mouat.

Deputy Kay-Mouat: Thank you, sir.

Unfortunately under Rule 17, I would like to register an interest as an Open Market property owner.

The Bailiff: Deputy Niles.

Deputy Niles: Whilst I am broadly supportive of the ballot system, the one thing that I would like some clarity on, and perhaps I did not fully understand but I could get some clarity on, with scarcity, scarcity always breeds value and I understand that we have got some attention to the value that it creates to the States of Guernsey, but I want to understand who really captures the uplift in the value that we create through this scarcity and how that is divided between the States, the donor property owner and the developer? Or is it a combination of all three? What is successful?

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Some of us have had the privilege, if that is the right word, of seeing the policy letter and the draft legislation through the Legislation Scrutiny Panel. But we did feel the correct process is to do what we are doing and agree the policy and the resolutions and then look at it at a later juncture.

I actually found on a couple of reads it to be relatively opaque and as clear as mud in a way because I do not know how the balloting system is going work. I point out that there is a tradition in parliament, in House of Commons I should say, in another place, that there is apparently a ballot that occurs that enables backbench MPs, like us backbench Deputies, to put a potential Law across. They have that power.

Assisted dying, of course, is number two in the list. Now that ballot must work in a particular way, but we do not know really how this ballot will work. Would it be somebody like me coming in with a hat and pulling them out? No, probably not. Would it be a data system? Well, that would raise some of the issues that we have heard from Deputy Kazantseva-Miller about people who were digitally extremely numerate and professional having an advantage. So that was one problem.

The other thing is the number. Is it three or five; I cannot remember? I always thought it should be more than that to really make the Open Market work. Will a person who loses at the ballot lose their chance like going to the bottom of the list? Or will they have a – I will give way.

Deputy Inder: Thank you for giving way.

It is good to see States' Members talking about how to design the ballot, but if I can refer Deputy Gollop to 2.3, it actually says details of the mechanism and how it will operate is an operational decision. So that is a decision for the Committee. It then goes on to say that the guidance will be published. So we are not here to guess whether it comes out of the hat or Deputy Gollop goes dressed as a Christmas pudding. You are just here to trust that you are satisfied

with this policy letter as explained by the President. It specifically says in there, 'We do not know yet, but do not worry about it, we will publish the guidelines later'. That is the answer to his question.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you.

Maybe I am not that trusting because I remember how over the years this has been a very contentious subject and you get people on both sides of the spectrum. You get people who want to see more Open Market development, pro-economic development, migration, innovation reasons and those who definitely do not, who are local nationalists or concerned about the rising price of property or its availability. There was certainly a nuance. I actually was quite sympathetic to the view that high-net-worth Local Market properties could, in certain circumstances, be transferred to the Open Market. But a lot of people did not like that, whether you are an Open Market owner who wanted to keep things as they were, or – I will give way.

Deputy de Sausmarez: With great respect, Deputy Gollop, I think this is relitigating policy decisions that have already been made and are settled, and this policy letter is really much more focused on the mechanics of actually making it work. So it is always interesting listening to Deputy Gollop but I am not sure it is particularly relevant to the policy letter in front of us and it is quite a warm afternoon to have that kind of protracted conversation.

Deputy Gollop: But we need to scrutinise this thoroughly because there may be litigation. We will see legislation. What is the point of legislation if we are devolving it all operationally to housing? That I do not know, and I think the whole nature of Open Market development and the amount of money that will go into it, and what new properties are included is very important. In principle, I support this, but I think we need to actually know more detail at the next stage of this. Certainly it will be put on trial and I, for one, would want to know whether anybody who feels that they have not won a ballot have the right to appeal or the right to apply again in the fullness of time.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

It was just a question to the President, really. I was on the Committee *for the* Environment & Infrastructure last term when we discussed the potential for these sorts of things, and one of the ideas that I had suggested at the time, and I think was discussed, was the idea of an auction for the inscription rights rather than a ballot. I know it does mention in passing in 2.2 that the Committee had discussed alternate methods. I wonder if the President could just expand upon what those discussions were and why a ballot was chosen as the method rather than an auction.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: I invite Deputy Williams to reply to the debate.

Deputy Williams: Just for clarity, these are just three refinements. As Deputy de Sausmarez mentioned, we are not looking at the whole policy that has already been approved, and this is a matter of tidying up three areas that we need to agree on in order to progress the whole of the policy. Hence, it is not a major restructuring and it is not a debate on the whole policy.

Just going through chronologically in terms of the Deputies that stood up, sir. Thank you, Deputy Kazantseva-Miller; I fully endorse what you said. Thank you very much. It is very much going to be us looking at the individual awarding of inscriptions, and I think the point has been made by Deputy de Sausmarez that we may well have a lot more interest at the beginning as a flurry of excitement and interest, and we will have a discussion whether we release three or six inscriptions initially, in order, because there may be some pent-up demand. We obviously, as has been mentioned already, wish to avoid any delay in the process and keep it rolling as swiftly as we can.

Thank you, Deputy Blin, for your positive support. Yes, I think it will be part of our reporting back in terms of the number of properties, what has happened, what it has enabled as a policy, because we will be very interested to see that ourselves and obviously on the revenue side as well. So very keen to look at that to make sure that what has been several years of hard work by the previous E&I Committee, and now ourselves, actually bear some fruition and some fruit for everyone concerned.

Deputy Camp, a very good question regards to the ballot; we are not aware currently, although we have not spent lots of time and effort on this because we wanted to know that we could proceed with it in terms of a policy. There is not a specific ballot process that we are following, but it is something that we feel can be done. It is done in other areas, not necessarily to do with property, and is something that we, as has been already explained, wish to try and avoid people gaming the system by a first come, first serve.

Deputy Niles, thank you for your broad support. In terms of clarity, I think the value is for everyone concerned. It is for property owners, for developers and for the States. In terms of there is obviously an increase in value to the property for a new build development but then we are looking to – well, we are going to be charging a fee of £500,000 per inscription that gets transferred across to new build properties and was created as a new inscription, that is. So we will gain financially. The figures arrived at in terms of what was reasonable for a developer to take the risk, bearing in mind the investment and the time lag, to actually then transfer to a new property that has to be developed, has to be funded and that will lead into another question shortly.

Deputy Gollop, the detail of the ballot, as Deputy Inder very kindly pointed out, we are not actually here to design the ballot around this room today – 40 of us – that is detail that we will sort out and we will come back on, but obviously I would like you to be rest assured that we will deal with it professionally. We are not here to be taken advantage of, we want it to be done properly, but obviously fairly and transparently to people.

What was agreed was three inscriptions per year – new inscriptions per year – averaging 15 over five years. That was arrived at after a long period of consultation with the stakeholders involved because there are a number of people in the Open Market who do not want to see a major growth in the Open Market because they are concerned about the value of their own properties, yet we want to try to introduce it.

This is very much a suck it and see. We will see how this develops. There is flexibility for the Committee to change things in the future if we have an argument to justify that. So that is something we may well come back on. Yes, it is after several years of hard work that has been gone through. It has not been simple.

Thank you, Deputy Matthews, for your comment. The auction was considered and the feedback, as I recall it, is that the developers concerned who would be bidding for these new inscriptions were saying, 'Well, we do not know what the end figures are, how do we know what to bid to buy a site when we do not know what the end cost is going to be for the new inscription?' This way, they know up front. Anybody who wishes to buy a site and develop it wants to know what their costs are up front, as far as possible. Obviously, if you know it is £500,000 for the new inscription, you can put that into your figures and you can work back to the residual land value. That is how land values work. You work back to your residual land value of what you can afford. If it is an auction, it is open-ended and it is unknown. It felt it produced too much uncertainty into the market and therefore we potentially might reduce our interest by developers in the whole process. So after much debate and consultation, again, which is obviously sensible to do with the industry, that is what we decided.

I think I have covered all the points, thank you very much.

The Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, there are four propositions. Does any Member wish to vote differently on either of Proposition 1, Proposition 2, Proposition 3? Now on that basis I will put all four propositions to you together and I will invite the Greffier to open the voting on all four propositions.

There was a recorded vote.

2970 *Carried – Pour 33, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 0, Absent 4*

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	Hill, Edward	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne		Kay-Mouat, Bruno		Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina		Snowdon, Alexander		Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Inder, Neil				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: There voted in favour, 33 Members, no Member voted against, 3 Members abstained, 4 Members were absent. Therefore I will declare all four propositions duly carried.

STATES' TRADING SUPERVISORY BOARD

12. QEII Marina Gate Replacement (and the Associated Infrastructure) – Proposition carried

Article 12.
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether, after consideration of the Policy Letter entitled 'QEII Marina Gate Replacement (and the Associated Infrastructure)' dated 18 May 2026, they are of the opinion:-
To authorise the Policy & Resources Committee, following consideration and approval of the Full Business Case, to approve the release of funding of up to a maximum of £10.7 million for the replacement of the QEII Marina gates and associated infrastructure, through an interest bearing loan of up to £5.35 million and a grant from the General Revenue Reserve of up to £5.35 million.

The States' Greffier: Article 12. States' Trading Supervisory Board, QEII Marina Gate Replacement (and the Associated Infrastructure).

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Helyar, to open the debate, please.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir. Groundhog Day.

The STSB brings this proposition seeking authority for the Policy & Resources Committee to approve funding of up to £10.7 million for replacement of the QEII Marina gates and associated infrastructure, funded equally by an interest-bearing States' loan and a grant from the General Revenue Reserve, subject to approval of a full business case.

The QEII Marina is the Island's largest marina, providing berths for more than 700 local vessels and generating an operating surplus of approximately £1.1 million per year. That surplus is aggregated with other Guernsey Ports revenues to fund harbour infrastructure across the Island. It is not a peripheral asset. It is central to how Guernsey Ports currently finances itself. The gates at the marina entrance, or in total, arranged as inner and outer pairs across two channels, perform a critical function. Unlike the fixed sills used at the Island's other smaller marinas, these gates act as a movable sill, retaining sufficient water depth at low tide to keep vessels afloat but, by lowering it at certain states of tide, extending the tidal window for entry and exit. Without them functioning correctly, the marina would not operate as designed.

The gates and their supporting infrastructure, concrete sills, towers, pulleys, counterweights, sensors and control systems are 40 years old. A condition survey in 2022 identified a significant and growing risk of permanent failure. A further survey in 2026 found additional structural defects, particularly deterioration, in the concrete sills at the base of the gate mechanism. The gates are already exhibiting erratic and unpredictable behaviour, failing to rise on schedule or rising unexpectedly when vessels are passing over them. Increased maintenance is managing symptoms, not the underlying condition, which will continue to deteriorate.

If both sets fail, and the advice is clear that the likelihood of both failing is near-term and inevitable, water levels within the marina over a low tide period would fall on average by approximately one metre. That would make most marina berths unsuitable for vessels of standard draft. With a waiting list for marina berths already standing at approximately 100 at the end of 2025, any reduction in capacity of the marina to accommodate only vessels which can dry out or touch the bottom would be seriously damaging both to local boat owners and to Guernsey Port's financial position.

I want to address directly what the Assembly is and is not being asked to approve today. The States is not being asked to approve a specific technical solution or a settled design. The STSB does not have a preferred option. What is proposed is a design-and-build contract based on a performance-related specification. Contractors will be free to develop their own design and construction methodology in response to that spec. Whether that involves repairing the existing gates, installing a replacement set in the existing position, or installing a new set between the two existing pairs. The specification sets the outcome required, maintain the current tidal window, maintain current depth, achieve a minimum 25-year design life, and minimise future maintenance costs. How contractors achieve that is for them to determine and to price competitively.

The construction methodology, access arrangements, temporary works and the detailed gate solution will all materially affect the price, the programme and the risk. Design and build should transfer the interface risk between design and construction to a contractor, encourage genuine competition on value and avoid the States committing to a technical solution before the market's been tested. The £10.7 million figure before the Assembly today is therefore intended to be the upper bound based on a preliminary assessment. The most detailed estimate relates to a completely new installation and provides a prudent ceiling therefore for this request for funding.

Other options based on current high level estimates fall within that envelope. The final cost will only be known following tender and value engineering. That is why this proposition requests that

the Assembly grant delegated authority to P&R, conditional upon full business case approval, as the appropriate mechanism in this case rather than a fixed capital vote.

Guernsey Ports cannot absorb a project of this scale from routine operating surpluses without what are considered to be disproportionate impacts either on user fees or other essential capital requirements. Recovering the loan components solely through QEII Marina mooring fees would require an increase of more than 15% above RPI during the predicted lifetime of the replacement gates, clearly disproportionate for a single user group, and so repayments are intended to be met from general harbour fees and the remainder made-up with a grant from the general reserve. It is worth pointing out that if the Port's accounts and other capital sums had not been transferred to the capital reserve as a result of States' policy in the intervening period and there was general access to them for capital purposes, the STSB would itself have access to capital with which to carry out these works.

Sir, as a postscript, I will take this opportunity to express my personal dissatisfaction with the costly and unnecessary duplication of effort and wasted time between STSB and Treasury that this centralised Treasury capital control system process currently represents. It is only adding cost and time for no qualitative benefit to project completion, quality or value for money to the public. It is yet another example, much like the recent experience unfortunately of the GDA, of our government system attempting to create a facsimile of independence whilst imposing processes which effectively retain complete control. The summit of what this looks like to the public in real terms is problems such as the scaffolding on the airport roof and the endless process-led delays in resolving such problems.

Subject to States' approval today, procurement will proceed in 2026 with the full business case expected for P&RC approval in early 2027. Construction could then be completed during 2027 assuming contractor and plant availability.

I thank Members again, just in concluding, for their engagement in the presentation and in all of the questions that we have asked. I know some people have actually been down to look and spoken to Harbour staff as well about the issues that we have. I am grateful for the engagement, and I would just ask Members for their support in getting this important work completed.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: People are very quiet today.

I want to support the project. I think it is a complicated issue as to why it is on a half-by-half basis, some of it being fundraised through commercial loans, some from the States. I know STSB have been asking that, and there is a wider issue. Clearly STSB needs capital for day-to-day projects and it should not all be centralised. I agree with the President there. I hope it does not cost the £10.7 million or whatever it is. Hopefully, with this more open design and build approach, we will come in with a lower amount because it should not be a target, it should just be a ceiling for our purposes. It will be useful to see what comes back and whether this new way of doing things, which avoids micromanagement of us 40 people, as Deputy Inder does not like to see, whether the approach will be better. But I think that despite some Members probably having a misgiving over using part of our capital nest egg, and some Members not wanting to spend at all, I think you have to look at the political context of it.

In a useful question and answer session, we see very much the response that the problem has gone over time. But if it was all from Guernsey Ports, as it is currently constructed, not only would that be a huge burden for Ports, but it would require to pay for itself a substantial increase in current fees and charges. Some people would say boating is a luxury, others would say it is part of the Island's way of life, but we know from political feedback what an issue it was in the last term and, to a degree, at the election. Many people who do not personally own a boat, as we are told, derive benefit from participation and leisure boating of others, and I think it can be inclusive.

The specific point I would like to make is both in the presentation and in the questions, we are told that there is an economic benefit. Local owners spend on average around £4,000 a year on boating, excluding mooring fees. The vast majority was spent on Island. We are told there is spending on eating and drinking, buying groceries, buying fuel, and other entertainment and leisure activity. One would hope, too, they would be buying other products. When berth fees are included, it is more than £500 per vessel.

We have had the Marine Spatial Plan. I was happy to participate in that. There were lots of States' Members there, but still not enough. But surely if we are serious about the blue economy and taking full advantage of the recreational and leisure facilities that are on offer and the repurposing of our harbours, and maybe restructuring fishing as well, we must proceed with the infrastructure now and fully support this project and not await further reports or, for the sake of argument, the tax debate or the mid-term financial plan.

We are always waiting for something to happen so nothing ever does happen.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Sir, I rise simply to declare an interest. I have a boat in the QEII Marina.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: Thank you.

It seems to me this policy letter gets to the heart of a pivotal point, but it is fundamentally flawed to own and operate commercial trading assets, yet treat their income as general revenue, to the detriment of sound commercial practice. Having reflected on this, my instinct is clear. As an asset serving the leisure marine sector, this marina should be run on a proper commercial footing, independent, self-sustaining, with mooring fees structured to at least cover operational costs and long-term capital maintenance. Some may interpret that as an argument that private boat owners should bear the full cost and, I have to admit, that is where I started off in my thinking.

But the situation is not so simple. By choosing to operate the marina, the States of Guernsey has entered into a contractual relationship with its users. Boat owners pay for a service, a safe, well-maintained facility with reliable access. In return, the States has a responsibility to provide that service to an appropriate standard. That arrangement might have worked had Guernsey Ports been allowed to retain and ring-fence its revenues for maintenance and reinvestment. Instead, this asset sits in an uncomfortable middle ground, neither run as a true business nor supported as a strategic public service. Income is absorbed into general revenue, while spending decisions appear disconnected from the long-term obligations the States has entered into.

In that context, I welcome STSB's proposal to fund half of the required capital expenditure through commercial borrowing, recognising that the marina and port should be capable of servicing that debt. However, it is hard to ignore how inefficient this approach is. Borrowing externally at cost, simply to reinvest in our own asset, is an expensive substitute for what should have been routine reinvestment of retained earnings.

This highlights a broader issue. Commercial assets like this should be allowed to operate as real businesses, financially independent, accountable and focused on long-term sustainability. The current model, where such assets are pooled into the general public purse, creates distortion and undermines good decision-making. Indeed, I would go further, the operation of ventures like this should be as hands-off as possible from central Government and managed as viable, commercially disciplined enterprises.

Despite my general inclination to limit public expenditure, I will support this policy letter. It is the pragmatic choice in the circumstances. But, let us be honest, this situation appears to have arisen because the QEII Marina has not been allowed to operate as a self-sustaining asset.

I am persuaded by the representations made by STSB that they have done all they can to keep this gate operational beyond their intended lifespan and in testing tidal conditions. I am further persuaded when I consider the increase of manhours now deployed in the sticking plaster method of maintenance, resulting in Ports having to utilise external contractors from time to time to supplement the specialist nature of the work and the other calls on the team that cannot simply stop because the scale of this job has increased.

So while I will support this proposal today, I urge colleagues to reflect seriously on whether the States is structured or equipped to manage commercial assets effectively in the long term. We often say that Government is not a business. This is a clear example of why. Government struggles to run businesses because it cannot help but behave like Government.

The Bailiff: Deputy Strachan.

Deputy Strachan: Thank you, sir.

I also need to declare an interest because I co-own a boat in the QEII Marina.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

Deputy Blin: Thank you, sir.

I think the QEII originally was almost the cost of the marina and everything paid so much of the cost, and that was almost a commercial way of looking at it. I do have a question for the President of STSB, is that in his speech and I think looking at the report, it talks about the key condition survey referred to as carried out in 2022. I would just like to know if there has been another engineering report since, because I did not see it mentioned and I did not hear him mention it, but that would make a fundamental difference on the engineering side of it. Apologies if I have misheard. That could also change the risk assessment of what is the likelihood of the gate failure. He did give a number of examples of that at any time anything could happen, but it would just be good, given the fact that that report is four years old and the other ones will be according to what is happening in that space right now.

The other question is, looking at the difference between the capital grant and the interest-bearing side, why 50% each? If the £10.3 million, given the fact that Deputy Helyar spoke about inner gates, changing gates, changing, etc., that figure surely could be substantially higher or hopefully lower, as Deputy Gollop hoped, but does that have a bearing on the consequential impact on how the rest of it would be done, i.e. taking money from the marine income, etc.?

So it is just to get a bit more clarity, compared to the PFOS, which is 100% has to be done there. That is one thing. This one, I would just like to get a bit of reassurance from the President of STSB on those aspects.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Vermeulen.

Deputy Vermeulen: Thank you.

I have also got a small launch in the harbour, in the marina there, the QEII, and I regularly go out through those gates and have done probably for the 40 years that it has been in operation. Sir, there are a considerable amount of boats in that marina and I would hate to think what the cost, should those gates fail, of all the damage caused, especially to the large vessels that would be beholden to the States. So I would urge that after 40 years these gates are replaced and hopefully they can last longer than 25, maybe another 40 years for the future.

I understand from the Guernsey boat owners, and having looked at the accounts, is that the Ports – the harbour – makes a good surplus, but it quite often has to go up to the airport, which makes quite a loss. So basically the busier we can get the harbour, the marina, the airport, the more

people we can get through there, more duty we can collect, the better. That is what we should be aiming for; is growth.

With that said, I am going to support this wholeheartedly. It is a shame that we have not accrued each year a little something over the 40 years to allow for renewal. We knew they would not last forever, but they do need replacing. So maybe moving forward you could consider that so you are not in a similar position in another 40 years. I am sure John Gollop will still be making those speeches in this Chamber.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Helyar is correct, we are here at Groundhog Day again with a virtual gun held to our heads because there is not a do-nothing option. I would just like a bit more clarification about the repayment of the loans. It is a little bit quiet on that. It tells us in 6.5 that it is not practical to charge the users of the marina, the 700 users, because their rates will go up by 15% above RPI, but to defer the repayments on to harbour fees generally. I would like to understand a little bit more around what that will mean. Would it mean harbour dues going up for railroad traffic, for example, bearing in mind that railway traffic brings in 98% of our food? Will that be going up by 15% plus RPI? What will be the real-time impact on the rest of the Island on funding the gates for what is, in effect, 700 users, albeit I appreciate that those 700 users are buying other items in our economy and putting money into our economy. Those boat users are a valuable asset to Guernsey, which we do need to look after as well in harbouring their leisure function because again it provides all sorts of dribble down economic benefits.

In summary, I would like to understand the funding repayment method and what the impact will be on the general harbour users.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oswald.

Deputy Oswald: Thank you, sir.

I echo Deputy Vermeulen's thoughts. I, too, have a very small boat in the marina, but every time I go through the gates I think of the carnage which would ensue if those gates failed. Can I just ask one simple question, that a functioning depth over the sill gauge is installed in the new application since the one currently there or was there has never worked?

The Bailiff: Deputy Kay-Mouat.

Deputy Kay-Mouat: Sir, you will be surprised to hear I am not going to declare an interest. *(Laughter)* What I would like to say, though, is with this particular proposal, the STSB has actually instigated a progressive idea of getting consultants – or not consultants, getting contractors to actually come up with solutions rather than giving contractors solutions which we think are the best solution, whereas we are actually going to go out to the experts and ask them for their solutions.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy Helyar, to reply to that debate, please.

Deputy Helyar: Thank you, sir; and thank you Members for your contribution to the debate this afternoon.

To Deputy Gollop, I think most of what Deputy Gollop said was actually just a repeat of my opening speech so I could not see anything that really required responding.

Deputy Camp, I could have written that myself actually possibly. Music to my ears. Certainly, I believe, as a board, all of these entities running themselves with their own cash is what we would like to see, and perhaps more of that in discussions when we talk about GST outside of the room before the debate next month.

Yes, those entities running themselves independently and raising their own capital would certainly potentially reduce a lot of work, which we do on a political basis but which is largely just engineering and a choice of one engineering solution against another.

Deputy Blin asked about a more recent survey. I did mention in my opening speech that there had been another survey in 2026, a dive survey, and in fact some of the video was used in the presentation to States' Members. That included – for the benefit of the public listening – video of the area of scouring at the base of the sills that hold the gates in, but also testing the leakage in the sills where they are cracked by forcibly closing one of the gates at certain periods of the tide to show that there are cracks which are starting to grow in the structures.

Why 50%? Well, that is what Treasury have determined that Ports can bear out of its cashflow, and that similarly answers Deputy Gabriel's question that there is no plan for dues to go up in this regard. This financing has been structured on the basis of what the Ports can bear from their current cashflows. There was a plan originally to pay for this entirely out of rises in marina fees but those were very significantly resisted by boat owners.

Deputy Vermeulen, thank you for your support and, Deputy Oswald, I am not a current owner of a vessel that is in the QEII, but having owned several that have been in and out of there and having worked in the Ports in the past, I have been over that gate many, many, many times and, yes, depth over the sill would be a very nice thing. In fact, at one stage, the only way to know whether the gates were up or down was a red or a green line that was painted on the wall to show where the warps were, which was not a very reliable method, and certainly not one which anybody that was not local knew. So it was not a really safe way of doing it.

Just to echo Deputy Kay-Mouat's comments, we really have leaned quite heavily on his expertise in this area in order to ensure that we are getting to the largest extent possible external solutions to this rather than a dreamt-up solution within the Committee, which were then telling everybody how much money they can spend and which they then come back with a proposal for £10.69 million. That is not what we are aiming to do and, hopefully, we will not spend this much.

This represents a sum which would be the maximum based on all of the solutions that we looked at. So I hope to reassure Members that we will do our very best. It needs to go through another final project approval by P&R and another look over by Treasury once we have done the tenders and, at that stage, we will get on with the work. So I would really appreciative your support.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition so I will invite the Greffier to open the voting in respect of it.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 33, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 3, Did not vote 0, Absent 4

Pour	**Contre**	**Ne vote pas**	**Did not vote**	**Absent**
Blin, Chris	None	Inder, Neil	None	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne		Snowdon, Alexander		Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina		Strachan, Jennifer		Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				

Gabriel, Adrian
Gollop, John
Goy, David
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah
Helyar, Mark
Hill, Edward
Humphreys, Rhona
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Laine, Marc
Le Brun, Ross
Malik, Munazza
Matthews, Aidan
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Parkinson, Charles
Rylatt, Tom
St Pier, Gavin
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon

The Bailiff: In respect of the Proposition from the States' Trading Supervisory Board, there voted in favour 33 Members, no Member voted against, 3 Members abstained, 4 Members were absent. I declare the Proposition carried.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

13. Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting – Proposition carried as amended

Article 13.
The States are asked to decide:-
Whether, after consideration of the policy letter entitled "Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting" dated 19th May 2026, they are of the opinion:
To agree the schedule of prioritised legislative drafting as laid out in Appendix 1 of this Policy Letter entitled "Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting".

The States' Greffier: Article 13. The Policy & Resources Committee, Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy de Sausmarez, to open the debate, please.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I suppose it has a little bit of length to it, this policy letter, once the substance is taken into account, but really it is quite a short concept and I will keep my opening remarks very brief. This is really just an opportunity for the Assembly to take a look at the prioritisation that is afforded to the legislation that has already been approved by this Assembly.

It is not a complete view. Obviously, it does not show us the legislation that is coming down the track, for example, through the Committee Work Plans or further work on the GWP or anything like that. It is a snapshot in time but, essentially, Members will note that the items for legislative drafting, some of which go back some time actually, have been afforded prioritisation which is either low

priority, medium priority or high priority or prioritisation not yet determined, or words to that effect. That can also change.

So really this is driven by the Committee responsible. P&R have not waded in and decided that it thinks differently from any of the Committees, so this really does reflect the Committee's view of the prioritisation as it currently stands. Some of the legislative drafting is complex and time-consuming, some of it is more straightforward and can be done more quickly.

One of the key constraints is often if there is any subject matter expertise or policy input that needs to happen from the Committee side, so they need to work with the legislative drafters, and sometimes that is a key constraint as well. I am really happy to lay this before the Assembly and welcome any comments.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, there is an amendment that you want to move in respect of this. Do you want to move that now?

Amendment 1.
To insert immediately after "Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting" the following wording: "subject to the following amendment:
"For the line-item Billet IX 2025 (Article 15) "Driving Licence Category - D1 Not for Pay or Reward" substitute "High" for "Not yet prioritised".

Deputy de Sausmarez: Yes, please, sir.

It is a very simple technical amendment really. There was one that fell between the slats, and it was just on the prioritisation of one of the items which was marked on our policy letter and is not yet prioritised. It is in fact high priority – as Deputy Gabriel was very quick to remind me – so we are simply correcting that through this amendment.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel, do you formally second that amendment?

Deputy Gabriel: Wholeheartedly, sir.

The Bailiff: Is there any debate on the amendment? No. In that case, we will have a vote on the amendment to the Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Gabriel and I will ask the Greffier to open the voting on the amendment, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 0, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 2, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	None	None	Inder, Neil	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne			Matthews, Aidan	Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Camp, Haley				
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				

Hill, Edward
Humphreys, Rhona
Kay-Mouat, Bruno
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha
Laine, Marc
Le Brun, Ross
Malik, Munazza
McKenna, Liam
Montague, Paul
Niles, Andrew
Oswald, George
Parkinson, Charles
Rylatt, Tom
Snowdon, Alexander
Strategic Pier, Gavin
Strachan, Jennifer
Van Katwyk, Lee
Vermeulen, Simon
Williams, Steve

The Bailiff: We will now please close the voting, Greffier. So in respect of Amendment No. 1 proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez and seconded by Deputy Gabriel, there voted in favour 34 Members; no Member voted against; no Member abstained; 6 Members were absent at the vote and, therefore, I declare it carried.

Is there any debate on the Proposition? Yes, Deputy Camp.

Deputy Camp: I genuinely want to know what the point of this document is. It is called 'Prioritisation of Legislative Drafting' and yet making no definition of prioritisation that I have ever been taught. What it essentially looks like to me is a rolling flexible list that can be altered at any time. That is not prioritisation. It is a catalogue and it is one that just simply queues paperwork.

So I really wonder why we are wasting Government time looking at a document that seems to set out to purposely do nothing, achieve nothing and, yes, I think that is all I can really say on this one.

The Bailiff: Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Deputy Camp raises an interesting point. *(Laughter)* I am sure many Members may have a similar feeling. However, my recollection is it is a requirement of the Rules that previous States have wanted to have a hand in the prioritisation of legislation.

Deputy Camp is clearly challenging whether this enables that, but I think the value added from it can rightly be questioned. It clearly does take significant time for officers and indeed some Committee time in reviewing it and signing it off. There is probably some value in the sense that I think, prior to this, there was really no structured oversight of this ever-rolling and ever-increasing list of Propositions directing legislation.

I think the fact that when the President said, when opening the debate, some of this goes back a considerable period of time, of course does pose the question of whether it is still really needed. The mere preparation of it does at least allow that question to be asked. Perhaps there is an argument that more could be culled through that process, but there is always a temptation just to keep it there just in case.

That was not the main reason I rose, sir, and I apologise. I did submit a Rule 11 question in relation to one of the items on this list, which is actually the penultimate item on page 34 of the table. It actually describes itself as 'Revised Age Limits for Body Piercing.' I should advise that that is not what the States approved. *(Laughter)*

However, nonetheless the decision of the States was to effect the Ordinance from the beginning of this month, and that has not happened, and I had submitted a Rule 11 question to the Committee

for Health & Social Care, but apparently done so to the wrong address. So it has not appeared in this meeting's list of Rule 11 questions.

The reason for the delay is that the Committee has needed to consider the debate and a particular question raised by Deputy Cameron on seeking DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks on those that undertake this work, and that does seem to have grown legs. I think that is a very good illustration of some of our processes which go beyond the intentions of this Assembly. So I am hoping, with some engagement of the requêrants and Deputy Cameron, and the helpful contribution of Deputy Rochester and Deputy Oswald, that that matter can be resolved relatively quickly.

At the moment, the timeline, as I understand it, is that it will not be back before us before the end of the year which, in my view, is an unacceptably long period for a very straightforward piece of legislation which, to the greatest extent, this Assembly has already approved. As I have already warned Deputy Oswald, I may well submit a question for the next meeting in order to maintain some pressure on the system to hopefully enable this one item to pop out quickly. The purpose of the requête was precisely to avoid exactly what has now happened.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Both Deputy Camp and Deputy St Pier I think have cut to the chase on this issue. The prioritisation of legislation is a bit of an anomalous thing. I sat on the Scrutiny side of it for many years and I sat on the Prioritisation Committee for about 18 months and it did seem to me to be a bit of a, dare I say, Civil Service approach to the issue whereby you collated material from all the Departments.

When you look at prioritisation legislation, you can take a departmental view, you can take a Policy & Resources view and you could take a Law Officer view based upon the resources you actually have available and what perhaps is legally the most cogent. You can take an international view of what we need to do outside external affairs and internal affairs.

Deputy St Pier's point about body piercing or teenage piercing, or whatever, was a political priority that appealed to Members who supported it in a requête, and it appealed to us who voted for it. I do not think it would make the cut in terms of the hierarchy of legislation that perhaps we were encouraged to look it. There are other things like that. Some of us in Home Affairs have thought about maybe at some point revising liquor licensing, as they have been doing in Jersey, but that is not a priority in the scheme of things.

Actually, this has been a little bit of a chaser, this whole exercise, because I see we have more and more work to do on Home Affairs that we must get on top of. For example, I note there is the parole legislation which is a high priority. Revised draft ordinance regulations were sent to the Committee on 20th November 2021 relating to applications for parole revocation and recall in the Parole Review Committee.

Then further on, there is the Terrorism, New Offences. The Ordinance was approved by the States in April 2021 and just after COVID. In the following discussions with law enforcement and the Committee – that I was not fully aware of, it has to be said – it was noted these historical proposals did not go far enough. A lengthy report recommending much wider reform was submitted to the Committee within the last year. The report extends far beyond the comparison with the Terrorism Act 2006 and aims to consolidate all material gaps.

There is another one; people working with children and vulnerable adults. The Committee, meaning I think Home, plans to recommence work on this resolution as soon as resources allow. The Committee considers this to be a high priority for progression under the justice – that is not irrelevant to any safeguarding vulnerable group's legislation but may be wrecking and barring.

There are a lot of things to do and actually I think our Committee work and the work Policy & Resources do does have to reflect legislation. Maybe this point of this policy letter – and I am afraid the depressing 'bonfire of the vanities' when the resolutions get burnt that we are next going into

are a wake-up call for our States' Members because we are apt to vote for things, especially by amendment, and not follow them up.

If that is done in the last few weeks of a dying term, when half the Members will not even be in the next Assembly, that adds to our problems. So we have really got to get to grips with this and get on with it in all the Departments and not just prioritising the legislation but giving the correct instructions to our able Law Officers at St James Chambers so that their time is not wasted. That is perhaps a matter for all of our boards.

The Bailiff: Deputy Curgenven.

Deputy Curgenven: Apologies, sir. I am not like you. You do not seem to perspire in the heat. *(Laughter)*

I know on page 24 of the amendment or report, however you want to call it, I see 93 out of 108 is of course my favourite, the zero-based budgeting resolution that I seconded, and that came from Deputy Camp relatively recently.

So, obviously, just as a reminder to the Assembly, that was to direct the Policy & Resources Committee working with the Principal Committees to establish a programme for zero-based budgeting under which material – I will not go on. It was basically across all Committees. As I understand it, this has been rejected and we are looking at a process of something called zero –

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: I believe 17(6) applies here. I think Deputy Curgenven might be talking about the next policy letter.

Deputy Curgenven: Thank you. Apologies. *(Laughter)* I blame it on the heat, sir.

The Bailiff: You should drink more. *(Laughter)* So I will uphold that point of order. Deputy Curgenven has now sat down and we will have it all again next time, will we not?

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Sir, I enjoyed Deputy Camp's contribution today in terms of calling this a catalogue. I do wonder whether, as an Assembly, we need to actually rethink what happens with legislative drafting as part of our political process because if you look at other parliaments, such as Westminster, for example, each year with the King's Speech, you have your legislative policy agenda and the plan is that you complete that legislative agenda in that calendar year.

What happens in our case is that all the policy work that we are very busy doing as politicians with our officers go into, what I would consider right now, an entirely black box of legislative drafting. As a Deputy that has been in this Assembly for six years, I have zero visibility in terms of what happens with that black box.

I have also zero visibility of what kind of activities are going there to potentially improve the throughput of legislative drafting so that actually it could meet the political objectives that we are trying to achieve as an Assembly because we all come here to be able to effect change in the political term where we are elected. Not 10 years, 20 years or how many years down the line completely outside of our control.

I do not know how the legislative drafting black box is using technology such as AI. In my view, it is a prime case where I think AI efficiencies could be implemented, but I have no visibility into that and I do not know who does. I do not know whether that is Policy & Resources working with the St James Chambers and others. As Committees, we should potentially have options in terms of if we wanted to progress legislative drafting in a quicker capacity we could have the options of doing that. I do not think that is even on the table.

So I would really like to ask P&R, have they given any more thought in terms of whether the current process in terms of how we approach the legislative drafting black box is sufficient and whether, as an Assembly, we could choose to prioritise more resourcing to be put into this area where we could actually get through this catalogue of legislative changes that are required in a manner that we want through this political term.

So it is really a wider question, but I do not think we ever have a chance of policy letters coming to the States where we could debate those issues or proposals coming where we could actually understand what is going on and what can be done more efficiently.

The Bailiff: Deputy Collins.

Deputy Collins: Thank you, sir.

I will be very brief. Just following on from the last speaker, exactly when I returned to this Chamber, I did feel quite a difference – it has been a 10-year gap when I was last in here – about how different, in my opinion, the Law Officers were. I actually met them several months ago and I have actually had a couple of meetings now about the fact that I get from some Policy Officers one view about the legislation and when I talk to the Law Officers I get a different view. It is exactly the point that has just been raised about resources.

I sit on a couple of Committees who have some really interesting things and legislation they really want to happen. If we had to find additional money in order to put that into the Law Officers to get this done, then that is a conversation I am willing to have. To my surprise, obviously, the Law Officers have been asked to find 1% savings in the general round, so that could very well mean that we might be losing a member of staff because, obviously, the Law Officers heavily pay costs. So, for me, that was definitely a concern.

I absolutely echo the previous speaker that this is a conversation that we need to have. We must get much closer to our supporting team and the Law Officers, and this is something I said to them on day one, 'Having worked in the industry, on 1st July I was your new client, and I am surprised I have not seen you. Many of those on Committees have presentations from HR and Finance and various things, but the Law Officers, I have not seen you. I am your client'.

As the President of P&R said earlier today, P&R, through the Corporate Services, look after that pot, but actually they are working on behalf of Committees, so I do think we need to seriously look at this. I know it has also been mentioned today about the arm through EDDIAC. We are seriously looking at that because when the report came in about how much legal was spent on EDDIAC and possibly drafting in that, it was quite surprising the number because it was this top line.

So I definitely think there is a serious conversation to be had about how we are supported through legislation drafting and what we need to do. So, personally, if we need some more heads in there to get some of this done, I am willing to have that conversation and willing to bring amendments at Budget time to make sure we have the right resources with our legal colleagues.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: I will invite the President, Deputy de Sausmarez, to reply to the debate.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Camp kicked us off with a question of what is the point. I think actually the subsequent debate has neatly answered some of that. Essentially, as Deputy St Pier pointed out, this is in the Rules. This is something that P&R is required to do and so we have done it, but I think in terms of the more macro question of 'What is the point?', it provides the Assembly with a consolidated overview of what is in the legislative drafting pipeline.

I was quite surprised not to see any amendments, but the Assembly has the ability to bring amendments if they disagree with the prioritisation that the Committee has afforded. That was something that Deputy St Pier slightly alluded to really. So this is the Assembly's opportunity to influence and shake the prioritisation afforded to the legislative drafting resource.

It is also a really helpful discipline from a Committee perspective because in order to compile this, each Committee has to go through their legislative drafting programme, to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller's point, and afford a prioritisation. I am quite surprised to hear some of the comments about this being a black box. Committees really should be asking the questions about where the legislative drafting is.

One of the things that I think is quite useful on the spreadsheet that we have appended to this policy letter is it does help to anchor things to, for example, the Government Work Plan priorities, but it also gives a snapshot of where things are and why. Again, Deputy St Pier's question touched on that. So I think this is a really useful discipline for Committees to go through. I would encourage them, as per what Deputy Collins has just said, to get much closer and much more involved in it.

I think I was a complete pain when I was President of a Principal Committee with respect to the legislative drafting. So I think that is the point of it in all this and it does help, to Deputy Gollop's point as well, Committees themselves direct their own resources. If there is legislative drafting that they feel needs to be prioritised and if one of the barriers is the fact that actually resource on their side – so subject matter expertise – is not available, then that is something in the Committee's gift to remedy.

So I think Deputy Kazantseva-Miller described it as a 'black box' and she talked about the legislative policy agenda. Usually in this debate, it is me who pops up and says, 'Is it not dreadful that our legislation takes so long?' and then in every other parliamentary system the legislation is completed within the same term. We do not have that system but partly because of course we are all very conscious of resources. Again, Deputy Collins has just touched on this.

There are a few constraints in terms of why we cannot just throw money at the problem, because that was the question that I certainly put to previous P&Rs. Obviously, one constraint is financial resources, but actually there are others that are more material. So even where money is not as constrained, our ability to bring on board the right kind of expertise is one constraint in Guernsey. I think they actually do a pretty good job at having a broad base there.

Also the constraint that I have talked about is in terms of the input that is required from the Committee side. When you dig in and you get in under the bonnet why that piece of legislative drafting is taking some time, it is usually because of the things that Deputy St Pier referenced. For example, an additional complexity has come up in the course of talking through that policy decision with the legislative drafters or with the subject matter experts themselves. So these things sometimes are not as straightforward as we might like to perceive them when they are all neatly tabled in a spreadsheet.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller also talked about AI. St James Chambers were actually early adopters of AI. They have been quite innovative and it is quite interesting hearing how that has supported them and increased their productivity. To that point, and to Deputy Collins's point again, if Members feel it would be worth arranging a briefing or question and answer session, I think that is something that would be really worthwhile.

I think that covers all the points, apart from the point that relates to the next debate, which we will get on to, but for now, I thank Members for their contributions to the debate and hope that Deputy Camp has found slightly more point in what I said. If she has not, I hate to warn her what is coming next because there is something quite similar but, anyway, I just commend this to the Assembly.

Thanks.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, there is a single Proposition that has been amended and I am going to invite the Greffier to open the voting on the Proposition as amended.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 34, Contre 1, Ne vote pas 0, Did not vote 1, Absent 4

Pour	Contre	Ne vote pas	Did not vote	Absent
Blin, Chris	Camp, Haley		Inder, Neil	Leadbeater, Marc
Burford, Yvonne				Ozanne, Jayne
Bury, Tina				Rochester, Sally
Cameron, Andy				Sloan, Andy
Collins, Garry				
Curgenven, Rob				
de Sausmarez, Lindsay				
Dorrity, David				
Falla, Steve				
Gabriel, Adrian				
Gollop, John				
Goy, David				
Hansmann Rouxel, Sarah				
Helyar, Mark				
Hill, Edward				
Humphreys, Rhona				
Kay-Mouat, Bruno				
Kazantseva-Miller, Sasha				
Laine, Marc				
Le Brun, Ross				
Malik, Munazza				
Matthews, Aidan				
McKenna, Liam				
Montague, Paul				
Niles, Andrew				
Oswald, George				
Parkinson, Charles				
Rylatt, Tom				
Snowdon, Alexander				
St Pier, Gavin				
Strachan, Jennifer				
Van Katwyk, Lee				
Vermeulen, Simon				
Williams, Steve				

The Bailiff: In respect of the Proposition as amended, there voted in favour 34 Members; 1 Member voted against; no Member abstained; 5 Members did not participate in the vote and, therefore, I will declare that Proposition duly carried.

King's Baton Relay

The Bailiff: Let me tell you what is going to happen tomorrow. We are going to have the King's Baton Relay starting with the baton that we have had for the Commonwealth Games, that start in Glasgow next month. Every territory and nation that is involved in the Commonwealth Games, so that includes us as the Bailiwick of Guernsey, has been given their own baton this time to decorate.

There are three sides to the decoration. You can visualise it as a Toblerone. There are three sides to each of the batons and sixth form art students have been participating in designing the baton that we will have brought into the Assembly after Roll Call tomorrow morning. Everyone will get the opportunity to pass the baton between themselves.

The three designs are from Brooke Carre who is at the Sixth Form Centre, Summer Turberville who is at Blanchelande College – and see if you can guess which one that is – and Amelia Bell and Hannah Ozanne who are art students at the Ladies College. So they have designed each of the three sides to it. It is very much in keeping with Guernsey traditions. I am sure that you will be delighted to be able to see the baton that will be brought in here after roll call tomorrow.

So we will take a little bit of time to make sure that you all get the opportunity to inspect the work of the four art students who have designed our baton. What is going to also happen is that,

as part of the King's opening of the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, each baton has a single word that will form part of the opening ceremony speech of the King and you will be delighted to know that our word is 'Love'.

Therefore, when you see the baton tomorrow morning, you will be able to inspect all the sides of it, pass it amongst yourselves and we will take maybe 10 or 15 minutes or whatever before we then move on to the last three matters in the debate tomorrow.

I think with that, we will probably just close the meeting for today and then we will start tomorrow, have the roll call, and we will have the baton brought in.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.27 p.m.